

THE
WESTMINSTER
REVIEW.

JANUARY AND APRIL.
1877.

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

SHAKESPEARE.

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

~~~~~  
NEW SERIES.

VOL. LI.

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

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

THE
WESTMINSTER
AND
FOREIGN QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

— — —
JANUARY 1, 1877.

ART. I.—A MINISTRY OF JUSTICE.

ONE of the most illustrious among the lawyers of the great Empire in which legal history may be said to have had its origin, has defined the science of jurisprudence to consist in the knowledge of divine and human dispensations, acts, and dealings, and in the distinction of the just from the unjust.* This definition is so far correct, that no subject, either theological or scientific, or relating to the transactions of men with each other, either as nations or communities or individuals, can be said to be foreign to the science of jurisprudence, or to be such as may not from time to time be brought before the tribunals of whose conclusion the science of jurisprudence is or ought to be the guide.

The epoch of this definition was that of the plenitude of the imperial power, when the sway of the Roman Empire embraced the whole of the world, so far as then known to the races with whom we are historically associated. But it must be remembered, in adopting within the scope of the science of jurisprudence the knowledge of divine and human affairs, that at that time the magnitude of such an extent of inquiry did not appear so overwhelming as it may now seem. The range of metaphysical philosophy was not wide. It was not elaborated into the multiplicity of doctrines which have since appeared under its name. Theology had no separate text-books, and except in so far as it was included in philosophy, hovered between poetry and decaying superstitions. Natural science, as now understood, was non-

* "Jurisprudentia est divinarum atque humanarum rerum notitia, justi atque injusti scientia."—Ulpian, Dig. i. 1, s. 10.

existent. History was only in progress of formation, and political duty consisted in obedience to the will of the Emperor. There remained only, as the more special subjects for the study and exposition of the professional or philosophic jurist, what was known as *jus*, or right, or law, under its several heads of the *jus gentium* and *jus civile*. The mastery of these, to a reasonable extent, was not beyond the acquirement of competent and persevering application.

The *jus gentium*, which may be popularly translated as "the law of nations," related rather to what may be called the elementary and universal principles of action common to the human race, than to what in modern times is known as international law. There was no such thing as international law in the sense in which we understand that term. The imperial governors of the world recognised no equals. When they entered into treaties or alliances, more or less temporary, with protected or tributary kings or nations, they were themselves, by force of their superior power, the interpreters of the meaning of their own treaties. There was no arguing against the masters of the legions.

The *jus civile* included the whole laws of the Empire, as administered among its own citizens. As applicable to them, it included the principles of the *jus gentium*, which became more and more blended with the *jus civile* as the citizenship became gradually more and more extended.

When the Empire became consolidated, after its wars of aggression had come to an end, it was found that the political life, more or less free, which existed under the Republic, had also come to an end, and that almost the only function of civil life remaining open to persons of active intellectual tendencies, consisted in studying and promoting the administration of justice. In this way minds of the highest order were directed to the perception of the principles of right and duty between man and man. The circumstances were favourable. Much progress had been made in these principles under the praetorian administration of the Republic, and when they became a leading study and pursuit under the Empire, they were matured into a system so complete and perfect in its fundamental elements, and so general in its application, that, notwithstanding the dissolution of the Empire which produced it, it has remained the recognised basis on which all other systems of jurisprudence claiming to be scientific, are still formed. Without any authority, except that which is derived from its own inherent force of reason, it holds its place under the name *par excellence* of *The Civil Law*, and sometimes under the name of *The Common Law*, and it still maintains paramount weight in regard to almost every question which falls within its sphere. It was the principles of this grand system which Cicero pronounced to be "general and universal ; not one

thing in Rome and another in Athens—one to-day and another to-morrow ; but to be ever the same, exerting their sway over all nations and throughout all ages."

If the conditions of the Roman state had been otherwise sound, she might have become as glorious and permanent as a civil power as she had been great as a military one. But she had become demoralised by centuries of war and conquest, and the tribes and nations overrun by her were made tributaries rather than equals. She allowed them to become the prey of proconsuls and their parasites, and she preferred herself to subsist upon the plunder of the subjugated world rather than to turn the energies of her citizens to the pursuits of trade or industry, or to the development of the proper resources of civil enterprise. Weakened in her seat of empire by corruption from within and assailed by violence from without, she ultimately fell, but her history and her laws remain the property of humanity for the guidance and instruction of all future ages.

In recent times the fields of scientific and philosophical and intellectual pursuits have become so multiplied and enlarged, that it is impossible for any mind now to attempt a competent knowledge of the whole of them. The *notitia divinarum atque humanarum rerum* is no longer, in its full signification, within our ability. We may acquire a general knowledge of general principles, which will enable us, when necessary, to apply ourselves to details ; but as regards special proficiency, each man, as an individual, must be content that it shall be limited to the more special range to which he may find it necessary to restrict himself.

Some things, however, are essential to the most limited range of legal study. One of these is history. Our positive written laws are only fairly intelligible through a competent knowledge of their history, and the same history contains the only accurate explanation of our unwritten customs.

We find in history that whenever the idea of establishing positive laws arises among any community or nation, and when, emerging out of their primitive simplicity, they begin to discern the conditions of progressive civilisation, the tendency in the first instance is to surround the most ordinary transactions with forms and ceremonies. There are traces of this in the Old Testament.* In the early history of the Roman law the same rule prevailed. We find, for example, that some of the most ordinary transactions of life, such as the sale of any article or commodity, could not be carried into effect without the presence of seven persons in addition to the contracting parties. Other simple transactions were classified into special heads ; and

* Gen. xxiv. 23 ; Ruth iv.

in order to form any binding stipulation, a special form of words in the shape of question and answer—such as “*An Spondeo?*” “*Spondeo;*” “*An dabis?*” “*Dabo;*” “*An promittis?*” “*Pro-mitto,*” and the like—had to be repeated by the parties in the presence of a specified number of persons. The omission of any part of the formula nullified the contract. The terms of a testament or bequest, if not made in the form of a bargain and sale, had to be publicly declared and approved of in the courts or *comitia* of the state. But the requirement in this last instance had a meaning. It was thought to be a stretch of the right of property to entitle a man to devise and regulate any estate or means after his death, and the state, which could alone protect or give effect to the transmission, required to be a party to the bequest.

It is difficult to conceive, if any such system of ceremonial stipulation ever actually existed to the full extent, and if its history, as we have it, is not in some degree the result of tradition elaborated by the love of the marvellous, how any general dealing could have gone on. But these formalities did not continue to prevail. As transactions multiplied, cumbrous ceremonials were found to be unsuitable, and by the device of what were called *actiones utiles*, introduced by the prætors in contradistinction to the *actiones legis*, which followed on the formal contracts, means were found of giving to *bona fide* transactions, in which the specific ceremonies had not been observed, almost the same effect as if they had.

These prætors exercised judicial functions in all matters, other than those of public and state affairs, reserved for the senate and for the popular courts or *comitia*. It was the practice for each prætor, and also for some of the other magistrates, on entering office, to compile and issue a sort of summary or code of the principles of law and equity according to which he proposed to regulate his judgments during the period of his tenure. These documents came to be known as the *Edicta Magistratum*. Each successive prætor, who, of course, would have his clerks or assistants, would naturally frame his own code or edict more or less according to the model of his predecessors, modifying it according to circumstances, and to continually increasing experience of the operation of previous codes or edicts. The tendency would be to relieve their rules more and more from the incumbrances of ceremonialism, and gradually to introduce more and more the elements and principles of general equity. Each new code or edict would be practically a revised and improved edition of previous ones. In this way the fundamental principles of jurisprudence were continually growing and maturing towards the perfection which they afterwards acquired. It is possible that, with the future growth of the state and the increasing multiplicity of affairs,

much was done, as in our own Government, in the name of these great officers without their personal intervention in each matter ; but the effect was nearly the same. If this were so, it led practically to the fact that the prætors, instead of personally judging in each case, became ministers, as it were, of the departments, which performed the work in their name and under their supervision.

The same course of procedure virtually continued under the Empire as under the Republic. The leading offices were still nominally preserved, and most of the forms of senatorial and popular election were still maintained. These were so managed as to concentrate all the offices and all their powers in the person of the Emperor. The Emperor, then, as the head of the state, arranged his Government with a view to ensure its most effective working, and the administration of law and justice would naturally fall into the hands of such persons as might, by their training and qualifications, be supposed to be most capable of rendering the best services in these departments. There was little occasion for jobbing (as we would call it) such appointments into the hands of incompetent persons, because there were ample means otherwise for providing for favourites and adherents.

Every Roman patrician was held to be devoted to the service of the state, and was held to be bound to apply himself to the studies and acquirements necessary to qualify him for all the offices of the state. It was considered part of the duties of his station to know the laws of his country, and one of his highest privileges to be the patron and advocate of such clients and followers as sought for the assistance of his forensic skill. Among this class, or along with it, an order of lawyers arose, of great reputation for learning and ability, who were resorted to for their opinions, not merely by private parties, but by the judges and magistrates for their guidance on questions involving difficult or conflicting principles. These opinions were known as the *responsa prudentum*. Many of them were regarded with the highest respect as settling questions of general interest, and took their place among the authoritative legal writings of the time.

Such a system as this was well calculated to develop the principles on which justice and equity ought to be administered. The long peace which followed the accession of Augustus, the advancement of learning from the introduction of the Greek philosophy and literature, the grandeur and extent of the interests which fell to be regulated according to these principles, and the absence of other fields of intellectual avocation or ambition, drew into those of practical and scientific jurisprudence the most cultivated and powerful minds of the time. They had the whole civilised world for their sphere of action, and their fame extended even beyond it. Horace tells us in the *Carmen Seculare*, that even in his time

the barbarians of the outer world sought advice from Rome on questions of legal principle,

Jam Scythæ responsa petunt, superbi nuper, et Indi.

This particular statement may, perhaps, to some extent be a rhetorical one, but in any case these great jurists had all the dealings of all the nations and peoples of the Empire within their cognisance, and they extended to this great sphere the application of the doctrines which had been growing up and maturing themselves among them.

It was in this manner that jurisprudence formed itself into a great body of scientific principles and propositions and doctrines. Peace continued. There was no such thing as free political life or controversy. Christianity, or what passed for Christianity, was making its way underground, as it were, but otherwise, except in the shape of the Stoical and Epicurean philosophy, religion, as understood by modern sectarians, was almost non-existent. Hence the administration and discussion of questions of jurisprudence continued to form almost the only avocation of intellectual civil life. The works and opinions of the Augustan and other lawyers became overlaid with additional decisions and emendations and commentaries, until the bulk of legal literature became too overwhelming for practical use. This state of matters ultimately led to the preparation of the famous Institutes and Pandects or Digests of the Emperor Justinian. In the former of these works, he caused his lawyers to set forth the fundamental principles of the science of jurisprudence, and in the latter what were looked upon as the most esteemed and authoritative doctrines of the most eminent jurists of his own and previous times, upon the points to which they refer. He enacted that these should have the force of law throughout the Empire, which was still practically co-extensive with the greater part of the civilised world.

The Institutes and Digests, afterwards added to by what were called the *Novæ Constitutiones*, *Novellæ*, and other enactments, have ever since been the basis of almost all European systems of law and equity. Their direct application became interfered with by the breaking up of the Empire, by the rise and predominance of the feudal system, and by the introduction of the ecclesiastical laws and customs which afterwards became embodied in the Canon Law. They had probably ceased to be directly taught upon their own authority during what are known as the dark ages, but the effect of their principles and operation was embodied in the habits and customs of all the nations which had formed a part of the Empire. Their doctrines formed the basis of the feudal laws themselves, in so far as legal learning was applied to the exposition and regulation of feudal principles; they formed

a great part of the elements of the Canon Law ; and when their direct teaching was revived after the time of the real or alleged discovery at Amalfi, it must have been received rather as an exposition of doctrines in many respects already familiar, than as the introduction of an unheard-of novelty.

During the first three or four centuries of our era, the whole of what is now known as England, and the southern parts of what is now known as Scotland, were directly governed and administered as Roman provinces. The power of the Empire then became a declining one, and she ultimately withdrew from the British Islands, leaving them in the hands of their native kings and chiefs. Both chiefs and people must have continued to be influenced by the traditions of the imperial administration which had so long prevailed among them. This is a period which there is scarcely any history to elucidate. But we find that as the power of the Church increased, her laws and regulations were full of the principles and maxims of the Civil Law, as might have been expected from priests and lawyers, whose education must to a considerable extent have been derived from its teaching. One remarkable example of the completeness and organisation of ecclesiastical law and regulation as regards the northern portion of our island is found in the canons of the Church of Scotland, drawn up by the Provincial Councils at Perth in 1242 and 1269, under the authority of a bull issued by Pope Honorius III. in 1225. These canons are given in the Appendix to Hailes' "Annals of Scotland."*

When the direct study of the Civil Law was resumed, it received its place as a recognised and universal authority without any express legislative adoption. It took its place in this way in Scottish jurisprudence, and is referred to in its legislation and by its institutional writers as an accepted portion of the laws of the realm.† Its principles and practice still rule in Scotland, and formulate much of its ordinary daily procedure. Among other points, it may be noticed that the Scottish verdict of "Not proven" in criminal prosecutions, which has been so much commented on, is simply an historical counterpart of the Roman verdict of "*Non liquet*." We venture to think that, in the cases to which it applies, it is quite as becoming a termination of the proceedings as the dismissal of a jury because they cannot agree, when the evidence is not such as to enable them satisfactorily either to acquit or to condemn.

Our own proper written law is embodied in our statutes or Acts of Parliament. These statutes, as is indicated by their form, are the enactments of the sovereign, with the advice and consent of the Estates of the realm.

* Lord Hailes' Annals of Scotland, 3rd Edition. Edinburgh. 1819.

† Erskine's Institutes of the Law of Scotland, B. i. t. i. s. 41.

The rules according to which these Estates originally acted and voted in the several portions of what is now the United Kingdom, in the preparation and adjustment of their various proceedings and Acts or statutes, cannot at present be altogether understood or explained; but many of these statutes, especially in the northern division of the island, have been prepared with a degree of effectiveness and precision far beyond what might have been expected in the rude ages to which they belong. In some of the Scottish statutes there are indications of economical wisdom and consideration for the humblest classes of the community which have no counterpart among their southern neighbours. An Act of 1449, for preventing the removal of agricultural tenantry or peasantry labouring the ground during the currency of their leases, in the event of the lands being sold or taken in execution, is a remarkable example of this. The explanation of such wise and systematic legislation in Scotland seems to be, that it was the practice, before introducing measures for the consideration of the Scottish Legislature, to have them put into shape by a body known as the Lords of the Articles, which generally consisted of the most sagacious and experienced statesmen and lawyers of the time. After the measures had been prepared by this body, and their principle approved of by Parliament, they underwent another revision upon the responsibility of the Clerk of Parliament before taking their place in the statute-book. The Lords of the Articles were discontinued after the Revolution of 1690, but their place seems to have been well supplied, and there is abundant evidence that through all this, and through the successive measures regulating judicial and other procedure in Scotland, high legal skill was rarely wanting in the ministry of Scottish legislation and in the Scottish administrations of the time. The Scotch Act of 1701 for regulating liberation in bail, and for enabling prisoners to compel the proceedings against them to be concluded within a limited period, is one of the best examples of wise legislation for the protection of personal liberty.

The continuous recognition in Scotland of the authority of the Roman Law, and its study by Scotch lawyers both at home and abroad, tended to maintain the cultivation in Scotland of law as a science. In the seventeenth century Lord Stair embodied the law of Scotland, as it then stood, in the Institutes of the Law of Scotland which bear his name. His work was directly modelled on the Institutes of Justinian. The leading precepts of the Civil Law, the authorship of which are ascribed to Ulpian, namely, *honeste vivere*, *alterum non lædere*, and *suum cui tributum*, and many of its other maxims and precepts, are referred to as matters of familiar and continuous application. It is interesting to reflect how far some of these carry us back, and how interwoven are the chains of thought throughout mankind.

Since the legislative union of the two countries, the Scottish Parliament has of course ceased to exist as a separate body, but it has been the good fortune of Scotland to preserve, in the functions of her Lord Advocates, a certain extent of qualified superintendence as to the language and terms of new legislation affecting that portion of the kingdom. The successive Lord Advocates have themselves initiated a great part of this legislation, and they have more or less taken a general charge of the whole. The position taken by them has been attended with great benefit to the community. They have fulfilled in some degree, as regards Scotland, the functions of a Ministry of Justice, and have been the means, from time to time, of improving the administration of justice in all its courts, civil and criminal, as well as the general administration of the country. Among other matters, they have done so in regard to its Prisons, Poor-Laws, and Lunacy-Laws; they have greatly amended its Bankruptcy-Laws; and they have introduced a system of Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages, and of Land Valuation for public purposes, unequalled in any other country. It is purely as matter of voluntary favour that the Lord Advocates have undertaken many of these functions, and they only do so so far as agreeable to themselves. The supervision of the general legislation of Scotland forms no part of their remunerated duties, and they do not in any way hold themselves responsible for errors, defects, or inconsistencies.

The fierce rovers of the Northern seas lay outside of the range of Roman civilisation. When the portion of our island which we now know as England was invaded and occupied by them and their followers, they made to a great extent a severance of continuity in regard to its previous laws and customs, both imperial and native, and substituted their own. So complete was the change, that they even obliterated the previous names of the days of the week, and they introduced new territorial allocations and divisions under the names of shires, wapentakes or hundreds, tithings, and the like.

The Norman Conquest, which afterwards followed, brought in the fental laws in their most tyrannical and odious form; but the Normans were numerically inferior to the Anglo-Saxon population, and, beyond the introduction of feudalism, they seem in other respects to have allowed many of the customs, like the language of the majority, ultimately to prevail. Except, therefore, in so far as the influence of Roman connection prevailed in the Church, of which England was always a very turbulent subject, she retained very little trace of the institutions of her earliest conquerors.

The Anglo-Saxon character favours individual independence, and has always preferred communal and divisional to centralised government. This has its advantages and disadvantages. It

promotes the formation of manly and self-reliant habits both of mind and of body, but it tends materially to impede united action and efficient administration. When Norsemen and Saxons were acting the part of invaders, and were incited by the common purposes of conquest and plunder, they carried all before them ; but when they themselves became the occupants of the conquered territory, and their separate and disjointed communities had no longer any proper coherence, they fell in their turn before the compact and disciplined forces of the new Norman invaders. These had their inheritance both of Roman and feudal training. They supplied among the people whom they had overpowered that general organisation which until then had been deficient, and which ultimately welded both conquerors and conquered into a united nation. It will be observed that all the high offices of state which still subsist in England, and their names and functions, are derived from the Normans. On the other hand, the language of the conquered has ultimately prevailed, and their laws and customs were also so far adopted that the barons assembled at Merton in 1236, professing to speak on behalf of the nation, in the famous declaration *nolumus mutare leges Angliæ*, refused to admit the authority or influence of the Civil Law of the Romans.

When the House of Commons was first instituted, it does not appear that it was intended to be what it ultimately became, a representative legislature for the purpose of enacting the laws of the country and of superintending their execution. The sending of members to serve in the House of Commons was imposed upon the shires and boroughs rather as a duty than as a privilege, and they were expected to strengthen the hands of the sovereign by assenting to his views, and by furnishing him with supplies, rather than to control his general policy. As causes of complaint arose from time to time in different parts of the kingdom, it became the custom to claim the right to discuss and obtain redress of grievances before proceeding to grant the supplies. Ultimately the whole practical control of the statutory legislation of the country came to be in the hands of Parliament, and more especially in those of the House of Commons.

During all this period, from the institution of the House of Commons to our own time, the only supervision which the administration of law and justice in England has received, has been such desultory and occasional attention as has been given by Parliament when occasional hardships or complaints have been brought under its notice. There has never been any continuous, systematic, or uniform supervision. A popular body, consisting of many hundred members, with discordant opinions, and with all kinds of diversified interests claiming their attention, is not adapted to the supervision of details which require skilled professional knowledge in order to be comprehended and intelligently dealt

with. Evils must attain great magnitude before they can be pressed on the attention of such a body, and even then the discussion may be of no avail, unless there be general co-operation and concurrence as to the remedy.

In regard to the administration of justice, the evils which claim to be dealt with consist mostly in the sum of many small evils, and in individual loss and hardship, rather than in any great conspicuous general wrong; they often involve differences of opinion both as to their cause and cure, and are frequently of a nature which cannot even be made intelligible, much less attractive, to a general assemblage, at one time composed largely of powerful landowners having interests of their own, and, in early times more especially, intolerant and resentful towards lawyers and all others who might seek to maintain the doctrines and principles according to which all men ought to be equal before the law. So far from availing themselves in these times of the assistance of the lawyers, who alone were capable of keeping their proceedings in reasonable and consistent shape, the powerful interests which held the ascendancy treated them as nuisances, and declared them ineligible to hold seats. The famous *Parliamentum indoctum* was the result, and it has become the laughing-stock of history. The House of Commons was obliged again to admit the membership of lawyers, but notwithstanding all that has taken place, neither that branch of the Legislature nor the other, nor the Executive Government as a whole, have ever adequately recognised the place which jurisprudence ought to hold as a department of the state. They have failed adequately to recognise that, after the defence of the realm, the next duty of the state, or what Adam Smith calls "the second duty of the sovereign,"* is the protection of the person and the administration of justice between man and man. They do not appear to have ever duly apprehended this to be the great primary function of peaceful government, and the leading object for which, next to external defence, the body politic is associated into a state.

There were, no doubt, courts of justice established which were presided over by the king or his judges, but when once they had been established to meet the primary necessities of order, they seem to have been very much left to themselves. The judges had to maintain themselves mostly by fees derived from the suitors. They and their clerks had a direct interest, therefore, in multiplying the technical and other difficulties of procedure, rather than in promoting simplicity and despatch. Each separate court had also a direct interest in extending its jurisdiction, in regard to the nature of the causes brought before it, beyond the limits

* Wealth of Nations, B. iv. ch. 9, and B. v. part ii.

assigned to it in its special appointment, such as the Court of King's Bench for criminal causes, the Court of Common Pleas for suits between subjects, the Court of Exchequer for revenue claims, and the like. In order to accomplish these and similar indirect ends, the monstrous anomalies known as fictions of law, such as that of suppositious assault and battery, suppositious ejectments, and the like, were invented, and were recognised by the judges as enabling them to afford redress which would otherwise have been beyond their jurisdiction. In this way, no doubt, a sort of justice was dispensed in circumstances in which it would otherwise have been unattainable, but the very idea of such a device as a set of substantially false allegations as a ground of legal process is opprobrious to truth and common sense. Above and besides all this, there was, until very recently, the conflict between the Courts of Equity and the Courts of Common Law deciding on the same facts between the same parties in opposite ways. Such anomalies and contradictions could not have prevailed for a day, and probably would never have been thought of or resorted to, except in the absence of proper legislative or administrative supervision, and except for the difficulty, in such circumstances, of obtaining effective amendment of the causes which led to these absurd expedients. In the general confusion and want of system which prevailed, and in the total absence of adequate or efficient supervision, the law of England, in some of its most important departments, has been pronounced by one of its leading commentators to be "the most intricate and unnatural that was ever adopted by a free and enlightened people."* Mr Hallam on the same subject says †—

"The vast extent and multiplicity of our laws have become a practical evil of serious importance, and an evil which, between the timidity of the Legislature on the one hand, and the selfish views of practitioners on the other, is likely to reach, in no long period, an intolerable excess. Deterred by interested clamour from abrogating what is useless, simplifying what is complex, or determining what is doubtful, and always more inclined to stave off an immediate difficulty by some patchwork modifications than by acting on a comprehensive scheme of legal philosophy, we accumulate statute upon statute and precedent upon precedent, till no industry can acquire the mass of learning that grows upon the panting student, and our jurisprudence seems not unlikely to be simplified in the worst and least honourable manner, by a tacit agreement of ignorance among its professors."

It is not difficult, in the sketch of history which has been attempted, to see why this should be the case. Jurisprudence is a science requiring special training and the highest skill and

* Blackstone's Commentaries, B. iii. ch. 17.

† Hallam's Middle Ages, 12th edition, vol. ii. p. 342.

ability for its mastery. It is, moreover, a living science, which has to be applied through living and fallible machinery, and which requires continuous adaptation to the ever-changing wants and dealings and exigencies of the community among whom it is applicable. A popular assembly does not possess such training, and is not qualified to give such continuous supervision to the operation and administration of the law, or to devise the measures which are from time to time necessary for its amendment. It might be otherwise if such an assembly had any functionary charged with the duty and responsibility of explaining and submitting to its deliberation, such matters pertaining to jurisprudence as might require its attention. The Attorney-General does not, even by implication, undertake the charge which, to a certain extent, the Lord Advocate fulfils in regard to Scotland; and except as far as any one may be actuated *ex proprio motu*, the jurisprudence of England is not the special charge or concern of any human being. Nominally it is said to fall under the charge of the Lord Chancellor and the Home Secretary. The former has no means of interesting himself actively in the matter. As to the latter, it is simply an absurdity to say that he can take charge of it, as the gentleman who fills the office is not necessarily even a lawyer.

It is not enough to say that any person may at any time bring a grievance before the House of Commons. What is every person's business is no person's business. It is not every person who sustains or knows of a legal grievance that is able to explain or to make an effective claim for redress. Even when this can be done, it is difficult to gain the consideration or sympathy of a great popular assemblage with innumerable other claims upon its attention. The House of Commons, like the great Jove himself, should not be troubled except with matters worthy of its interference. An elephant can pick up a pin, but if we have no means of picking up pins without calling in the intervention of elephants on each occasion, they are likely to be left where they are. It is the same with many of our legal and other abuses. There are more than mere pins to pick up. There are old weeds with strong deep roots, and new varieties of weeds, perennially springing up. Mr. J. G. Phillimore, in commenting on some of the imperfections of our law, and the difficulty of obtaining amendment, remarks, with almost ferocious bitterness, on our inaptitude for rational or systematic progress in such matters, and mentions as an illustration, the circumstance that England was nearly two centuries behind the other nations of Western Europe in adopting the Gregorian Calendar.* We may add, that she has not yet found time or opportunity to abolish the tradition of ignorant barbarism, which renders the clumsy and ridiculous

* Phillimore's *Private Law among the Romans*, p. 6.

addition of a piece of stamped wax or a wafer necessary to validate a signature. Indeed, the English mind seems to be singularly callous to legal enormities. It seems to look upon them as something inevitable and irretrievable. In criminal process, when a man refused to answer or plead to the charge, instead of simply recording his silence as equivalent to a plea of not guilty, our forefathers could think of no better device than pressing him to death (*peine forte et dure*) as a means of getting him to speak. It is amazing, in the light of the present age, to read the complacency with which Sir William Blackstone extols the tenderness and reluctance with which this most foolish and horrible operation was usually carried into effect.* Within the last few years we have read of savages in New Zealand being sentenced to be drawn and quartered for "imagining the death of the Queen:" under the old and not less savage treason-laws of England, and, through our clumsy practice of leaving the initiation of criminal proceedings to policemen, instead of to qualified professional public prosecutors, we have seen an Italian in London sentenced to be hanged for a murder that he did not commit, and only saved by a spontaneous investigation, undertaken by the benevolence of his countryman, Mr. Negretti, at his own expense. We have seen, through similar blundering, another foreigner of education and position (Dr. Hessel) undergoing imprisonment and severe penal treatment for another murder, the perpetrator of which is still undiscovered, whereas it was evident from the first that he had not, and could not have had, anything to do with it. In civil process, again, the simple course, adopted in almost every other civilised country, of holding a defendant as confessed when he does not appear in court after being duly summoned, was scarcely known until recently, and is not even yet fully adopted.

The only proper remedy for these and other defects and anomalies is one which exists in almost every other state of advanced organisation except our own. It is that of the establishment of a permanent Ministry or Department of Justice. Such departments exist in France, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and other countries in Europe, and in several countries beyond Europe. It can only be gross prejudice or lethargy, or incapacity of organisation, that prevents the establishment of such a department in our own country. Its place is not filled by any of our existing departments. No sound argument of any kind has ever been offered against it, and several of our judges and legislators have pointed out its necessity. It was made a special topic in an address delivered by one of the Scotch Judges

* Blackstone's Commentations, B. iv. ch. 25.

in 1874, and afterwards published.* In this address Lord Shand expresses his opinion that "until the great want of a Ministry of Justice should be supplied, there was no reason to believe or to hope that the general common and statute law of the kingdom would be placed on a better footing than at present." If we are to have such a department—as have it some day we must—its head should probably be a legal peer (a life-peer or otherwise), with a Chief Secretary in the House of Commons, and two Under Secretaries for England and Scotland respectively. The details may be matter of arrangement, but the institution itself sooner or later is indispensable. Royal Commissions, Committees of Parliament, and the like, are of no permanent use. Tribonian himself could not codify our statute and other laws as they stand. Even if a code were more practicable than it is, it would be insufficient, and, with the progress of time and circumstances, it would always be becoming more so. A code at best can only regulate for a time. It cannot superintend. It is a department doing the work daily and continuously that can alone be effectual.

No doubt many reforms have been made in the law since the time of Sir William Blackstone, but there are still many serious defects and incongruities, and the administration of the law still lacks the only kind of supervision which can conduce to the promotion of simplicity, uniformity, or consistency. The Law of Equity is still but very imperfectly welded with the Common Law. The judicial power of the Supreme Courts is wasted on work which might be done by inferior tribunals, and the enormous and growing accumulation of undisposed-of cases, and the delays and remnants of our assizes, inflict an amount of loss, hardship, and inconvenience far beyond all means of calculation. The scandalous latitude allowed in the cross-examination of witnesses, under which they may be compelled to answer questions irrelevant to the facts in issue, to the injury and disgrace of themselves and others, and of which there have recently been several flagrant examples, is still unrestrained.† The election, qualifications, and functions of coroners are all on the loosest footing. It is quite inconceivable that, if there had been a department for the purpose, all this, or at least a great part of it, would not have been remedied long before now.

The want of a proper department is felt financially as well as legally. The English County Court system was introduced in 1846. It was founded, to some extent, on a similar footing to the Scotch Sheriff Court system, with the distinction that the jurisdiction of the English County Courts is not so extensive in

* Address by Lord Shand to the Scots Law Society. Edmonstone & Douglas, Edinburgh.

† Digest of the Law of Evidence, by Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, Q.C., art. 129. London. 1876.

civil process, and that they have not as yet any criminal jurisdiction, such as is exercised by the Scotch Sheriff Courts. But the expense of the English County Courts is enormously greater than that of the Scotch Courts. In England the Government not only pays the judge and clerks, but the bailiffs and other officers, who in Scotland are exclusively paid by their employers, according to the work they may have to do. In England the Treasury pays even for the imprisonment of private debtors, whereas in Scotland the whole charges of imprisonment and all other kinds of execution, when resorted to, are defrayed exclusively, in the first instance, by the individual creditors, with, of course, the right to recover them from the debtors when they are able to do so. Mr. Russell, County Court Judge of the Manchester circuit, in his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Imprisonment for Debt (Answer 4973), says, that it is "perfectly monstrous" that the community should be charged with these expenses. The public returns show that these County Courts, over and above the salaries of the judges, cost about £300,000 a year for items for which there is no corresponding public expenditure in Scotland. These charges have all arisen under the eyes of Parliament since the institution of the County Courts in 1846. No one knows who is responsible for them, and there does not seem to be the least attempt to control, or prevent, or diminish them in any way. If there were a properly-constituted Ministry of Justice, such abuses might never have occurred. It would, at all events, be known where the responsibility lay, and where redress ought to be looked for.

Waste in one direction leads to injustice in another. Ireland has never yet got a County Court system for civil debts, and it seems that practically there are no reasonable local means of recovering small debts in that country. It may be that the Government dreads a repetition of the monstrous charges which have occurred in England. It could be shown that more than half of these charges are not only unnecessary, but unjustifiable, and that, under proper management, very much less than what is now spent in England alone would maintain an improved system of these courts in both countries. It adds to the indefensibility of the position, that the Supreme Courts in Ireland are maintained on a footing notoriously beyond the requirements of the country. •

Better consideration and better drawing of judicial Acts of Parliament is another matter in which the assistance of a Department of Justice would be expected. Many miscarriages in legislation must be within the experience of almost every person engaged in the practical business of life. Space will not admit of mentioning more than one example of the kind, but it

will be a recent and familiar one. Of all subjects of legislation, the law of master and servant is one which ought to be expressed in clear, concise, and self-contained language. Instead of this, the Master and Servant Act of 1867 makes reference to and adopts as part of it, no less than twenty-one other Acts of Parliament. Some of these make similar references, so that, without examining the whole of this library of legislation, the Act of 1867 is in many respects unintelligible. Even with the help of these other Acts, its language is so obscure and confused, that the Supreme Courts of England and Scotland have given opposite judgments on the fundamental point whether or not, in certain circumstances, the Act applied to contracts of service other than those entered into in writing. The High Court of Justiciary, in the case of *Kershaw v. Mitchell* in 1872 (2 Couper's Reports, p. 206), held that it did, while, on the other hand, the Court of Queen's Bench, in the case of *Banks v. Crossland* in 1874 (Law Reports, Queen's Bench, vol. x. p. 97), held that it did not. In violation, again, of every existing principle of law as to the responsibility of infants, which is held in the privileged classes to extend to twenty-one years of age, the language of the Master and Servant Act of 1867 makes children in pupillarity liable for breach of contract to punishment as criminals. The same anomaly is continued in the Employers and Workmen's Act of 1875, by which the Act of 1867 has been superseded. It is even made more pointed, because, while an adult breaking his engagement is now only liable for civil damages, an apprentice, however young, doing the same thing, is liable to imprisonment from time to time, apparently for ever, as long as the apprenticeship is unserved.* A responsible Minister of Justice could scarcely have permitted such a provision to pass without protest. If he did, we should know whom to blame.

The Master and Servant Acts are not perhaps the most clamant or the most suitable subjects of attention. We have selected them, because they are recent Acts, professing to amend and simplify the law, and that in some respects, more especially as regards the Act of 1867, they have signally failed to do so. Probably, with a proper system of scientific law, and with a proper system of judicial administration, the question of master and servant should be left on the ordinary footing of the law of contract. In Scotland, where the system of judicial administration is in many respects better than in England, it is understood that questions between masters and servants are mostly dealt with in the ordinary local courts, on Common Law principles, and that the special statutory legislation on the subject is very little resorted to.

* The Employers and Workmen's Act, 1875, sec. 6.

The Master and Servant Act of 1867, like many of our other Acts, is understood to have been to a great extent the product of legislative amateurs. The practical work of drawing Acts of Parliament is not a function for such people. They may have the most proper and laudable sentiments, but, if they want to put their views into legislative shape, they must have skilled hands to do it for them. They are no more able to do it for themselves than they are to build St. Paul's or to command the Channel fleet. It appeared very easy and very simple to one of our historical amateurs to enact that seven halfpenny-loaves should be sold for a penny, or for the National Assembly of the French Revolution to decree that their assignats should pass in place of coin, but, fortunately or unfortunately, such enactments are soon found to be impracticable.

It may be pointed out that, besides England, the United States of America is almost the only other civilised country in which there is no Department of Justice. What we read and hear of the administration of justice in that country is not likely to invoke our admiration either of its purity or of its efficacy. It would not be right to say that there have not been, and that there are not, in America both judges and lawyers of the highest eminence, but the point here is the nature of its administration generally, and the prevailing impressions in regard to it.

If a Department of Justice were established for the United Kingdom, it would at once have work on its hands which would probably more than occupy its energies for the present generation. Some matters requiring its attention have already been mentioned. Besides these, it would have, in the first place, the arrangement of the whole of our courts of justice, civil and criminal, and the regulation of their procedure. These, under any system, will always require continuous supervision and adjustment from time to time. It would also belong to a Department of Justice to see to the amendment of the Land Laws, the amendment of the Bankruptcy Laws, and the amendment of the Criminal Laws, including the practice of coroner's inquests, and the establishment and supervision of a system of public prosecutors. In regard to this last subject, the somewhat satirical remarks under the head "Prosecutor" in Chambers's Popular Encyclopedia" can scarcely be considered exaggerated. The department would also have the general supervision of our statute law, and the task of gradually placing the whole laws of the United Kingdom on a homogeneous, simple, and consistent footing, so that we might gradually attain a clearness and efficiency of expression which might ultimately give us all the advantages of a code. This has not been by any means kept in view as much as it might. Even when so great a lawyer as the

late Lord Westbury proposed to limit the right of recovery of tradesmen's accounts in England to one year after their being incurred, he paid no regard to the fact that a law to a similar effect, but for a more reasonable period, and of much more judicious operation, which he did not propose to repeal, was already in existence in another part of the kingdom. In this way, under our present want of system, we are always more likely to increase than to diminish existing diversities.

As far as space will admit, the views now stated show the scope and importance of the science of jurisprudence, and the place which that science, and the administration of law and justice in accordance with it, ought to hold in regard to the general government and administration of the state. While we are at peace with other nations, as Mr. Hume says, the whole vast apparatus of government has as its first object the distribution of justice. Looking, however, to past experience, we fear it will be long before the illogical countrymen and descendants of the race of Athelstane the Unready are prepared to carry that or any other primary principle into efficient or symmetrical operation. Logical or moral consistency can hardly be expected from a nation which maintains the largest and wealthiest of its official corporations to teach as truth, what its universities and colleges and men of science, and even the humblest thinkers who try to aim at moral and rational consistency, all but unanimously hold and teach and demonstrate to be the reverse.

ART. II.—THE WARFARE OF SCIENCE.

The Warfare of Science. By ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, LL.D.,
President of Cornell University. With Prefatory Note, by
Professor TYNDALL. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

IT has always seemed to us a matter for some wonder that people should take such a deep interest in the peddling events of poor individual human existences, and so little in the dynasty of ideas, that they should be content to wear their eyes out over the drivelling three-volumed account of the loves and hates of vapid men and women; to indulge their finest emotions over the fifth act of some puling melodrama, and yet be altogether indifferent to the gigantic drama of truth, in which the unity of place is the world, the unity of time the centuries, and the actors are beneficent truths or malevolent errors.

Why men should be indifferent to those momentous events in the past which constituted the history of science, the history of philosophy; and, in the truest sense, the history of religion; and yet should enter with such eager zest into the gossip of the day and the trivialities of personal reminiscence, it is difficult to say. Why they should be quidnuncs of the borough, when they might be denizens of the larger realm of vital history, it is not easy to conjecture. But, however hard it may be to discover the meaning of, there is no possibility of doubting the fact. While the personal histories of men who have very small claims upon our better sympathies are read with avidity, the impersonal narrative of truths which have paramount claims upon our hearts and heads are treated with the passive contempt of neglect. Men are much to us, while doctrines are little. We like to have our truths in the flesh; and we are too apt, when we find a doctrine incarnated, to neglect the sacred revelation and worship the man, to transfer the reverence which is due to an idea to the individual who is, as it were, the bearer of it. Here we have, in epitome, the history of many religions. Men will worship the truth with startled reverence, then they will worship the truth-bearer, and overlook the truth, in the symbol, and forget that of which it is the sign.

But the history of science is not a tranquil narrative of happy relations, but a troubled history of battle and murder. Here those who have a sympathy with the quiet evolution of great thoughts will not alone be satisfied, but the lover of the stirring incidents of cruel persecution, of brave perseverance, and of intrepid martyrdom, will also find much to his morbid taste. The annals of science are ghastly indeed, and the intellectual truths which contain the broad likeness of Nature, can boast as many martyrs as the moral truths which depict the human heart. Dr. White is not guilty of straining a metaphor when he speaks of the "Warfare of Science," and he has the merit of having written a very readable account of the incidents of the long campaign of the war between the growing revelation of facts and the decaying revelation of superstition. We are constrained to praise not only the contents of this little book, but the spirit in which the work has been conceived and executed. The President of Cornell University is an able man, but he has undertaken to treat in very few pages of print a very difficult subject. The barren detail of the horrid facts of persecution might of itself have been easy, but to retain command of the temper and judicial calmness so necessary to the adequate exposition of the grim inter-relations of science and religion, was by no means easy. Some unfairness, some intellectual bigotry, against doctrines which had been held to sanction such outrages

to truth, might have been pardoned, but the absence of the necessity for such excuse from these succinct and graphic pages calls for grateful recognition and admiration. Dr. White is peculiarly fair and just, and yet the result is, as Professor Tyn-dall says in the prefatory note, that he shows "that against the benefits which religious associations have conferred upon humanity stands a vast debit of committed wrong." Had the conclusion been other than that, the history of the war must have been improperly read—and facts disguised. But, as we said above, Dr. White is peculiarly fair; and considering the dimensions of the work, it is peculiarly full. What we required from a writer who undertook to treat of that paramount warfare which has been going on through all these later centuries, and which is not ended even now, was a wisdom which could see the excellent uses to which, in the gradual progress of humanity, religions have been put; and yet at the same time, while he treated prejudices with the consideration which those defects of intellectual culture deserve, would yet recognise the evils which had been wrought in the name of religion, and by those who professed to be the chartered exponents of God's truth, while they were "riding with darkness," and afraid of the dawn which they were ungenerous enough for a long time to obscure. It would have been easy to declaim upon such a subject, but the President of Cornell University is content to explain; and the story itself is eloquent enough of abuses of power, and subversions of religious truths without the aid of extraneous rhetoric. But we said that the warfare of science is not ended, and consequently a history of the struggle between the Church and the truth is by no means unimportant to us. We cannot but think that Dr. Maudsley, in his introductory lecture at University College, made too light of the difficulties which are in these new days thrown in the way of the promulgation of scientific truths. It is true, as he says, that the modern scientist has not to encounter the Inquisition, which made Galileo say with his tongue words which were apostasy to his heart; nor has he to go, like Geordano Bruno, to the stake as the alternative of a refusal to utter a recantation of the truth; but had he read Dr. White's book further, he would have found instances enough of the continued war which is waged against science even in these free days. It is true that the war is waged more feebly by religionists now than it was. They are losing ground. They have lost temporal sovereignty for their Pope, and they have set up the spiritual despotism of infallibility instead. But in miniature we see the same blind ignorance opposed to scientific advances, we see the same resistance of the light by those who pretend that it is their duty to make the Sun of righteousness to shine,

the same intolerance of truth which is not Hall marked by themselves, which was so diabolically illustrated by the persecution of Copernicus, of Galileo, of Roger Bacon, of Vesalius. Even Dr. Maudsley himself, with considerable shrewdness, in an earlier portion of his lecture, points to the agitation against vivisection as an instance of theological opposition to scientific discovery; for he says that "there was more in the fierceness of that agitation than a laudable feeling of compassion for the animals—an intensity of acridity betraying another origin." But in the work before us there are instances enough of this modern warfare. Here is one instance of that bigoted intolerance which is the great enemy of progress. In 1847 Sir James Simpson advocated the use of anæsthetics in obstetrical cases. The fact that that able physician was a devoted, nay, almost a fanatical religionist, did not protect him from the roughness of a storm of theological opposition and abuse. The pulpits—like great religious mortars—began to open fire with their explosive texts. His suggestion and practice were denounced as impious, on the ground that Scripture had said that women were "to bring forth children in sorrow," and that the use of anæsthetics "was an attempt to avoid one part of the primeval curse on woman." Here we have the same old arm furbished up, and again—as during many centuries of stark ignorance—doing war against science—the argument that the Bible is not only an excellent compilation of wise, and, in some instances, dramatic poems, but is an inspired hand-book, not only of chemistry, of astronomy, of meteorology, and of geology, but of midwifery.

Sir James Simpson replied to his adversaries. He even turned their own guns upon them, and in one of his pamphlets he said: "My opponents forget the twenty-first verse of the second chapter of Genesis. That is the record of the first surgical operation ever performed, and that text proves that the Maker of the universe, before he took the rib from Adam's side for the creation of Eve, caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam."

But the Scotch controversialists were not to be silenced by one text. Other hireling verses were forced into the service, and not a little sacred abuse was bestowed upon the physician who had done so much to alleviate suffering—to make the dark and burdensome hours of life less dreary and less heavy—to rob disease of its tortures, and death itself of some of its anguish. Those who know the amenities of Scotch theological controversy will understand Sir James Simpson's position. In the end, however, Dr. Thomas Chalmers—a most wise and good man—engaged in the battle on the side of humanity, and secured to his suffering fellow-creatures one of the greatest boons which has been given to mankind even by science. But those who think

that peace has been proclaimed must be ignorant of many facts of modern history. It is not long since conscientious men, both in Sweden and the United States, objected to the taking of a census because the numbering of Israel was condemned in the Old Testament, and David was punished for his disobedience in that regard. And in Bishop Dupanloup's writings, Darwin, Huxley, and Lyell are stigmatised as authors of "shameful theories;" and a vigorous and determined attack was made upon advanced education in France by the Cardinal de Bonnechose in the Senate. It is true that in that recent encounter, as ultimately in all others, science was victorious, and the energetic dignitaries of the Church were only laughed at after their vigorous explosion of tremendous invective; but the incident is of itself sufficient to show that the struggle is not ended, and that this history of the warfare of science is interesting to us not only in its antiquarian aspects, but has a very urgent present concern to all who have the good cause of truth at heart—a cause which can only be advanced by the possession of liberty, which it has always been the object of religion to withhold. That some of the incidents of the warfare should be put upon paper without fear or favour is therefore a matter of some importance.

There is always danger in a figure of speech. "We all of us," says George Eliot, "grave or light, get our thoughts entangled in metaphors, and act fatally on the strength of them;" and it is very certain that men who have created tropes have not unfrequently been ruled by them. It is a very obvious metaphor to call the incessant struggle which has been going on for centuries between the emissaries of science and the emissaries of the Church a warfare. There have been deeds done which change the metaphor into dire fact. It is not improper to compare the various rhetorical and polemical missiles to instruments of battle. There is therefore no want of appropriateness in the title of Dr. White's book, but it is unfortunate, we think, that he should have been so much influenced by the happiness of his simile as to carry it with him throughout. There is as much genius shown in knowing when to drop as when to employ a figure of speech, and possibly Dr. White carries his comparison to too great a length. It is possible, however, that the origin of the work—for it was at first a lecture, and was expanded into its present form—may account for the continuity which is given to a trope which gets rather threadbare before he has finished with it. Figures of speech are best put to ephemeral uses.

It cannot be doubted, then, that the work is full of interest. The subject is a great one—nay, one of the greatest, and although some of Dr. White's chapters are sketchy and inadequate, it is only fair to say that, in view of the object and dimensions of

the work, it is a remarkably full and perspicuous history of some very terrible events—events which have an intense interest in relation to the history of progress, events which in their ugly outlines are here starkly sketched as a ghastly lesson to a foolish, a superstitious, and cruel humanity. Each of the individual episodes is a startling human tragedy. The lives of the martyrs here referred to demand as many tears and more admiration than those who died for a faith which, when its day of power came, could in its turn become persecutor—a faith which set its face against God and His daily revelations of science, and attempted to stamp out the truth of the world by the aid of the self-same means which the pertinacity and firmness of Christianity had baffled. As we said above, even for those who cannot rise to the high sympathy with truth itself—to those to whom the vicissitudes of men are fraught with far more fascination than the vicissitudes of thoughts, this book contains much matter that will interest. The story of Galileo, which since the discovery of the documents relating to the trial of that martyr to science, by M. de l'Épinois in 1867, has not been fully given in our language, is here narrated with care and accuracy. The strange infatuation of ecclesiastics in relation to scientific truth is as well illustrated by the Church's treatment of Galileo as by any other chapter in history. The astronomical fallacies which were adopted by the Church were only paralleled by the geographical absurdities which she put forth as scientific explanations of the phenomena of nature. Nothing is more curious in the history of ideas than the circumstances of their genesis. Just as, before the sun shows his brightness above the eastern edge of day, hill-tops glow with a proxy splendour which may well dazzle the eye into the belief that the sun is atop the morn; so ideas, before they are in the sufficient sky of the intellectual firmament, seem to send out their rays of illumination to lofty minds, and make these prematurely bright with the unfulfilled truth. Thus it is that even when the truth has come and is recognised, we seem to have been familiar with it from of yore, for the dawn "broke the news" of day. Thus from early times there seems to have been slight adumbrations of the rotundity of the earth.

In the works both of Plato and Cicero there are definite foreshadowings of the truth as to this matter; and the references in other places to this cardinal fact were sufficiently explicit to induce certain fathers of the Church to assume a hostile attitude to the coming doctrine. They began to insist upon the interpretation of natural phenomena in the light of revelation. No doubt a revelation, if authentic, would be an absolute guide to truth concerning all matters in connection with which it pretended to enlighten; but there has always been a difficulty in

ascertaining the authenticity of the so-called revelations, and their supposed accuracy has been speedily refuted and shown to be false in the light of the revelation of progress which broadens through the centuries, which is not a fortuitous gift, but a laborious achievement, the revelation of learning, of science, and of true philosophy.

Very early in the history of Christianity we find an inimical attitude towards science. Eusebius endeavoured to throw contempt upon those who would follow physical science. Lactantius was of opinion that the pursuit of astronomy was "mad and senseless, and argued that it was ridiculous to suppose that there are men whose footsteps are higher than their heads, that the crops and trees grow downwards, and that the rains and snow and hail fall upward toward the earth." Such arguments, however absurd, could be met and refuted; but the doctrine which was opposed to this true geographical notion of the earth's rotundity was that which has been opposed to almost every scientific discovery, to almost every social advance—the doctrine that Scripture did not teach that truth, and that consequently the notion must be false and heretical. It is a fatal error to attempt to make a book, however excellent that book may be, the measure of the universe. Even man himself is no measure of the universe, if by "man" we mean the individual and not the race; but the product of individuals—however able these individuals may have been—who could only reflect the dim lights of a necessarily dark age, must inevitably fall shorter and shorter as a hand-book of morality, of philosophy, and of science, as the race advances from feeble beginnings toward perfect day. The multifarious nature unfolding herself before the centuries in all her order and in all her brightness, was but ill depicted in the dreams of early singers or the expositions of half-informed preachers. To discredit all those features which they had not seen was the retrograde policy of the Church. Thus St. Augustine took his stand upon Scripture in the controversy as to the rotundity of the earth. Scripture had not mentioned any descendants of Adam inhabiting the other side of the earth, and consequently there could be none such. It never occurred to those men that in opposing Nature to a Book they were pitting the weak against the strong, and that the only result which could follow was the refutation of the fallacies which abounded in their favourite text-book. They were blind to the very obvious truth that they were showing the futility of Scripture as a guide to physical science, and were not in any way impugning the truth of the scientific doctrine they assailed. The Bible has, however, by almost all those who have opposed the advance of truth from the direction of science, been regarded not only as a valuable history, which it is; not only as a volume of almost

incomparable poetry, which it is ; not only as a compendium of the purest and most beautiful morality, which, in its latter portions at least, it is ; but as an exact scientific text-book, which it is not. They have been content to tear the soul out of grand passages of poetry in order that they might substitute the meagre statements of what they supposed to be science. They were content to lose sight of the higher truths which were taught by the genius of these early writers, in which sense truly they might have laid genuine claim to inspiration ; and were anxious to make good their reputation in the field of accurate science, in relation to which they were, in no sense, prophetic.

But as the doctrine of the rotundity of the earth was not snuffed out by a whiff of Patristic contempt, it fell to the lot of Cosmas to demonstrate by means of the Scripture that the earth is a flat parallelogram, surrounded by four great seas. At the outer edges of these seas, according to this religious toady, rise walls which make the universe a sort of box, the lid whereof is the vault of heaven. This ridiculous theory was supported by numerous texts from Scripture warped from their true meaning, and turned to the base use of buttressing the weakness of absurdity. The curious conception of proof which must have existed to sanction such a palpably fallacious method is worthy of illustration. That the heavens were a lid was proved by the words of Isaiah, "It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, that stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain, and spreadeth them out like a tent to dwell in ;" and the theory that above the star-sprinkled firmament there is a vast reservoir of water is proved by the quotation of the text, "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters ;" and the accuracy of this surmise is confirmed by a reference to the fine ejaculation in the Psalms, "Praise him, ye heaven of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens." Bacon said that the ugliness of the ape lay in his resemblance to man, and the contemptibleness of such reasonings as these is the greater because of their distant resemblance to proof, and because they assume the sacred likeness of demonstration. They might be amusing if we could regard them as the efforts of children who had said, "Come let us play at Logic ;" but they are pitiable when we have to look upon them as grave efforts at scientific explanation. But had the action of the Church gone no farther than the attempt to heap the obloquy of hard words upon the sacred achievements of science, had it gone no farther than the childish ratiocination of Cosmas, little harm would have come of it. Time fights against foolishness. The ridiculous cannot stand the test of centuries, and laughter is sure to follow upon the heels of

such a feeble science as that which Cosmas invented in the supposed interests of religion. But unfortunately religion has not been content to leave results to the stronger arguments; but, having the power, has attempted, at all times, to force conclusions by means of violence where it could not compel them by reason; and to insist upon convictions with threats and tortures, where it could not win belief by argument. It is always difficult to contend in controversy with an antagonist who does not hesitate to secure acquiescence by means of an Inquisition or a stake; and the Church has always shown herself an unflinching advocate of the efficacy of compulsory conviction. Even in this early controversy, theologians were not content with representing a belief in the antipodes as a damnable heresy, but had recourse to the persecution of those who believed it. However, the faith in the flatness of the earth, which they regarded as so salvatory, was destined to die out. It has been said that the difficulties we encounter are our allies, and in that case Columbus had no need of friends. He had in the first instance to encounter the obstinate opposition of the Bishop of Ceuta in Portugal, and in the second he was opposed in the Junta of Salamanca by the theologians, who proved to their own satisfaction, from the writings of St. Paul and St. Augustine, that the audacious speculation of Columbus could have no foundation in fact. Still Columbus succeeded—succeeded in making his gigantic contribution to the geography of the earth, a contribution which greatly strengthened the doctrine of the sphericity of the world. But victories have been won from the Church foot by foot; and even after this notable discovery of a new world, Pope Alexander VI. issued a Bull, laying down a line of demarcation upon the earth as a flat disk, and in the plenitude of his power divided the East and the West between the Spaniards and the Portuguese. In 1519, however, the earth was circumnavigated by Magellan, and the arguments of the theologians and the Bulls of Popes were shrivelled in the strong light of truth.

But the Church showed a wonderful inaptitude to learn by experience, and it profited little from its exposed errors of the past in its controversy as to the centre of the universe. The pathetic stories of the lives of Copernicus and Galileo are narrated with care and candour in Dr. White's work; and as possibly it is in this connection that his essay is most adequate, and as it is in relation to the struggle between Faith and Science as to the astronomical discoveries of these men that readers are best informed, we propose only to allude to what Dr. White properly designates one of the greatest battle-fields in the warfare he has undertaken to describe.

Any reader who has truth at heart must sorrow as much for the compulsory apostasy of such a man as Galileo as for the martyrdom of a Geordano Bruno. Every man or woman whose heart is open to the large and kindly influences of human sympathy, and who is not precluded from the genuine feelings with others by the narrow selfishness of superstition, must feel revolted by the trickery with which the Church endeavoured to crush the truth which was too strong for it; and by the pettifogging logic and scurrilous casuistry of those apologists who, when the truth had prevailed, endeavoured to excuse and vindicate the barbarous actions of that holy institution.

But it is necessary to point out, as the President of Cornell University does—for, as we said above, there is no bigotry in his pages, and no bias in his book except the bias to the side of truth—that this opposition to the truth was not confined to the Roman Catholic Church, but that the truth had as vindictive enemies amidst the professors of the Reformed doctrines.

Nothing is stranger than the uselessness of experience to some persons. After the early vicissitudes of the Christian Church, one would have imagined that those who professed the religion of peace—those who took for their example the lowly and forgiving Preacher of the Sermon on the Mount—those who had had experience of the horrors, and at the same time of the ineffectiveness of persecution to stamp out doctrines even when it annihilates men, would have been the last to have recourse to those weapons of power and of cowardice which had branded not the victims but the persecutors with infamy, while they sealed the truth of certain great moral doctrines with blood. One would have thought that the children of martyrs would have been the last to become persecutors. One would have imagined that they would have had confidence in doctrines which had flourished in spite of the malice of power, and which had not yielded to the violence of infidelity, that they would have had no fear for the integrity of such doctrines when power was upon their side, and when emperors and kings counted themselves the subjects of a great spiritual hierarchy. But, strange to say, they had not learned that lesson. The wealth and power of the Church as an institution had become great, but it abused that wealth and that power with an indiscretion and a recklessness which were quite comparable to the folly of those who had preceded them in these dangerous possessions. Those who ought to have learned tolerance from their own early need of it, only showed intolerance, or the incapacity to exercise power when fortune favoured them with that edged tool. But if such would have been rational expectations with regard to the early Church, surely we

might upon similar grounds have anticipated better things, in relation to science, from the men who carried out the Reformation. We might have believed that those who saw so many errors in the Church of Rome that they felt it necessary to free themselves from her trammels, who protested against the superstitions of the Church, and separated themselves from her communion at personal risk and in spite of Bulls and proclamations, would have accorded a similar freedom to those who prosecuted science to that which they claimed for themselves in their own devotion to a pure religion—that men who had been alive to certain important truths which negated the pretensions and chicanery of the Roman See, would have yielded their assent to the facts which were brought to their knowledge by science. But that was not so, and Luther was no less urgent for the recognition of the Bible as a hand-book of astronomy than Bellarmine. "People," he said, "gave ear to an upstart astrologer, who strove to show that the earth revolves, not the heavens or the firmament, the sun and the moon. Whoever wishes to appear clever must devise some new system, which of all systems is of course the very best. This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy. But sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still and not the earth." And Melancthon, too, argued in the same way. "The eyes," he says, "are witnesses that the heavens revolve in the space of twenty-four hours. But certain men, either from the love of novelty or to make a display of ingenuity, have concluded that the earth moves, and they maintain that neither the eight spheres nor the sun revolves. Now, it is a want of honesty and decency to assert such notions publicly, and the example is pernicious. It is the part of good men to accept the truth as revealed by God, and to acquiesce in it."

We might concur with Melancthon in the last proposition, although we would differ from him in regard to the exact nature of the revelation. Not, as he seemed to think, has God spoken only through the writers of Psalms and Ecclesiastes—which, according to him, leave no doubt as to the fixity of the earth—but through all men has the truth of the universe been made clear. If Moses was, as Bacon finely calls him, "God's first pen," surely Copernicus, Galileo, Vesalius, Kepler, and Newton have been eyes and hands to God. If the writers of books which we would not hesitate to call sacred—for the presence of truth will sanctify all meaner things—were inspired, not less inspired were those who read the great Book of the Universe, and interpreted the language of Nature in the interests of the welfare, the happiness, and the prosperity of mankind. These men, too, were revealers of the truth, and we may well

say with Melancthon that it is the part of a good mind to accept it, and to acquiesce in it.

We have already said that the work before us is exceedingly explicit as to the life of Galileo, and the persecutions which took place in connection with the Heliocentric theory in astronomy; for its author not only traces the painful details of that indelible blot upon the Christian escutcheon, but also describes the pusillanimous excuses which have been made for the conduct of the Church in relation to Galileo, and the casuistic apologetics of such writers as Marini, De Bonald, Rallaye, and De Gabriac.

His reference, too, to the Nebular Hypothesis, although very short, is not without interest. That theory, guessed at by Bruno, reasoned out by Kant, and fully developed by Laplace—that theory of the natural evolution of an organised universe, was opposed by the religious world. It was a blow at the Mosaic cosmogony, and hence those who dealt it were assailed with hard names; for religious people have a very vituperative vocabulary, and even when worsted in argument are seldom excelled in the use of sacred Billingsgate.

However, hard names break no bones and cannot long impede the progress of the truth. For a time the opponents of this nebular hypothesis were triumphant, when the construction of more powerful telescopes resolved many heavenly bodies which had in earlier times been regarded as *nebulæ* into distinct stars, and they inferred somewhat hastily that because some of the so-called *nebulæ* had been proved to be galaxies of stars, all would in time be resolved. They were content to wait until a larger reflector than that at Slough was constructed.

The all-important discovery of the spectroscope, however, set this disputed matter at rest. The discovery of Fraunhofer, that the spectrum of a solid or liquid body is continuous, while that of a gaseous body is discontinuous, was made a means, in the able hands of Kirchhoff in Germany, and of Huggins and others in this country, of determining the real nature of a great number of the *nebulæ*, and it has been proved that a very large number of these are gaseous bodies; and therefore we find that the nebular hypothesis has been startlingly confirmed from a new and unexpected quarter.

Passing, however, to Dr. White's chapter upon chemistry and physics, we would note a contribution to the interesting controversy as to Lord Bacon's services to Philosophy and Science. After referring to the great pioneer of modern science, Albert of Bollstadt, against whom the charge of sorcery was brought so effectually as to procure his condemnation by the authorities of the Dominican order, and ultimately, alas! his compliance with the

scholastic methods which were prescribed to him ; after alluding to Vincent of Beauvais and to Roger Bacon, concerning whom he speaks some admiring but not fulsome words, he refers to the life and labours of Francis Bacon, who did so much to lead the modern world to the appreciation of the proper use of the experimental method. "Strange as it may at first seem," he says, "Francis Bacon, whose keenness of sight revealed the delusions of the old path and the promises of the new, that man whose boldness in thought did so much to turn the world from the old path into the new, presents, in his own writings, one of the most striking examples of the strength of the evil he did so much to destroy." And by some apt quotations he shows that while Bacon fully understood the pernicious consequences of the theological method, and appreciated to the full the advantages of experiment and observation untrammelled by Scriptural interpretation and foregone conclusions, yet that he himself yielded, upon occasions, to the temptation of forming that spurious amalgam of science and religion, and would incorporate with his perspicuous observations of nature some vague and superstitious interpretations of the sacred writings. But possibly he infers too much from the existence of some stray expressions in Bacon's writings which favour that view. Possibly every bookmaker is a little of a time-server, and while Bacon was a thorough disciple of the true method, and especially repudiated the old as an unmitigated evil, we cannot but think that these expressions were only sopas to the Cerberus of popular superstition. Bacon was not only a great philosopher, and, in so far as science went, a great scientist, but he was one of the greatest of literary men. He wrote not merely expository works, but contributed to the classical literature of the country. Possibly that fact may account for the existence of these phrases in the "Advancement of Learning," which would seem to show that Bacon was not true to his own creed, as he repeatedly stated it in the "Novum Organon." We confess we cannot think that Bacon did vacillate as to this matter, but rather lean to the belief that in his works, as in his life, he showed himself as not only a philosopher, but a courtier. But in our admiration for Francis Bacon we would not wish to depreciate his great predecessor in name and method. We have only recently learned to do anything like justice to the memory of Roger Bacon. But the more we know of his achievements, the more admiration is demanded of us. He not only advocated the experimental method in science, but practised it with success, and attained what can only be regarded as wonderful results. A mere enumeration of the benefits which we directly or indirectly owe to his labours is sufficiently convincing. Clocks, lenses, burning specula, telescopes, are amongst

these. We find in his writings formulæ for extracting phosphorus, manganese, and bismuth, and it is said—and not without some evidence—that he had investigated the power and use of steam. These are gigantic practical benefits to the world, but it is a question whether we are not even more his debtors for the institution of that method in the natural sciences which has been so fruitful in the hands of those who were to come after him. But this great man lived three centuries before Lord Bacon, and was charged with magic, and all the other sins which were in the Church's foolish head associated with scientific progress. Here there are some instructive passages in the history of persecution. At first Bacon was protected, owing to the elevation of his friend Guy Foulkes to the popedom; but his respite was short. The rabble of the priesthood gave tongue as usual, and even the two orders, Franciscan and Dominican, entered into the controversy, and used their influence to stay the tide of progress. In 1243 the Dominicans interdicted every member of their order from the study of medicine, and a few years later they issued a similar prohibition in relation to the study of chemistry. In 1278 the Franciscans condemned Bacon's teachings. But condemnation was not enough, and the Church endeavoured to defraud the world of the benefactions of this great man by means of violence. Bacon, now an old man, was imprisoned, and was, after fourteen years, released only to pass to the larger liberty of death. We know of few more pathetic utterances than that of Bacon. "Would," he said, "that I had not given myself so much trouble for the love of science!" An inexpressibly sad sigh of the old man worn by the persecutions of a Church which ought to have fostered and cherished him, looking with dissatisfaction at the little he had done, and with longing to the great things he might have accomplished, confessing his love for science, even while he feels worn and weary with the harshness and cruelty of the world, and looking forward to the quietness of that cloister which persecution cannot invade, and where trouble cannot come. But there is a haggard sameness about the history of the attitude of religion towards each of the sciences. Thus we find that Geology has been vigorously opposed by religionists, not only with arguments, not only with vituperation and obloquy, but by means of certain *pious frauds*. Even now, however, that battle rages, and its incidents are familiar to the readers of these pages.

In the history of another new science—political economy—there are some instructive instances of the folly of those who oppose themselves to the truth. That chosen as an illustration by Dr. White is well adapted for the purpose. The Church has always and in all places opposed the receipt of interest, however

moderate, for money lent. Certain texts in the Old and New Testaments are regarded as authorities for condemning the practice of lending or borrowing money at interest. The fathers, both of the Eastern and the Western Church, were emphatic in their condemnation of the practice. Amongst the former St. Chrysostom held that nothing could be "more unreasonable than to sow without land, without rain, without ploughs. All those who give themselves to this damnable agriculture shall reap only tares. Let us cut off those monstrous births of gold and silver, let us stop this execrable fecundity." And St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, Tertullian, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome were equally hard upon money-lenders and their practices. Interest-bearing loans were universally condemned. In many countries the estates of money-lenders were confiscated, and the Third Council of the Lateran decreed that every "impenitent money-lender should be excluded from the altar, from absolution in the hour of death, and from Christian burial."

In the beginning of the fourteenth century, too, the Council of Vienna declared "that if any one shall pertinaciously affirm that the taking of interest for money is not a sin, we decree him to be a heretic fit for punishment."

It is not to be doubted that the results of this action upon the part of the Church were, in an economic point of view, disastrous. It led to the crippling of enterprise and to the practice of usury. It favoured pauperism and clipped the wings of commerce. But further, seeing that the accumulation of capital was by these foolish doctrines discouraged, it led to a lavish luxury upon the part of the wealthy, and a disregard of that self-denial which is one of the best moral attributes of prudence and economy. In the fifteenth century, John Gerson, at that time Chancellor of the University of Paris, a learned theologian and an able orator, raised his voice against this ridiculous prohibition. "Better it is," he said, "to lend money at reasonable interest, and thus to give aid to the poor, than to see them reduced by poverty to steal, waste their goods, and sell at a low price their personal and real property." But most voices of reason and right speaking to the Church were voices "crying in a wilderness." His arguments were met with quotations. But the error was not only an error of the Church of Rome. The Reformed Church adopted this glaring economic fallacy. Thus Luther says, "To exchange anything with any one, and gain by the exchange, is not to do a charity, but to steal. Every usurer is a thief worthy of the gibbet. I call these usurers who lend money at five or six per cent." This sounds somewhat strong language to modern ears, who are familiar with such institutions as Banks. But while Luther was thus vituperative, Calvin took

a more rational view of the matter, and saw no objection to interest-bearing loans, although he set his canon against loans at illegal or oppressive interest. But now so late as the seventeenth century the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne declared that usury is the taking of any interest at all, no matter how little, and this position was defended by a reference to the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel. But Popes themselves have taken an interest in this market controversy, and there are several condemnatory Bulls and declarations which thoroughly identify the infallible heads of the Church with this flagrant politico-economical heresy.

It is scarcely necessary to follow further the intricate history of this foolish and pernicious error. It is somewhat humiliating, however, to find that such a man as Bossuet could lend his strong, keen faculties and his vigorous eloquence to such a ridiculous cause as the condemnation of a system which is undoubtedly the most advantageous arrangement in relation to capital and production which could be devised. Dr. White, although he has confined himself very much to the ground already traversed by Leckey, has written a clear and pithy chapter upon this episode of the war.

Those who wish to follow more in detail, and yet shortly, the history of the various fights which science has well fought, will find what they seek in the work before us. Even with the recent guerilla warfare, which continues, although some of the graver aspects of that great struggle have ceased, these pages deal. Perhaps it was scarcely necessary. We are only too familiar with the intolerance of so-called religious people at the present time. We know too well how the word "Materialist" is used by them as a weapon of offence and defence against those who are endeavouring to advance science, and how some of the ablest leaders of science are shuddered at as "atheists" and "unbelievers." There is the same spirit rife among such people as instituted the Inquisition; and although there is not a Papal, there is a social "Index," in which the names—we may be sure—of most of the best books are entered. Have we not ourselves seen the opposition to the Evolution Hypothesis of Darwin? have we not heard it denounced by well-meaning men who knew nothing of it except that it was a theory of natural history unsanctioned by Scripture? Have we not seen Professor Tyndall called by very hard names in consequence of some candid utterances of his at the meeting of the British Association at Belfast? Are we not, each one of us, familiar with the dogged resistance which all new truth encounters from old dogma? It is true that the Church is feebler. It is true it has had its teeth drawn, but it shows the old animosity by munching with its gums what it can

no longer bite. Science is stronger. Its votaries may be sent to Coventry, but not to gaol. The press is no longer gagged, the laboratory is no longer trammelled, and men are free to pursue the great path of science to secure for themselves—if no other reward—that of their own conscience by well-doing, and for mankind the inestimable benefits which accrue from a faithful study of nature, from a diligent pursuit of science. The great work—of accumulating knowledge—is in progress. The dissemination of truth goes on. Those who devote themselves to science owe a duty of faithful and earnest work to those great men who laid the foundations of the stately edifice at their peril, and cemented its first stones with their blood. They will not do that duty unless they carry on the work without fear or favour, unless they are, in the words of Fichte, “men whose chosen friend is Truth, who adhere to her in life and death, who receive her when she is cast out by all the world, who take her openly under their protection when she is traduced and calumniated, who for her sake will joyfully bear the cunningly-concealed cunily of the great, the dull sneer of the coxcomb, and the compassionate shrug of the fool.”

One word in mitigation of the sentence which may be passed on those implicated in this indictment which has been drawn by the President of Cornell University. In a great many instances truth has come from within the pale of the Church. The first opponent of Cosmas and his ridiculous geographic notions was a Bishop Virgilius of Salzburg, who asserted his belief in the existence of the antipodes. Then we know that Copernicus was at one time a professor at Rome, and that afterwards, through the influence of his uncle, who was bishop, he procured a canonry in the Cathedral of Frauenburg; Roger Bacon was a monk; Bernard Palissy, who first broached the true theory of geology, was a “devoted Christian;” and John Gerson, who as we have pointed out, was the first person who made a vigorous stand against the Church doctrine that it was damnable to take interest for money lent, was so noted for his piety that men ascribed to him the authorship of “The Imitation of Christ;” and without enumerating other instances, we have seen that Dr. Chalmers took up arms against the so-called orthodox party when it opposed the use of anæsthetics in relation to obstetrics.

These facts may, we say, be pleaded in mitigation; but even with such a set-off, how poor a figure does the Church make through all these centuries! Has she not attempted to stifle and stamp out the truth? has she not endeavoured to divert effort from the true channel of effective achievement? has she not endeavoured to do the worst of violence by endeavouring to make men think her thoughts instead of thinking—to use the

fine phrase of Kepler—"the thoughts of God"? It is well for the little credit which is left to the Church that she has not succeeded in this great crime, well that she has been worsted in the long campaign of the Warfare of Science.

ART. III.—THE FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS.

1. *The Factory and Workshop Acts.* By GEORGE JARVIS NOTCUTT, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. London. 1874. (Stevens & Sons.)
2. *The English Factory Legislation.* By ERNST EDLER VON PLENER, First Secretary to the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Embassy in London. Translated from the original German by FREDERICK L. WEINMANN. London. 1873. (Chapman & Hall.)
3. *Report of the Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshop Acts, with a view to their Consolidation and Amendment; together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index.* Vols. I. and II. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1876. (Eyre & Spottiswoode.)

IN some thoughtful passages in the "Reign of Law" (Chapter VII., "Law in Politics"), the Duke of Argyll moralises on the relation between natural law and human law, as exemplified in the passage of the earlier Factory Acts through Parliament in this country. "No more signal illustration," he says, "has ever been given of that relationship than in two great discoveries in the science of government" (which we have made during the present century). "The one is the immense advantage of abolishing restrictions upon trade; the other the absolute necessity of imposing restrictions upon labour." In an admirable summary of the rise and growth of these enactments, he shows how the progress of invention and the employment of new motive powers acted and reacted on the progress of legislation, and how, step by step with this encroachment on an entirely new province of government, a retreat from one of its oldest and most cherished domains was simultaneously effected. "Since 1802 there have been passed a long series of laws, removing one after another all restrictions which aimed at guiding the individual will in its sharp and sagacious pursuit of material wealth. During the same period there have been passed another long series of Acts, imposing restrictions

more and more stringent on the individual will in its blind and reckless disregard of moral ends." The noble author proceeds to complain, however, that while the first of these great legislative movements has met with almost universal acceptance, with respect to the second, "there is still no clear and well-grounded intellectual perception of the deep foundations of principle on which it rests."

The history of factory legislation as a whole is a subject, indeed, which has received far less attention, both from jurists and politicians in this country, than it merits,—which is the more remarkable when we consider that for both classes of thinkers, and for many more, it is a history replete with instruction. The constant antagonism between men's natural propensities (laws of nature so called) and human laws (positive institution), a subject of such endless interest to the legislators, is there exhibited in some of its most interesting, and at the same time pressing, forms, and amidst a series of social phenomena of surpassing brilliancy and novelty. The ever new, yet so old, question of the proper limits of individual freedom, dear to the philosopher and jurist, is raised in it in its clearest and most intelligible aspect—in the aspect even of the right to labour, of all rights apparently the most indisputable. Its theme, too, is necessarily and inseparably connected with quite the most glorious epoch of commercial progress, physical discovery, and mechanical invention that has ever adorned the annals of any nation; and finally, it is so much a part of the history of our own time, that we can scarcely be said, any of us, not to feel some sort of personal interest more or less close or remote in it. Yet for one reason or another it has been strangely neglected. Apparently people who were not much affected by them have been generally content to know that such laws were in existence; whilst, on the other hand, it would seem as if repeated extensions had been accepted by many others whom they did affect with a sullen and unquestioning acquiescence as a sort of necessary evil. The one party has been guided in its approval by sentiment without inquiry; the other has been restrained in its opposition only by the fear of incurring public odium. It was not so always. In the commencement of the controversy, the battle raged hotly round the principles at stake, little as those principles seem then to have been understood. The opponents of the measures, some of them among the most notable and noblest of Englishmen, were not ashamed to lift up their voices and proclaim their antagonism with all the eloquence and earnestness of conviction. The unalterable laws of science were, as they conceived it, on their side, and only unreasoning philanthropy against them. It was the turn, then, of "the party of humanity" to shun argument, and the reproach of being "cold-blooded economists" was too often the best reply

that they had to offer to their opponents' logic. How false a position this was is well shown in the work of the Duke of Argyll, already quoted, who elucidates the principle fully and clearly. "If the supporters of the Factory Acts had only known it," he says, "all true abstract argument on the subject was their own;" and the explanation of this statement has reference to that relationship between human law and natural law already noted. The reign of law (he argues) is supreme, not only over physical and economical phenomena, but over mental and moral phenomena in a like degree; nor is the relationship more clear and certain when the impulses to be controlled proceed from the observed tendencies of external agents than from the observed tendencies of human character. Thus it is not more certainly legal, in the highest sense, to facilitate the operations of trade than to impede the incentives to immorality or physical degeneration; for just as natural law shows the advantages of the one set of results, and offers to us the means of influencing them, so does it show the disadvantages, and offers to us the means of influencing the others. Conversely, it is equally just and right to labour to remove the impediments that obstruct the one, and to contrive obstacles to obstruct the other. The former course is not more surely a proper function of government than the latter. That this perception of the truth does never seem to have been firmly held or fairly pleaded all through the long debates on the earlier Factory Acts, was partly owing, in all probability, to the unnecessary heat imported into those discussions by the partisans on either side, and partly, no doubt, to the essentially practical tone, dealing almost exclusively with details, which characterises our parliamentary treatment of any subject. It was publicly asserted, too, even by intelligent men, that the contest was one of "Mammon against Mercy;" and this deplorably false and offensive description of the issue was almost of itself sufficient, notwithstanding its manifest injustice, to poison the whole discussion. Had the supporters of the proposed restrictions but argued the question fairly out upon its merits, their ultimate triumph would not have been less, while the public mind would have been far more enlightened on the justice as well as the humanity of their demands. Owing to the ill-judged course which they did pursue, the matter of the discussion was clothed with a character not its own, and animosities were aroused which need never have been stirred. Another point which should not remain unnoticed in passing judgment upon these events, is the common mistake then made by many economists in the very elements of their own science, namely, in the use of its terms, whereby their strongest arguments were invalidated. The expressions "freedom of trade" and "freedom of labour" were constantly coupled together by them, as if they referred to similar or identical conditions or

things—as if, indeed, the similarity proceeded any further than in the repetition of the same word, perhaps of all words the most misleading. It would really appear as if many of them believed that the demand for free labour necessarily rested upon the same basis as the demand for free trade; as if, in short, the affairs of sentient beings, with all their human responsibilities, were to be disposed of by the same laws as those which regulated the production and exchange of commodities! It is no wonder that many worthy people, without precisely seeing where it failed, revolted against this doctrine, and to be deplored, perhaps, more than condemned, that, in their just antipathy to it, they assailed as false and heartless the whole system of political economy, of which they ignorantly supposed it to be a part. The proper subject for wonder is, that any one who had ever thought upon the matter at all should have fallen into such an error, for its origin is not far to seek. It resides, of course, in the double meaning which is commonly attached to the word “labour.” At one time this expression is understood as meaning a certain quantity of physical energy, like other impersonal energies supplied by Nature; at another time it means the accumulated energies of individual human creatures. How different in kind the two forces are will perhaps appear most clearly when we remember, that in the one case they ultimately represent an instrument of production only, and in the other case the persons for whom that production is undertaken. By the simple expedient of always including the notion of labourers in that of labour, this unfortunate mistake need not have arisen.

But the debaters of those days were apparently ignorant or careless of the finer issues involved in the discussion, and, instead of an appeal to the reign of law to settle the differences between them, were content to fight them out on the narrower lines of indiscriminate sentiment on the one side and uncompromising theory on the other. The consequence was, that when the victory was won, and the Factory Acts imposed, the vanquished still remained unconvinced, and even when brought reluctantly after a while to confess that they had not been productive of the anticipated evils, were willing to attribute this to any cause rather than to the inherent worth of the Acts themselves. Another consequence was, that they came to be looked upon by many in a wrong light, as concessions wrung from the abstract conclusions of science, and thereby destructive of these, instead of, as they really were, a beautiful instance of the harmony prevailing among all the forces of nature of which any science must be but a generalisation. But a further and most important consequence was to follow. Flushed with a success which yet they could attribute to no new principle consciously discovered or sought, but towards which they had been urged forward only by the sentiments and instincts of humanity,

the reformers now looked about them for new enterprises. The original Factory Acts, from dealing only with apprentices in mills, were soon extended, first, so as to include all children so employed, next all "young persons," then all *women*, and ultimately so as to embrace every manufacture, and, in a minor degree (through the operation of the Workshops Regulation Act),* even every handicraft throughout the kingdom in which any of these were engaged. From such small beginnings did so comprehensive and unprecedented a system of legislation come to establish itself amongst us, and, almost unchallenged at length, to command and control nearly every avenue of industrial employment. And now the critical juncture was approaching. As each successive enlargement of the original design came into force, resulting in an enlarged benefit to the community, still higher and higher rose the chorus of jubilation on the one side, and more silent and sullen became the opposition on the other. Neither party "had any well-founded intellectual perception of the deep foundation of principle" on which the legislation was based; and while the successful side kept on blindly doing good, the unsuccessful side kept on as blindly, whilst ever more feebly, opposing them. Statutes affecting the regulation of labour multiplied exceedingly, till at last, as we learn from Mr. Notcutt's able and valuable compilation, there are fifteen now in use for factories and workshops alone. As many of these, too, were but supplementary or complementary to preceding ones, and as very many repeal portions of those that go before them, a state of confusion is attained which is perhaps not unprecedented in the history of our jurisprudence, but which is certainly no credit to it. "Factory" obtains no less than thirty-five to forty separate definitions, applicable to that number of specifically different processes; and, in addition to specific applications, is further made to include, "*any* premises, whether adjoining or separate, in the same occupation, situate in the same city, town, parish, or place, and constituting one trade establishment, in, or on, or within the precincts of which fifty or more persons are employed in any manufacturing process" (30 & 31 Vict. c. 103, s. 3). "Workshop" comprehensively embraces such other processes of manufacture as, "whether as not having been specifically mentioned, or as being carried on on too small a

* The following is a full list of the processes to which the Factory Acts have now a specific application:—

Blast furnaces, bleachworks, bookbinding, brass foundries, percussion caps, cartridges, copper foundries, copper mills, cotton, dyeworks, earthenware, flax, fustian-cutting, glass, gutta-percha, hair, hemp, india-rubber, iron foundries, iron mills, jute, lace, letterpress printing, lucifer matches, machinery, metal (other articles of), paper, paper-staining, print-works, silk, tobacco, tow, wool, worsted.

scale to be comprehended within the above-mentioned general provisions" (Notcutt), do not come within the scope of the Factory Acts considered apart; a workshop being defined in the extensive terms, "any room or place whatever, whether in the open air or under cover, in which any handicraft is carried on by any child, young person, or woman, and to which and over which the person by whom such child, young person, or woman is employed has the right of access and control" (30 & 31 Vict. c. 146, s. 4). Innumerable difficulties, complications, and confusions are thus created. A bookbinding shop or printing office (for instance) is a factory by the Act of 1867 (30 & 31 Vict. c. 103), no matter how many or how few hands are employed in it, while a cornmill, a sawmill, or distillery, a brewery, or a manufactory of the most noxious or dangerous chemical compounds (for instance), is only such where fifty or more hands are. A brick and tile works, or either of them, is a workshop in nine cases out of ten, but in the tenth, if it should also produce any kind of pottery, even to the mild extent of a flowerpot or the rudest kind of earthenware, it is a factory (27 & 28 Vict. c. 48). There shall be in the same town, and in the same street of it, two establishments engaged in precisely the same trade, in the manufacture of clothing or of furniture, for instance, and the taking on of an extra hand or two shall decide whether they are to be classed as factories, and subject to a very strict code of regulations, or workshops, and subject to a much less stringent one. In order to escape the more binding set of rules, the one shall keep its numbers strictly down, perhaps to forty-eight or forty-nine, and by so doing acquire not only a greater liberty of action, but, in consequence, an unquestionable trade advantage over its competitor; or it shall employ children of tender age without any surgical certificate of fitness, which nevertheless is required to be obtained under heavy penalties if the place should be called a factory. In the one case, the factory children must go to school every half day or every alternate whole day; in the other, the workshop children have only to make up ten hours schooling in a week. A woman or young person, again, may perform ten and a half hours' work any time between 5 A.M. and 9 P.M. in a workshop, but in a factory the day's work must be invariably performed between six and six or seven and seven. The inequalities and injustices resulting from so faulty a principle of classification, and the jealousies and discontents thereby engendered, are accordingly endless, and it is really remarkable that much more has not been heard about them, that they have been patiently borne at all so long. Such a result either points to great moderation or great laxity in the administration of the law, or it reveals a most unexpected indifference to their own concerns on the part of the wage-paying classes. For, further, and as it were

“to make confusion worse confounded,” even the worst has not yet been said of these enactments that can be said, but long schedules of temporary or permanent modifications annexed to most of them have yet to be taken into account, suspending or supplanting the more general provisions, and supplying the while an utterly inadequate, imperfect, and all but incomprehensible machinery for the purpose of giving themselves effect. Hours of overwork are to be reported *after* they have occurred; permissions to work overtime are to be sought from the central department in London, and not from the resident factory inspector of the district, who is thus left in complete ignorance of what establishments have such permissions and what have not, they coming thus to be granted perfectly at haphazard, and the very names of the firms applying for them being unknown to the authority who nevertheless decides, arbitrarily and offhand, who are entitled to exceptional privileges. Finally, the Factory Act of 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 44), reverting to the original scope of factory legislation, selects textile processes only for its operation, and introduces a series of quite novel regulations, and a new curtailment of the hours of labour for these separately.

And contemporary with this spread of confusion in the laws themselves has been the spread of confusion in the machinery for administering them. Originally four factory inspectors were appointed for this purpose, and their duty was to inspect factories, as the name implies. In process of time, their duties increasing considerably, some sub-inspectors were added to render them assistance, and gradually the curious spectacle was afforded of this latter class increasing very largely, and arrogating to itself the whole duty of inspection, while the class of inspectors, so called, proportionally diminished, and no longer fulfilled the offices that justified their name. A still more remarkable change followed later, when four assistant-inspectors, a title unrecognised by any Act of Parliament, were appointed, intermediate between these two classes, to assist the inspectors in not inspecting; and the climax was reached in the creation of a fourth class of “junior sub-inspectors,” also quite unknown to law, performing in all respects the same duties as the original inspectors, through four gradations of title! The present staff is now curiously constituted of eleven of these junior sub-inspectors, thirty-eight full sub-inspectors (whatever that title means), four assistant-inspectors, and two inspectors, these last dividing the United Kingdom between them, according to imaginary and arbitrary lines of demarcation of their own, interpreting the law in a sometimes diverse manner, and directing, the one from London, the other from Leamington, the prosecution of offenders of whom they have never heard before,

and of whose culpability or other circumstances they have, of course, no personal knowledge.*

So the matter of factory legislation and its administration rested up to a recent time, its history being one of continual encroachment upon an ever-increasing variety of industries, conterminous with an ever-increasing confusion in the machinery of factory inspection. So it rested up to the passing, and the failure in practice, of the Agricultural Children's Act, and the appearance of a Shops Regulation Act for dealing with the labour of persons employed in retail trading. From that time, however—from the time, namely, that it was authoritatively proposed to subject agriculture to a similar control as manufacture, and to regulate the hours for the sale of commodities as well as for their production—it was apparent to thoughtful men that the time could not long be deferred when a reconsideration of the whole question must be entered on, and a "new departure," in all probability, be undertaken.

These forecasts were realised in the issue of a Royal Commission, at the instance of the present Government, empowered to inquire into the working of the Factory and Workshops Acts, "with a view to their consolidation and amendment." † The terms of the Commission pointed at once to the direction whence reform was to be sought. The Acts were to be "consolidated." The extravagant anomalies, a few of which only we have adverted to, were to be reformed away, by the easily-comprehended process of putting all handicraft industries, so far as possible, on the same basis, and subjecting them, so far as possible, to the same code of rules. Yet, simple as this procedure may appear in statement, it would be impossible to exaggerate its difficulties in practice. The task which the Commissioners undertook was, in truth, a huge one. It was not only that they had to weigh and adjudicate on a profusion of various and often contradictory testimony, offered either upon the part of the employers or employed, or in favour of this or that particular occupation or process, with respect to the proprieties of its regulation; not only that they had to make themselves per-

* See Report of the Royal Commission on Factories and Workshops, paragraphs 248-255, vol. i.

† "To inquire into the working of the Factory and Workshops Acts, with a view to their consolidation and amendment, and specially to consider whether they can be made more consistent and harmonious, and whether any of their provisions may properly be extended to other trades, industries, and occupations not included therein; and whether, in the case of other trades, industries, and occupations, other than those dealt with by the Act of 1874, any further provisions are requisite for the improvement of the health and education of young persons and children, and whether any further provision is needed for the due enforcing of such Acts; or if not, in what way the existing provisions may be improved."—*Extract from Report of Commission*, p. 3.

sonally acquainted with a number of technical and very minute details, from a full knowledge of which only a fair judgment could be formed; but they had, moreover, to do all this unassisted by any authoritative statement of the principles involved in that body of legislation which they were set to reform—uninformed even by any recognised definition of wherein the sanctions for a legislative interference with labour were to be found at all. They had to take up this subject as a surgeon might take up the scattered limbs of a body to put into their proper places, and to introduce, as he might, a backbone whereon the disjointed members might be fitted into some kind of symmetry. Nay, they may be even said to have undertaken to do more than that—to supply the nerve matter to the central stronghold thus provided, that should animate the limbs, and enforce unity of action over the whole work, as well as propriety of design. Herein, without doubt, their principal difficulty lay, and herein, above all else, it was necessary that their vision should be of the clearest. A body of laws had gradually grown up whose principal characteristics were—firstly, that they had been produced piecemeal, different defects in different Acts of the Legislature being remedied by merely patching up those defects as an occasion pointing out such a necessity arose; secondly, that they had been produced fortuitously—that is to say, that different processes had been brought under regulation as public attention happened to be directed at the time towards evils in those particular trades; and, thirdly, as has been said, that at no time had any universally guiding principle, any plainly recognised scope of, or limit to, interference, been assigned in theory or pursued in action, each separate good accomplished being apparently considered as sufficiently justified by the event, and no conspicuous evil having as yet displayed itself. Even a history, or any published connected account of the course events had taken, was wanting to them, and to the nation, until the appearance of Herr Edler von Plener's little work, and it is highly characteristic, both of his country and of ours, that for the first comprehensive account of the progress of a body of laws that have for long dominated our industry, we should be indebted to a German. This concise and accurate summary of English factory legislation appeared in 1873, and in 1875 the Royal Commission was appointed.

We shall briefly avail ourselves of it for obtaining a general view of what had been done in the direction of factory legislation previous to the commencement of the Commissioners' labours.

The original design and scope of the English factory system was exclusively moral and sanitary. It was a system devised, as it were, on the spur of the moment, to combat certain novel evils that were then for the first time showing themselves in connection

with the unprecedented extension of manufacturing industry. The first Factory Act ever passed (42 Geo. III. c. 73) was called specifically "The Health and Morals Act;" and while the immediate cause of its enactment was the alarming spread among the manufacturing population, especially of Derby, Nottingham, and Lancashire, of epidemic disease, this condition of things, it was stated, was chiefly brought about by the new conditions of industrial labour. "At the same time, general misery prevailed in the southern agricultural counties; and unprincipled poor-law guardians, anxious to rid their parishes as speedily as possible of pauper children, showed great eagerness to meet the requirements of large industrial establishments for cheap labour" (Von Plener). The children were driven up from distances to the mills in vans, and chiefly to mills situated in remote places, or anywhere that water-power was accessible, and there housed, without any proper provision (most commonly) for comfort, health, or decency. They were apprenticed to their work to prevent them leaving it at pleasure, and thus it was that the original Factory Acts dealt only with such apprentices. But with the introduction of steam as a motive power, a different phase of the factory question opened. Mills were now built in already populous places, and children no longer necessarily apprenticed, the supply on the spot being found quite equal to the demand. Employers thus evaded the requirements of the existing law, which had, indeed, in many other ways already been proved to be practically worthless. Two parliamentary inquiries (in 1815 and 1833), which greatly alarmed the country, were held, and after various abortive efforts had been made, that very important measure the Factory Act, 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 103), ultimately became law, and still forms the basis of all subsequent legislation on the subject. This is the statute often quoted as Lord Althorp's Act, as the above is as Sir Robert Peel's. It differed from the former one, among other things, in foregoing all concern with morals, for which, in the earlier Act, there had been some rude provision made (secs. 7 & 8, 42 Geo. III. c. 73), and principally addressed itself to defining the hours of labour, and the ages at which labour might be undertaken. It applied to all cotton, wool, worsted, flax, tow, and linen mills, forbidding work between 8.30 P.M. and 5.30 A.M., or for more than twelve hours a day, to all persons under eighteen years of age, and for more than nine hours a day to all persons under thirteen years and over nine. Under nine years of age, work was altogether prohibited. An exception was, however, made in favour of silk mills, where a child might commence work at eight years, and continue it for ten hours a day. The terms "child" and "young person" were defined separately. A child was one between eight and thirteen years; a young person one between thirteen

and eighteen. It also for the first time introduced the principle of indirect compulsory education, a system which, under the name of the half-time system, was destined to expand itself so greatly in succeeding labour-regulating Acts. All children were required by it to attend school for at least two hours a day. Another provision was that certificates of age and fitness for work were to be granted by surgeons appointed for the purpose. Inspectors were provided to enforce the law. Now, it is of the first importance, with a view to a subsequent understanding of the more recent developments of the factory question, to note the points of difference between this and the preceding principal Act—that of George III. Intermediate statutes of a more or less partial and imperfect kind had somewhat bridged over the differences in principle between them, but those differences are nevertheless remarkable and very suggestive when the two are compared together. Probably there is no better way of doing this than to quote the preambles of both, and put them side by side. The first recites (42 Geo. III. c. 73):—"Whereas it hath of late become a practice in cotton and woollen mills and in cotton and woollen factories to employ a great number of male and female apprentices, and other persons, in the same building, in consequence of which certain regulations are become necessary to preserve the health and morals of such apprentices and other persons; be it therefore enacted," &c. And the second (3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 103):—"Whereas it is necessary that the hours of labour of children and young persons employed in mills and factories should be regulated, inasmuch as there are great numbers of children and young persons now employed in mills and factories, and their hours of labour are longer than is desirable, due regard being had to their health and means of education; be it therefore enacted," &c.,—where the base of operation, the "reason why," is completely shifted from the temporary necessity of providing for the health and morals of certain persons to the permanent necessity of abridging their hours of labour, and incidentally of so promoting their health and (now for the first time) their education. The Factory Act, 1844 (7 & 8 Vict. c. 15), which up to 1874 was in force for all textile industries, and is still that which practically regulates all legal proceedings under any of the Factory Acts, only carries this difference in principle one step further, by confirming and extending it—stricter rules for the curtailment of labour and for education being enacted, and health and morals being practically left to look after themselves. It also for the first time brings all adult women within the scope of the law, subjecting them to the same regulations as "young persons."

From 1844 to 1864, Factory Acts followed each other in rapid succession, the principal being the Printworks Act, 1845 (8 & 9

Vict. c. 29); the Ten Hour Act, 1847 (10 Vict. c. 29); the Act of 1850 (13 & 14 Vict. c. 54), which reduced the legal working hours for all young persons and women to a period of twelve hours, to be taken between 6 A.M. and 6 P.M., with an hour and a half out for meals = $10\frac{1}{2}$ hours, and from 6 A.M. to 2 P.M. on Saturday, thus establishing the normal working day, and putting the weekly half-holiday on a sure footing; the Bleachworks Act, 1860 (23 & 24 Vict. c. 78); and the Laceworks Act, 1861 (25 & 26 Vict. c. 117). In 1864, a whole batch of new industries, in no way connected with textile manufacture, were legislated for. These included the manufacture of earthenware, percussion caps, lucifer matches and cartridges, paper-staining and fustian-cutting (27 & 28 Vict. c. 48), and it becomes evident that the area of legislative interference with industrial labour was already entering on a new and wide development. The divergence noted in the guiding principles of the Acts of George III. and William IV., as exhibited in their preambles, had now proceeded to the full extent of a difference, and that not merely of an extrinsic, but of an wholly intrinsic and initial character. No longer professedly to meet the temporary inconveniences induced by unwonted combinations of labour was that labour now and from henceforth made the subject of statutory enactment, but as labour simply, whether in combination or isolation. The sanctions for interference, it thus appears, were shifting, and had already in great part shifted their basis from the circumstances of the environment of employed persons to the circumstance of their being employed at all; from the propriety of guarding against the tyranny of organic laws to the propriety of guarding against the tyranny of human avarice and despotism. The argument by which principally the older Factory Acts had been brought to a successful issue, namely, that an unprecedented code of laws was requisite to deal with an unprecedented condition of national affairs, was silently and finally dropped, and even the argument from machinery—that where intelligent beings were set to labour in conjunction with blind and unintelligent forces of nature knowing no weariness and finding no finality the former were entitled to the protection of some counteracting power—was forgotten or ignored. The trade of fustian-cutting, for instance (a process of raising a *pile* on velvets and velveteens by cutting the surface threads with a knife), is wholly a process of manual labour, and for by far the most part carried on as a domestic occupation, a cottage industry in short, precisely as spinning or hand-loom weaving used to be in days gone-by. Here, then, was exhibited the spectacle of a Factory Act controlling an industrial employment, the very supercession of which by other modes of production it was that originally was called upon to justify the passing of a Factory Act at

all. It was clear that, without at all perceiving where it was drifting, public opinion was coming round to a quite new view of the principles that justified the protection of labour, and that the old pleas were being rapidly abandoned. At last came the Factory Acts Extension Act of 1867, followed by the Workshops Regulation Act of the same year, giving the *coup-de-grace* to all old notions founded on associated labour or the employment of foreign motive powers, by including under one or other of them every handicraft whatever, as pertaining to its proper sphere of regulation.

Under these circumstances, what wonder that the next move was from commodities to services, and from production to exchange? for, in fact, the former sphere of protective legislation was exhausted. If a child required protection from exhaustive labour in a factory, why not also in a field? If a woman was unfit to work more than a certain number of hours in a work-room, why not also in a shop?

To this portion of the problem submitted to them it seems to us that the Royal Commissioners have supplied the least satisfactory answers. They had recommended to their consideration not only "the consolidation and amendment" of existing laws, but also "whether any of their provisions may be properly extended to other trades, industries, and occupations not included therein;" and upon this point, as upon others, they took a vast amount of evidence. But, their deductions from this evidence are curiously wavering and inconsistent. They very judiciously, as it seems to us, exclude agriculture from their scheme of consolidation, but also, as it seems to us, for the very least cogent reasons. They class it (for the purpose of exclusion) with the "wandering occupations,"—"errand-boys, street performers, news-boys, juvenile match-sellers, and hawkers of goods, the boys employed by carriers, and those employed by bargemen on canals;" but in their own classification of these wandering occupations they are singularly inconsequent. Thus they propose a special protection in favour of boys engaged in carrying from place to place goods in process of manufacture,* yet they propose to exclude from protection such boys as may be engaged in assisting bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, painters, locksmiths, and such like, when working away from home.† Why a news-boy who delivers or sells papers in the streets is a less fitting object of legislative care than one who carries parcels about them, it is difficult to see. Why a plumber's lad working out, or an errand-boy, is in less danger of overwork than other

* Vol. i. p. 20, par. 32.

† Vol. i. p. 20, par. 31.

boys, we must look to the Commissioners' Report to explain. But the explanation is not only unsatisfactory; it is, when taken in connection with other recommendations, even contradictory. The principal reasons given for the exemptions are, the absence of "definite premises" in the one case, and in that of wandering occupations, substantially the same, with this further comment added, that in their case "the general law appears to provide all that is possible, if not all that might by some be considered desirable, in the way of legislative protection against overwork."* Without doing more than remark, that in this expression of opinion—for which, moreover, the Commissioners themselves appear to be solely responsible, inasmuch as no authorities in favour of that view are quoted, though authorities on the other side very freely are—there are many people who certainly will not agree, we cannot conceive why the establishments from which the ragged news-boys (only too familiar to the public) and other errand-boys, are despatched, are not sufficiently "definite premises" for all purposes of supervision under a labour-regulating Act. Again, how is it that the Commissioners recommend that the persons engaged in working about a ship under repair should be considered as employed under the Factory Act,† while the plumbers, carpenters, locksmiths, &c., already mentioned, engaged in working about a house under repair, should not? Is a ship, then, more of a factory than a house—a floating edifice than a fixed one?—and why not then a canal-boat as well as a ship? But, moreover, if it is the question of definite premises and of the facilities for administering the law that should decide, still more so if of proved hardship, and of what the "general law" already provides "in the way of legislative protection against overwork," how can we reconcile these principles of classification with the Commissioners' decision with respect to the labour of retail shops? Here are premises, definite enough, open to the public view, under no sort of law with respect to hours of labour, or sanitary, or educational, or other advantages, and here, as we learn from the Report, young women are often employed as long as eighty-four or eighty-five hours a week, against from sixty to sixty-five hours a week in factories and workshops (inclusive of meal-hours in both cases), and even up to a hundred hours in some instances.‡ It is true the Commissioners adduce many good reasons why the employment of women in shops should not be interfered with, but many also which it appears to us apply with quite equal force to their employment in workrooms and factories. The danger of the further substitution of male for

* Vol. i. p. 20, par. 39.

† Vol. i. p. 19, par. 29.

‡ Vol. i. p. 19, par. 33.

female labour is not less urgent in many handicrafts than in the matter of the sale of commodities, and the fatigue of serving behind a counter is probably equal to the fatigue of most handicraft employments in which women are engaged. This is not, however, at present our theme, or we might have something more to say of it; what we are now concerned to point out is, how various and conflicting are the different principles of action relied on. At one time for one reason, and at another time for another, occupations are accepted or rejected for legislative regulation, and then again these very same reasons are promiscuously pleaded for or against other occupations, without any reference to a common standard of judgment. Now, the criterion is of the necessity of the interference, at another time of the feasibility, at another time of the fitness: now, it is of the possession of definite premises whereon the workers may be found at work; again, of the economical detriment or advantage to these, independently of any of the foregoing considerations; again, as to their being engaged in production only. Occasionally, it almost seems as if the old economic fallacy of a real classification of labour into services and commodities had possession of the Commissioners' better senses: occasionally, as if what used to be pleaded as the sanctions for earlier Factory Acts haunted their memories: occasionally, as if they had abandoned all thought of these. Throughout there is no guiding and all-pervading principle manifested, recognised, and obeyed; and however just, accordingly, the conclusions arrived at in many cases are, they are arrived at by an illogical and in an empiric manner.

Herein, then, we hold that the Commissioners have failed in what was expected, or, at all events, in what was hoped, from them. They have failed in infusing anything like an organic principle, or of imparting any element of finality, into their, in most other respects, admirable, and, in all respects, able and exhaustive Report. They have fixed—to return to our illustration—their vertebra fairly in position, and have grouped the disjointed members of the body of past legislation in some harmony of proportion about it, but the nerve force to make it a self-contained and self-adjusting thing is wanting, and it still remains an inorganic, though not quite so much as formerly, an incoherent mass of matter, and the opportunity is lost. They have done so designedly, but mistakenly, as we think. They have been satisfied to pursue well-trodden—too well-trodden—paths, and, above all else—as they say themselves—to do their work “without offending against that legislative principle which has hitherto been followed with such excellent results in the framing of our Factory and Workshops Acts,” namely, the principle “only to meet proved abuses, and to rectify particular evils” as they come to

be made public, however great the evil may have been before, and for however long it may have flourished. The consequences of this "happy-go-lucky" method of procedure quickly display themselves. We have seen into what contradictions and inconsistencies it has landed them in dealing with trades outside the present scope of legislation. It necessarily, though not always so obtrusively, hampers their judgments and complicates their suggestions throughout. When the Commissioners, for instance, come early to consider what should be regarded as the characteristic features of a factory and a workshop separately, with a view to amalgamation and consolidation, their want of any general principle to guide their judgment leads them into sad scrapes. The vast majority of witnesses testified that there were no such separate characteristics necessarily existent at all, that the distinction was a wholly fanciful one, and only created by the Acts themselves that are called by those names; and this is undoubtedly correct. The word "factory" has very greatly altered in meaning during recent times. Originally factories were trading concerns (what would now perhaps be called stores) established in colonial or foreign parts, and in the more modern meaning, of a large building where people are congregated together for work, the name only came into use towards the end of the last century. With this meaning, also, was generally mixed up at first the notion of mechanical power, and especially of machinery used in textile industry. But as the factory system spread to other trades than textile, this latter meaning was soon lost, and any large establishment engaged in production came to be called a factory, while smaller ones were recognised as "shops" or workshops. Thus a small machine-making place would be a machine shop, but a larger one a machine factory; a small boot-making place a boot shop, but a larger one a boot factory; a small carpentering place would be a workshop, but a large one a timber mill or timber factory. Lastly came the Factory Act of 1867, arbitrarily imposing the name on places where certain selected industries were carried on, no matter on how large or small a scale, and on other places according to the number of the hands employed. It is clear, therefore, that there is no necessary or specific difference between factories and workshops at all, and this conclusion the Commissioners were compelled to adopt. Indeed, they had few others offered for their consideration. Mr. Mundella seemed to think that the distinction could be drawn at motive power, all places using any power other than manual being factories, and all the rest workshops; * but on re-examination he rather doubted the feasibility of maintaining this line of demarcation in practice.

* Vol. ii. p. 113, query 2291 and following questions.

The O'Connor Don, himself a Royal Commissioner, and who has published a separate Report, promulgates some novel views on the subject. He writes—

“The natural distinction appears to me to be between piece-work and day-work, between work in which the employer must exact fixed and definite hours, and those in which no such necessity exists. . . . What I would venture to suggest would be, to take all the establishments in which the hours of work are fixed by the employers, and to place them under one system of regulation as to the limit of hours, and to place those in which the hours of work are at the discretion of the employed under other regulations.”* The O'Connor Don almost touches the vital principle here, but yet fails to grasp it. The Commissioners, however, having decided on effacing the line of demarcation rather than on adopting a new one, it is curious to see into what awkward dilemmas they are led by the want of a clearly defined principle of guidance. Are they in their consolidation to extend the factory regulations to workshops, and which factory regulations? or the workshops regulations to factories, and to which kind of factories? They enumerate three classes of works:—“There is, first, the class known as textile factories, comprising those which alone were originally subject to regulation under the statutes of 1833 and 1844, and their amending Acts of 1850, 1853, and 1856. . . . There is next the large and multifarious class of factories brought under regulation by the Factory Acts Extension Acts of 1864 and (more especially) of 1867, to which must be added the Factory and Workshops Acts of 1870 and 1871, embracing a variety of trades specially selected to be placed under the Factory Law, irrespective of the numbers employed, and those establishments in all other handicrafts in which the number of hands exceeded the statutory line of 50. The third class comprises all establishments not employing 50 hands in any handicraft not specified as subject to the Factory Acts above mentioned. These are known to the law as workshops, and were first brought under regulation by the Workshops Regulation Act of 1867.” But in what respect are these different classes? Different only “according to the degree of strictness and elaboration with which the law has regulated them;” differing, that is, in precisely those respects in which the Commissioners had been appointed to reconcile them. And do they reconcile them in these respects? By no means. Their second and third classes are fused in one, subject to some judicious modifications, but the first class (or “textiles”) are still left at a forced disadvantage, when compared with the others, as regards the hours of labour. If the Commission had been issued

* Vol. i. p. 117.

in 1873 instead of 1875, or if the Act of 1874 had never been passed, can the Commissioners conscientiously aver that they would have proposed this distinction? Again, they have an uneasy sense of something still astray, even in their consolidated Act. The O'Connor Don had, no doubt, in conference with his colleagues, enlarged, as he does afterwards with such excellent effect in his separate Report enlarge, on the hardships of restricting the work of all adult women, married or single, employed by another or working for themselves, within a definite period of twelve hours to be settled by statute, irrespective of whatsoever other engagements they have to meet or duties to perform; and the responsibility of such a proposal is in fact a grave one. The Commissioners feel it to be such; and what do they propose? They propose that there should be altogether exempted from the operation of the new law "Employment by the occupier in a room used also for the purposes of a dwelling-house, if there are no protected persons but adult women employed, and they do not, in addition to inmates, exceed two in number." That is to say, the old vicious standard of number is to be reintroduced as a test of the necessity for supervision, and three women working together in a room are to be protected from the possible rapacity of their employer, but two are not. That is to say, again, that an acute master who distributes his women-workers about by couples, in rooms "used also for the purpose of a dwelling-house," is to have full power, so far as the law is concerned, to exact any hours of work he likes from them for the sole reason of this distribution. This, indeed, is the principle of *Divide et impere* with a vengeance! There seemed yet one hope for these hapless women whom the Commissioners with cruel kindness thus seek to benefit, and it lay in that same existing variation in the definitions of "factory" and "workshop," which comes now, of course, to be rectified. At present, the former is defined as "including, while that (definition) of a workshop excludes, those places of work where no protected persons are employed." They recommend, "that in the consolidated Act the employment of protected persons should be made a general condition of the definition of a place of work within the provisions of the Act." That is to say, that an inspector must know intuitively where protected persons are employed before he can come to protect them; or, to try to render it a little more clearly, that he must somehow ascertain beforehand the very thing which he pays his visit in the first instance to ascertain. That is to say again, that the women working in pairs in rooms "used also for the purpose of a dwelling-house" must clearly be themselves the judges (along with the master) of whether the rooms are really so used at all; nay, for that matter, as to whether the arrangement of

pairs itself continues, for no one else is entitled to investigate it so long as it is supposed to do so. Into such dilemmas are even the very ablest men led in even their very best endeavours to found a code of laws on a basis wholly empirical.

But if the Royal Commissioners had happily taken the more philosophical and more comprehensive view of their duties, if they had better appreciated the opportunity which the present crisis in our labour-protecting legislation placed at their disposal, how much more consistent and satisfactory might not their suggestions have become, how much more valuable and permanent a gift might they not have bestowed upon their countrymen in their already useful and careful Report. If they had simply regarded the circumstance of employment in production *under another person* as the key to the whole position, how easily would most of the objections that can now be urged against their scheme have been provided for beforehand; in how much more advantageous a light might not their recommendations have shown themselves as founded on an unvarying and secure basis. Even the O'Conor Don might have here found a connecting link of sufficient substance to have prevented his severance from his colleagues; for, indeed, he alone among them, so far as we can judge, appears to have approached this general conception. For is not this in truth the real principle underlying legislation for the protection of labour? There are in a free state certain persons, the Employers and the Employed, and, in a competitive labour-market, the latter are in need of some counteracting force to oppose to that of unlimited competition among the former. Experience has shown that this unrestricted competition in labour is a demoralising and destructive agent, and has shown it by illustrations so shocking and terrifying that, even without realising its sanctions for the interference, the Government has had to intervene. Of what use were a government at all otherwise? Of what respect the highest expression of the nation's will, if it were to express itself on the side of degradation and decay? And among men, in a free labour-market, this counteracting influence to the vast force, Competition, has been found in the also vast force Combination, and the Government has not found it necessary to interfere for them. But to women and children the labour-market is not equally open, and women and children are by the necessities of their position not equally free to combine, and therefore in their behalf the Government has intervened, even though, as we have seen, at first blindly and only under the pressure of mere events. Thus, too, the history of the movement is explained: first, apprentices only are brought under protection, as being the most helpless, then children, then "young persons," then women. First only textile industries are legislated for, then several more, then many more,

then all industries. It has been a movement of continual advance, so happy in its results, so justified by events, that legislators have never paused to inquire after its sanctions. But surely the time has come to announce these; to place in the front of all further artificial limits imposed on industry a plain statement of the justification for them. An uneasy feeling is abroad on the subject of this ever-advancing Government interference with labour. On the one side, there are those who condemn it as imperialism and excessive centralisation, as a process calculated to emasculate the moral sense of responsibility among the people, an insidious intrusion on that faculty of self-government which has contributed so much to the greatness and the glory of England. There are others who see in it nothing more than an invasion of the sphere which should be more properly (and we must suppose wholly) reserved for the operation of economic laws, who even now regard those laws as a sort of huge engine directing and adjusting all our relations to each other, instead of as one, the directing and adjustment of which for good or for evil is our own, which surely is a truer conception. Nor is there absent a third party, just now the most dangerous of all, who, with little knowledge of the principles of their proposals, and egged on by an unresting and too intrusive philanthropy, are for pushing Government inspection into spheres far beyond its proper scope, are for invading even the privacy of the domestic hearth, and ignoring even the decent sanctities and secrecies of married life. Is it not time, then, to bring prominently forward the arguments from justice and logical consistency in favour of labour-protecting laws, in support of those too long pleaded on the grounds of expediency only? for until these are known and appreciated the course of legislation will be ever misunderstood. Is it not time to proclaim that there is a law, in the larger sense as well as in the more restricted, that justifies and ratifies the policy of the past; that the most pressing interests of the people have not after all been made the sport of mere speculative reformers, but are inquired after and provided for on the sound basis of principle, and of a principle founded on the deepest truths of nature? There is yet time to do so, and a few words in that sense inserted in the preamble of a forthcoming Factory Bill would fitly identify the epoch of the consolidation of the existing laws with the recognition and statement of their fundamental sanctions.

When the Royal Commissioners once get out of the region of first principles, however, and free from the consequences of their false start, it is not easy to praise too highly the industry, ability, the clear-sightedness and just-mindedness which their recommendations manifest. Their labours were of no ordinary kind. Seven hundred witnesses gave evidence orally before them, in addition

to a vast quantity of written matter which came into their hands for consideration. The volume in which this evidence is printed numbers no fewer than 1002 very closely printed pages in double columns of the ordinary size of Government "Blue Books," and the specific questions asked and answered reach the affrightening total of 20,892. Their own contribution to the discussion of the question, which is singularly lucid and compact, occupies only 96 pages of the first volume of 340, but ends up with no less than 113 distinct recommendations. We have, of course, no space to go into anything approaching an analysis of the vast majority of these. Some of them, namely, the very judicious and thoughtful ones on the subject of education, have been already provided for or against by "Lord Sandon's Bill;" and others, such as those relating to the position and duties of "certifying surgeons," are of an interest principally special. Others, again, such as those founded on their analysis of trade customs and requirements, are of too technical and detailed a nature for popular treatment in a review, and can, besides, be studied to far greater advantage in the Report itself. Of the proposals, however, for administrative reform, it may be just as well to say a few words. It was in this respect that the earliest developments of factory legislation were so defective; and it is just at this point, there seems some reason to fear, that more recent developments have been most weak. The principle of a dual government at the Factory Office is probably the worst that ingenuity could devise. Either there should be but one permanent head, as the Commissioners recommend, or there should be some half-dozen settled in the principal industrial centres of Great Britain, each with a separate staff under him, and each independent in his own division. Such inspectors-in-chief should meet together once or twice a year to confer, and the majority having decided upon the course of conduct, in any disputed point, most conducive to the common good, it should be incumbent upon them in their several divisions to see that this was faithfully and uniformly pursued. The office and title of Assistant-inspector, of which mention has been already made, is, even by the testimony of those gentlemen themselves, a useless and absurd anomaly.* It is amazing, then, that the Commissioners have not recommended its total abolition, unless indeed they had some notion of its identification hereafter with some such an one as that which we have above described, under the more appropriate name of inspector-in-chief, of which they do give some indications. But after all, the body upon whom the success or failure of any labour-legis-

* Vol. i. p. 90, par. 254. See also vol. ii. quests. 2431, 20,505, 20,517, &c.

lation must ultimately depend is that of the inspectors proper, those who are now called the sub-inspectors of factories. These are the gentlemen who really have the administration of the Acts in their hands, who personally visit the works where protected persons are employed, and recommend and conduct prosecutions in the cases of offenders. For the suggestion that they should now be conceded their proper title of inspectors of factories we have nothing but approval—an approval which we are sorry we cannot altogether extend to other recommendations on their behalf. It is proposed, for instance, to maintain the class of what are now called junior sub-inspectors, that is, gentlemen junior only to the others in the date of their appointments, though often in all other respects their seniors, as an inferior class, and that these “should be attached as subordinates to officers in charge of subdivisions.” We fail to see the utility of this arrangement. If they are to act merely as the assistants of the grade immediately above them, they seem a most extravagant class of men to appoint. Every one of these are educated gentlemen, graduates of the universities, retired officers of the civil, naval, or military services, members of the legal profession, &c. ; and to place them in positions much below their abilities, with a salary at all proportioned to their deserts, would be an unnecessary expenditure both of capital and of energy. Moreover, they would not be likely to perform the duties which it would appear would devolve upon them at all so well as men of a much inferior grade. These duties would apparently be the inspection of the smaller class of factories and workshops, of bakehouses, joiner’s and cobbler’s workrooms, and the like, and it is surely unnecessary that a highly cultivated class of gentlemen should be appointed to that duty. A real subordinate, both official and social, acting under the orders and supervision of an inspector, would be far better fitted for the post. Of course officers entering the department would require some training before taking up their full responsibilities in it, but it is not desirable, but very much the reverse, that this should be confined altogether to the less dignified and considerable portions of their duties. There has always been, we presume, some sort of provision for this initiation into the duties of inspection, and the embarrassment of a distinct classification to secure it is therefore needless.

Lastly, we are distinctly of opinion that the number of works for which inspection will have to be provided under the consolidated Act has been greatly under-estimated. The Commissioners calculate that all workshops, properly so called now, added to those other works, such as bakehouses, which they propose to include in future, will not, under the consolidated Act, amount to more than 100,000 places in all, while to our apprehension it

seems evident that there will be nearly that number in London alone, certainly in London and any two other large towns such as Manchester and Liverpool taken together. The total number will be far more probably 500,000. It is absurd to look forward to providing adequate inspection for all these out of the materials of which the present inspecting staff is composed, and unless adequate inspection is hereafter to be provided, the law might almost as well have been left as it is now. They do indeed propose some provision for local assistance, but timidly, and chiefly as a temporary expedient. Yet nothing is more certain than that in no other way than by local inspectors of an inferior grade acting under the direction of district inspectors can their proposed reforms be ever successfully put in practice. And these local inspectors should be remunerated partly out of local and partly out of imperial funds, even as their utility would be of a partly local and of a partly imperial character. This would not only be a convenient arrangement, but is simple justice. When the Workshops Act was originally passed, its administration was intrusted to local authorities. These bodies omitted or failed to carry it out, and it was then thrust upon the Factory Department to be administered, as it was but recently proposed that the Agricultural Children's Act should also be. But why should local authorities altogether shirk their fair responsibilities, or, more properly, why should they be allowed to do so? The benefits proposed to be obtained would be most certainly theirs in a peculiar degree, quite as much so as in many other directions where their responsibilities are now fully recognised. The method too is one of tried and singular efficacy. The union of local and central energies in the same occupation, local inspection that is under a central authority, would no doubt in this instance, as in all others in which it has been adopted, achieve a ready success. It is a device which has been proved to combine the maximum of efficiency in practice with the minimum of (easily understood) objections which can be advanced against the exclusive employment of either power separately. It would be the least expensive as well as the most efficient means to the desired end. Perhaps the somewhat similar machinery created by the last Education Act for advancing the elementary instruction of the country already points in that direction, as its limitation of the ages during which employment may be entered on, indubitably anticipates the provisions of the forthcoming Factory Act. We sincerely hope it will prove to be so, and that this excellent opportunity may not be thrown away of settling on something like a permanent, sound, and comprehensive basis this greatly important question of the legislative protection of labour.

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

The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. By THEODORE MARTIN. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. Vol. I. 1874. Vol. II. 1876.

ON the appearance of the first volume of this book, we determined to delay reviewing it until we had the whole work before us. The second volume has now appeared; and its length and the date at which it closes show, that if we further delay our review, it will be impossible to compress it into the space usually allotted to a single work; and we have therefore determined to lay before our readers our views on the two volumes already published. This "Life" is a biography of a high, if not the highest class. The materials placed by the Queen at the author's disposal—the time for the fullest use of which is, he says, not yet come*—could not but make the book a valuable contribution to the historical literature of our time. The book is avowedly written "in compliance with Her Majesty's desire;"† and this fact, though it has not caused the author to write a mere panegyric on the Prince, which, as he truly says, would have been distasteful to the Queen, as it would be unworthy of the Prince, nevertheless, almost unavoidably, and it may be unconsciously, causes him to write in a strain of too unvarying and indiscriminate praise of his illustrious subject. Another difficulty under which he unavoidably laboured we will let him describe in his own words.‡ "I have had to speak much and often of your Majesty, with whom his (the Prince's) life was so inseparably interwoven, that without the reflected light thus cast upon the Prince, the picture would lose many of its tenderest and most penetrating touches." The consequence is, that we have a Life of the Queen as well as of the Prince; and we think the work as a biography of the Prince would have been more effective if some of the passages containing her Majesty's opinions on various subjects, and extracts from her letters to various persons (interesting as they are), had been either curtailed or even omitted. A more serious defect remains. Mr. Martin tells us, "In writing the Life of the Prince, I have felt that I must write what would be in some measure a history of the time."§ This to some extent was of course necessary, but the great fault of

* Introduction, vol. i. p. 7. † Ibid., p. 1. ‡ Ibid., p. 7.

§ The Introductory Letter to the Queen, vol. ii. p. 1.

the book is, that the history is told with too much detail and with a lawyer-like prolixity. As one illustration of this defect, out of the many we could give, we refer to the story of the Pacifico affair in Greece, and the memorable debate of 1850 on Lord Palmerston's foreign policy, which is told with tedious detail; the Prince's connection with the transaction, so far as it is told by Mr. Martin, consisting merely of a gossiping paragraph in a letter to Baron Stockmar.* Allowing for all these defects, the book is both valuable and in the highest degree interesting, and will raise in public estimation, even higher than it stood before, the character and work amongst us of the Prince Consort. We find little trace of the influence of the Prince's parents in the character subsequently developed by him. Of his father little is said, and there is no evidence that he was a man of ability or in any way remarkable.† Of his mother it is said that he resembled her in person, and also in quickness, vivacity, and playfulness. Prince Albert was "her favourite child." The father and mother were separated in 1824, when the Prince was five years old; the separation was followed by a divorce two years later, and the mother never saw her children again, but "she had established a hold upon their affections which remained with them to the last."‡ From the Prince's earliest years there was a reciprocal attraction between him and his uncle Leopold (the King of the Belgians), which deepened with advancing years. It was the uncle, we think, who formed and trained his nephew's mind. In this respect much, no doubt, was due to the Prince's tutor, M. Forschutz of Coburg, who superintended his education and that of his brother through all its stages up to manhood. For Prince Albert M. Forschutz early formed a great affection. "Every grace," he writes, "had been showered by nature on this charming boy; every eye rested on him with delight, and his look won the hearts of all." It is not said whether M. Forschutz lived to see the subsequent career of his favourite pupil. Industry and energy were the Prince's characteristics from the first. "To do something was with him a necessity." His energy was directed alike to his studies and his childish sports. In his relation to others he early exhibited great strength of will, not inconsistent with a prevailing gentleness and benevolence of temper, an eagerness to do good to others, and a grateful disposition which never allowed him to forget a kindness, however small, done to himself. His cousin, Count Arthur Mensdorff, bears testimony to the "perfect moral purity, both in word and deed, which distinguished his youth,

* Vol. ii. p. 283.

† He is said to have had a genius for landscape-gardening, which his son inherited, vol. i. p. 94.

‡ Vol. i. p. 25.

and remained with him during life." To a broad general education suited to his rank, and the yet higher station to which, in the private councils of his family, he was destined, was added the study of music and drawing, for both of which he showed a marked inclination. He was also from childhood fond of natural history, and his early pursuit of studies connected with it contributed to form the habit of accurate observation by which he was in later life so remarkably distinguished. The first fruits of this education was the composition of an essay "On the Mode of Thought of the Germans." Its aim, as described by Mr. Martin, was "to trace historically the progress of German civilisation—a subject not a little ambitious for a youth of sixteen."* How far, if at all, the Prince succeeded in his ambitious effort, we are not told by his biographer. In 1836 the succession of the Princess Victoria to the throne of these realms could no longer be considered as doubtful. It was probable, also, that that event would take place at no distant period. Her future destiny was the object of intense interest and anxiety to her uncle Leopold (King of the Belgians), who had always taken a paternal interest in his fatherless niece. To him it seemed that her happiness and welfare would be best promoted by an early marriage with her cousin Prince Albert. Affection and prudence alike suggested caution in any attempt to bring about this union; and the King, as was his custom in matters of difficulty, called to his aid his secret and confidential agent and counsellor, Baron Stockmar. Of this German adventurer, and of his secret and irresponsible, and therefore bad influence on our court and government, we have on a previous occasion expressed our opinion,† and reviewing it in the additional light thrown on the subject by the further revelations made by Mr. Martin's book as to Stockmar's influence, its nature and extent, we see nothing which induces us to alter our opinion, but, on the contrary, much which confirms us in and strengthens that opinion. Stockmar was, of course, favourable to the proposed marriage, but he urged "that no claim on the Prince's behalf should be made for the hand of his cousin, unless an impression in his favour from personal acquaintances should first have been produced."‡ "Externally," he writes to the King, "he (the Prince) possesses all that pleases the sex, and at all times and in all countries must please. It may prove, too, a lucky circumstance that even now he has something of an English look."§ The desired opportunity for the personal acquaintance between the cousins soon arrived. An

* Vol. i. p. 11.

† "Westminster Review," N.S., No. 86, April 1873, Art. "Irresponsible Ministers: Baron Stockmar."

‡ Vol. i. p. 19.

§ Ibid., p. 18.

invitation from the Duchess of Kent to the Duke of Coburg and his sons to visit her in England—the result, no doubt, of Stockmar's wire-pulling—brought about the meeting. The Prince first came to England in May 1836. The impression produced on the Princess by her future husband was favourable, and the fact was sufficiently evident to enable her uncle to feel himself justified in disclosing to the Princess his wish that she should become the wife of her cousin. In the June following the Prince's arrival, the Princess notified to her uncle her willing assent to his advice.* At Stockmar's suggestion, the Prince and his brother, on leaving England, took up their residence at Brussels, that the Prince "might be under the eye and influence of his uncle," who was "living in the full stream of European politics, and was working out the problem of constitutional government."† At Brussels, under the guidance of M. Quetelet, the Prince added to his other acquirements the study of the higher mathematics, and the application of the law of probabilities to social and natural phenomena, and this study continued a favourite one with him to the end of his life. In his last speech in public, addressed to the International Statistical Congress, he referred to M. Quetelet, then present, as one "from whom I had the privilege, now twenty-four years ago, to receive my first instruction in the higher branches of mathematics—one who, also, has so successfully directed his great abilities to the application of the science to those social phenomena, the discovery of the governing laws of which can only be approached by the accumulation and reduction of statistical facts."‡ After nearly a year's stay in Brussels, the Princes went to Bonn, at which university they spent the next eighteen months. A fellow-student records of Prince Albert that "he entered with the greatest eagerness into any study in which he engaged, whether belonging to science or art. He spared no exertion either of mind or body; on the contrary, he rather sought difficulties, in order to overcome them. The result was such an harmonious development of his powers and faculties as is very seldom arrived at."§

During the Prince's stay at Bonn, the contingency occurred, the first knowledge of the possibility of which caused the Queen, as she herself tells us, "to cry much," and "which she has ever deplored." || On the 20th June 1837, William IV. died, and the Princess Victoria succeeded him as Queen Regnant. "Now," writes the Prince to his future wife, "you are Queen of the mightiest land of Europe; in your hand lies the happiness of

* Vol. i. p. 20.

† *Ibid.*, p. 21.

‡ *The Speeches and Addresses of H.R.H. the Prince Consort*, p. 124.

§ Vol. i. p. 23.

|| Vol. i. p. 13, note by the Queen.

millions. May Heaven assist you, and strengthen you with its strength in that high but difficult task. I hope that your reign may be long and happy and glorious, and that your efforts may be rewarded by the thankfulness and love of your subjects." * That he would be called to aid in realising his own hopes for his cousin, was at this time an event, if anticipated by the Prince as probable, still an event quite unsettled. Rumours of the Queen's intended marriage with the Prince got abroad, and it was thought by King Leopold judicious that he should be withdrawn from public observation; accordingly he spent the autumn of 1837 in Switzerland and the north of Italy. King Leopold urged on the Queen that some decisive arrangement with regard to the marriage should be made for the year 1839. The Queen objected to so early a marriage, urging that both she herself and the Prince were too young, and that the marriage would be considered premature by the English people. The Prince's imperfect knowledge of English was also a defect in one called on to fill such a position as the husband of the English Queen. These dilatory objections appeared to King Leopold unanswerable. "The Queen, however, writing of this period after the Prince's death, and under the influence of her deep grief, 'could not,' to use her own words, 'think without indignation against herself of her wish to keep the Prince waiting for probably three or four years, at the risk of ruining all his prospects in life, until she might feel inclined to marry.' The only excuse the Queen can make for herself is in the fact that the sudden change from the secluded life at Kensington to the independence of her position as Queen Regnant at the age of eighteen, put all ideas of marriage out of her mind." † Early in 1838 the state of the Queen's feelings, and the necessity for the marriage being delayed, was communicated by King Leopold to the Prince, who made this just remark, "I am ready," he said, "to submit to this delay, if I have only some certain assurance to go upon; but if, after waiting perhaps for three years, I should find that the Queen no longer desired the marriage, it would place me in a ridiculous position, and would, to a certain extent, ruin all my prospects for the future." ‡ It does not appear that any such certain assurance was given as the Prince desired. At the conclusion of his university course, he made a tour in Italy to complete his education. The Queen confided the state of her feelings with regard to the Prince to Stockmar, and requested him to accompany the Prince. At Florence they were joined, at King Leopold's request, by the Prince's friend for the remainder of their joint lives, Sir Francis Seymour, then a lieutenant in

Vol. i. p. 25. † *Vide* "Early Years of the Prince Consort," p. 220.

‡ Vol. i. p. 27.

the 19th Regiment. The society of a man so highly distinguished as Baron Stockmar, the Prince acknowledged to have been most valuable to him.* Now was laid the foundation of that confidential intercourse between the Prince and the Baron which ended only with the Prince's life, and of that secret influence which henceforward the Baron exercised over the Prince, of which every chapter of the volume before us supplies proof. The following estimate by Stockmar of the Prince's character and disposition at this time is interesting on account of the difference between it and similar estimates formed by some of the Prince's earlier companions, and the contrast between the Prince then and what he afterwards became. Stockmar describes the Prince as "possessed of the habit of not dwelling long upon a subject."† Contrast with this the following extract from the introduction prefixed by Sir Arthur Helps to his outline of the Prince's character prefixed to his edition of the "Speeches and Addresses:"—"He did not understand the merit of second-best, but everything that was to be done must be done perfectly. In the choice of a jewel, in the placing of a statue, in the laying-out of a walk, in the direction of a party of pleasure, his reasoning mind must be satisfied; and he longed that everything that was to be, should be the best of its kind."‡ "Great exertion," continues Stockmar, "is repugnant to him; and both morally and physically he tries to save himself from it.§ Full of the best intentions and the noblest resolutions, he often falls short in giving them effect. His judgment is in many things beyond his years, but hitherto, at least, he shows not the slightest interest in politics. Even while the most important occurrences are in progress, and their issues undecided, he does not care to look into a newspaper. As respects *les belles manières*, there is still room for great improvement. This defect must be in a great measure ascribed to the fact that his earliest years were passed without the advantage of the society or care of a mother or other cultivated woman. On the whole, he will always have more success with men than with women, in whose society he shows too little *empressement*, and is too indifferent and retiring."|| Although the Queen, to use her own words, "never had an idea, if she married at all, of any one else than the Prince," still as late as July 1839 her Majesty desired that their union should be still further postponed. This was announced by King Leopold to the Prince in language rather stronger than the Queen's real intentions justified him in

* Vol. i. p. 21.

† Vol. i. p. 33.

‡ Introduction to Speeches, &c., p. 33.

§ Compare with this vol. i. p. 9, and the testimony of a fellow-student, quoted *ante* and at vol. i. p. 23.

|| Vol. i. p. 34.

using; and in October of that year the Prince determined to go to England and bring matters to a crisis. He arrived under the impression that the Queen "wished the affair to be considered as broken off, and that for four years she could think of no marriage." He was speedily undeceived. He arrived at Windsor Castle on the 10th October. On the 15th October the Queen wrote to Stockmar—"Albert has completely won my heart, and all was settled between us this morning." "The crisis," the Prince wrote to the same correspondent, "has come upon us by surprise, before we could have expected it." In the same letter he sketches his ideal of his future position:—"An individuality, a character which shall win the respect, the love, and the confidence of the Queen and of the nation, must be the keystone of my position. Such an individuality gives a guarantee for the disposition which prompts the action; and where this exists, even should mistakes be committed, they are more likely to have allowance made for them than are the best and grandest designs to secure support where confidence in their author is wanting."* With this exalted ideal of his future position was combined a shrewd practical forecast of its attendant difficulties. "With the exception of my relations with the Queen," he writes to his stepmother, "my future position will have its dark side, since the sky will not always be blue and unclouded."† Stockmar accurately foretold "that after every storm the Prince will come safely into port;" and Professor Perthes, under whom the Prince had studied at Bonn, expressed this opinion—"Queen Victoria will find him the right sort of man; and unless some unlucky fatality interpose, he is sure to become the idol of the English nation, silently to influence the English aristocracy, and deeply to affect the destinies of Europe."‡ The Prince soon experienced the "dark side" of his position. Party feeling seldom if ever ran higher than at the opening of 1840. The Tories, long excluded from office, were now ravenous for it, the more so as in the previous summer it had slipped from their grasp. Their disappointment was due to the course taken by the Queen in reference to the ladies of her household, and they sought to revenge themselves by in every possible way annoying her in regard to the arrangements for her marriage. Rumours were set afloat as to the Prince's religious belief; even Lord Palmerston wrote in great haste to Baron Stockmar "to know whether Prince Albert belonged to any sect of Protestants whose rules might prevent his taking the sacrament according to the ritual of the English Church." The more popular suspicion was that the Prince had leanings towards "Romanism;" and the Duke of Wellington—with what motives we know not—moved and carried

* Vol. i. p. 42.

† Ibid., p. 43.

‡ Ibid., p. 51, 52, notes.

an amendment inserting the word "Protestant" in the congratulatory address from the Lords to the Queen. This was a trifle; a more serious annoyance was at hand. The Ministers proposed to settle on the Prince an annuity of £50,000. The veteran economist Joseph Hume proposed to reduce the annuity to £20,000. The Ministers defeated this amendment; but the buffoon of the Tories, the late Colonel Sibthorp, came forward with another amendment reducing the annuity to £30,000, and was supported by Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham. The Ministers were defeated by 262 votes to 158. "The Prince," wrote the Premier (Lord Melbourne) to Stockmar, "will be very angry at the Tories; but it is not the Tories only whom the Prince has to thank for cutting down his allowance. It is rather the Tories, the Radicals, and a great proportion of our own people."* The vote of the Commons was guided by wise and patriotic motives; the country was in a state of great commercial depression, and there was much political discontent—indeed, disaffection amongst the poorer classes. In this state of things, it was felt to be unwise to increase the cost of the monarchy. In the debate on the amendment, Sir Robert Peel expressed his "unwillingness to vote the larger sum until the Prince had given pledges of his intention to reside permanently in the country, and of his attachment to it." This cautious feeling was no doubt largely shared by the miscellaneous group of politicians which formed the majority. Having regard to the Prince's description of his own position, which we shall presently quote, it is worth observation that Sir James Graham, in supporting the amendment, drew a distinction between the position of the Prince and that of a Queen-consort. "The status of the latter," Sir James said, "was recognized by the constitution. She had an independent status; she had independent officers; and, from her sex, it was indispensably necessary that a large female establishment should be maintained for her." Praise for wise and patriotic motives cannot be given to those politicians who sought to defeat, and succeeded in defeating, the measure, on which the Queen laid much stress, for settling the Prince's rank and precedence as her husband. The Queen desired to secure for the Prince, by Act of Parliament, rank and precedence next after herself. This was opposed by a combination, of which the primé mover was the late King of Hanover. He found a willing mouthpiece in the Duke of Wellington, and the Duke found an ally at once willing, able, and unscrupulous in Lord Brougham, ever ready to avenge his exclusion from office by harassing and mortifying his former colleagues, the Whigs. The victory of these allies was certain, and the Ministry, rather than risk a defeat on so deli-

* Vol. i. p. 60.

cate a question, and so much affecting the feelings of the Sovereign herself, withdrew from the bill for naturalising the Prince the clauses settling his precedence. That was determined by letters patent granting the Prince "place, pre-eminence, and precedence next to her Majesty, upon all occasions and in all meetings, except where otherwise provided by Act of Parliament,"* The marriage took place. Years afterwards the Prince thus described his position at his first arrival:—"A very considerable portion of the nation," he wrote to Stockmar at the end of 1853, "had never given itself the trouble to consider what really is the position of the Queen's husband. When I first came over here, I was met with this want of knowledge, and unwillingness to give a thought to the position of this luckless personage. Peel cut down my income; Wellington refused me my rank; the Royal Family cried out against the foreign interloper. The Whigs in office were only inclined to concede to me just as much space as I could stand on. The constitution is silent as to the consort of the Queen; even Blackstone ignores him, and yet there he was, and not to be done without."† Lord Beaconsfield accurately described the Prince's position. "He was the prime councillor of a realm the political constitution of which did not even recognise his political existence."‡ Yet the Prince said he found it necessary "continually and anxiously to watch every part of the public business in order to be able to advise and assist the Queen at any moment in any of the multifarious and difficult questions or duties brought before her, sometimes international, sometimes political or social or personal." And he summed up in the following well-known words the diversified relations in which the husband of a Queen Regnant stands to the Sovereign:—"The natural head of her family, superintendent of her household, manager of her private affairs, sole *confidential* adviser in politics, and only assistant in her communications with the officers of her Government; he is, besides, the husband of the Queen, the tutor of the Royal children, the private secretary of the Sovereign, and her permanent Minister."§

At the outset of the Prince's life in England, there existed, and very naturally, a wide-spread constitutional jealousy that any interference with public affairs should take place on the part of one who was altogether irresponsible to the authorities of the country. It is worth while to recall the remarks on this feeling, and on the Prince's position generally, of the late Lord

* See the Queen's memorandum on this subject, vol. i. pp. 61, 62.

† Vol. ii. pp. 559, 560.

‡ Speech in Commons, July 1862, on the first meeting of Parliament after the Prince's death; and *vide* Sir James Graham's speech, *ante*.

§ Letter of the Prince to the Duke of Wellington, vol. ii. p. 260.

Derby, who would have been one of the first to resent any improper interference on the Prince's part.

“Those persons who thus argue, argue on a not unnatural constitutional jealousy, but they argue in forgetfulness of the very dictates of human nature, and require that which is rendered impossible by the very constitution of the human mind. For they require what amounts in fact to this, that two persons should be living in the closest and most intimate relations, in the most absolute confidence which can subsist between husband and wife, and yet that the opinions of the one should be altogether concealed, and that the thoughts of the one should altogether abstain from a consideration of those topics which, day by day, and hour by hour, must be a subject of engrossing care and anxiety to the other. My Lords, the very statement of facts shows the impossibility of meeting the views of those persons who thus argue. I should say there was occasion for that jealousy if in his high position the Prince Consort had ever made himself the tool or sought to subserve the machinations of political parties in England. I am sure every one who had an opportunity of judging will agree that no one could be more absolutely and entirely free from such imputations, and that the whole of his efforts were directed, irrespective of party altogether, to give his Sovereign and his wife that counsel and advice which he thought most befitting his position. But if it was desirable that there should be this influence between the Sovereign and the Prince Consort on the subject of public affairs, how much more desirable was it that it should be exercised by him with a full knowledge of every political circumstance, of the views brought forward by the Minister, and of all the discussions which take place, rather than it should be exercised in private, and with an imperfect knowledge of the grounds on which certain questions were submitted to her Majesty. And, my Lords, I appeal confidently to all who have had the honour to be admitted to that personal intercourse with the Sovereign which is the highest privilege of a Minister, whether from the presence of his Royal Highness, whether from his calm, and cool, and impartial judgment, whether from his great ability, and the manner in which he applied himself to any topic, they have not been frequently indebted to him for valuable and useful suggestions, and for great assistance.” *

This jealous fear of the Prince was, by those who had the best opportunities of observing and judging, soon laid aside. “I am quite confident,” writes Lord Spencer to Lord Brougham in 1843, “that the more influence Albert has, the better it will be. His judgment, temper, and excellent principles render him invaluable about the Queen. You are aware that I have pretty good means of informa-

* Speech in House of Lords, July 1862, on the first meeting of Parliament after the Prince's death.

tion.* "The Prince's character," notes Stockmar in the same year, "develops very rapidly." From the earliest period of his English career to its close, the Prince was advised and influenced by Stockmar. For the reasons given in the article in this Review to which we have before referred, we dissent from Mr. Martin's eulogium of him (vol. i. p. 75, *et seq.*), whom Bunsen truly described as "the silent guide of the English court." In a note (to p. 76, vol. ii.), there is an extract from a letter from Stockmar to the Prince (written in 1854), in which he says, "I love and honour the English constitution from conviction, for I think that, under judicious handling, it is capable of realising a degree of civil legal liberty which leaves a man free scope to think and act as a man." The English constitution which was the object of Stockmar's love was not the objective constitution as it exists and works amongst us, but a subjective constitution existing only in his own mind. It was his great object, as we shall later on more particularly point out, was so judiciously to handle the actual constitution as to obtain for the Prince a large amount of personal government. Two most prominent characteristics of Stockmar's, two of his disqualifications for his anomalous position, were his dislike, amounting to contempt, for the English character, and his hatred of Parliamentary government.† It is clear that he had instilled the latter feeling into the mind of his royal pupil. "In politics," writes the Prince to his mentor (7th June 1847), "Parliament is now the rock ahead." Again, on the very eve of the Crimean War, the Prince writes in the same spirit to the same sympathising friend. "Here we have advanced a step, that is to say, Parliament is prorogued at last."[‡] Impatience of Parliamentary control, especially in foreign affairs, was evidently a very deep-seated feeling in the Prince's mind. We cannot follow Mr. Martin into all the interesting details he gives of the beautiful family life of the Palace. In reading them we are reminded of the words in which Carlyle described Arnold's home at Rugby, and which are equally applicable to Windsor, to Balmoral, and to Osborne—"a temple of industrious peace." We must confine ourselves solely to the public and political side of the Prince's career. He soon ceased to be the object of party conflict. The prospect of the birth of an heir to the crown made it necessary soon after the marriage to provide for a Regency, should one unfortunately be required. It was feared that, like the Annuity and the Precedence questions, this would be made the occasion of a party fight. The more so as the surviving family of George III. were hostile to the appointment of

* Life of Lord Spencer, p. 559. The means of information was his sister Lady Lytton, the governess of the royal children.

† *Vide* article on Stockmar, "Westminster Review."

‡ Vol. ii. p. 502.

the Prince as sole Regent, and desired the appointment of a Council of Regency, of which the Duke of Sussex should be a prominent member. Stockmar opened negotiations with the leaders of the Opposition, and induced them to assent to the Ministerial bill for appointing the Prince sole Regent, on the ground that the father was "the natural guardian of his child." The bill, therefore, passed both Houses without further opposition than a solitary and ineffectual protest from the Duke of Sussex. "This was entirely due," Lord Melbourne told the Queen, "to the Prince's own character. Three months ago they would not have done it for him."* The Prince took a more modest, perhaps a more accurate, view of the transaction. "There has been much trouble to carry the matter through," writes the Prince to his father, "for all sorts of intrigues were at work; and had not Stockmar gained the Opposition for the Ministers, it might well have ended as did the £50,000."† Looking at the Prince's ignorance of Englishmen and English affairs, and the fact that the responsible Ministers of the Crown would have been constantly liable to be secretly controlled and overruled by the Regent's irresponsible Minister, Stockmar, whose strong leaning to personal government is abundantly proved, Englishmen cannot be too thankful that such a Regency never became necessary. Lord Melbourne, in quitting office in September 1841, informed the Queen, who says, "he would not have said so unless he thought and felt it," "that he had formed the highest opinion of his Royal Highness's judgment, temper, and discretion; and he cannot but feel a great consideration ‡ and security in the reflection that he leaves your Majesty in a situation in which your Majesty has the inestimable advantage of such admirable assistance. Lord Melbourne feels certain that your Majesty cannot do better than have recourse to it whenever it is needed, and rely on it with confidence." Even so early after the marriage as August 1840 the Prince wrote to his father, "Victoria allows me to take an active part in *foreign affairs*, and I think I have done some good. I always commit my views to paper, and then communicate them to Lord Melbourne. He seldom answers me, but I have the satisfaction of seeing him act entirely in accordance with what I have said." §

One of the offices earliest undertaken by the Prince was that of Lord Warden of the Stannaries of Cornwall and Devon. In this office he undertook radically to reform the management of the Duchy of Cornwall, which had been, up to that time, an unprofitable estate, except to those concerned in its management. That

* Vol. i. p. 89.

† Memoir of Baron Stockmar, vol. ii. p. 45.

‡ *Sic* in original.

§ Vol. i. pp. 95-118.

management was placed by the Prince on such a sound basis, that the Duchy's revenue now supplies the greater part of the Prince of Wales' income, and the Council of the Duchy was enabled, out of the accumulations made during his minority, to purchase for him the Sandringham estate. Lord Kingsdown, better remembered perhaps by his earlier name of Mr. Pemberton Leigh, who, as Chancellor of the Duchy of Cornwall,* saw much of the Prince, has recorded in his unpublished "Recollections," that in 1841 he was "introduced to the Prince by Sir Robert Peel, and that Sir Robert said he would find the Prince one of the most extraordinary young men he had ever met with. So," continues the Reminiscent, "it proved. His aptitude for business was wonderful; the dullest and most intricate matters did not escape or weary his attention; his judgment was very good; his readiness to listen to any suggestions, though against his own opinions, was constant; and though I saw his temper very often tried, yet in the course of twenty years I never once saw it disturbed, nor witnessed any signs of impatience." † It was as Lord Warden of the Stannaries that the Prince appeared for the first and only time in the character of a judge. He presided over the hearing of an appeal from a decision of the Vice-Warden of the Stannaries. The court consisted of the Lord Warden, the Lord Chancellor (Lyndhurst), the Master of the Rolls (Lord Langdale), Lord Brougham, Vice-Chancellor Sir James Wigram, and Mr. Baron Parke (afterwards Lord Wensleydale). The case was argued by a bar worthy of so distinguished a court. Sir William Follett, then Solicitor-General, was counsel for the appellant. It was one of the last cases in which that distinguished advocate appeared. As opponent he had "a foeman worthy of his steel," Mr. Erle, afterwards Sir William Erle and Lord Chief-Justice of the Common Pleas. The Prince delivered the judgment of the court, saying, "The judges with whom I have advised have communicated to me their opinion, and the judgment that I am about to pronounce is in conformity with that opinion." The judgment, by whomsoever composed, is one of the highest authority in the Stannaries Court. ‡ Apparently judicial business was not to the Prince's taste, as one of the reforms introduced by him into the administration of

* Chancellor, not Attorney-General, as erroneously stated by Mr. Martin, vol. i. p. 118. Mr. Martin seems at fault on Cornish matters,—e.g., at vol. i. p. 389, he speaks of an excursion to "Falmouth, St. Michael's Mount, and the Duchy of Cornwall." Is not Mr. Martin aware that the Duchy of Cornwall includes the counties of Devon and Cornwall, and that Falmouth and St. Michael's Mount are in Cornwall?

† See the passage quoted in the Life, vol. i. p. 119.

‡ See the report of the case, *Vice v. Thomas*, by Sir Edward Smirke, afterwards Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales, and subsequently Vice-

the Duchy was the transfer of the appellate jurisdiction of the Lord Warden to the Lords Justices.

The first public body with which the Prince was associated was the Fine Arts Commission of 1841. Sir Robert Peel was the Minister by whose advice the Prince was made a member of the Commission, and so initiated into public life. This Commission, the Prince told the Queen, "taught him more than anything else had done." Although Sir Robert Peel had, to use the Prince's own words, "cut down his income," Sir Robert had not long been in office before he gained the confidence and affection of both the Queen and Prince. It is evident from many passages in these volumes, that of all the Ministers who have served the Queen, Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen were the most acceptable to her and to the Prince. "Death," wrote the Prince to the Duchess of Kent in 1850, "has snatched from us Peel, the best of men, our truest friend, the strongest bulwark of the throne, the greatest statesman of his time." *

From the time that Sir Robert Peel had formed his Ministry in 1841, the Prince, with the assent of Sir Robert and Lord Aberdeen, had given more attention to politics, yet we do not find any decided proof of his activity in that sphere until after his election as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge in 1847. Stockmar was then urging on him to assert the rights of the Crown (*i.e.*, the Prince himself) to be permanent head of the Council over the temporary leader of the Ministry, and to act as such.† "The Prince," wrote Stockmar in 1847, "has made great strides of late. He has obviously a head for politics, before whose perspicacity even prejudices give way which spring from education or want of experience. Place weighty reasons before him, and at once he takes a rational and just view, be the subject what it may. He has also gained much in self-reliance. His natural vivacity leads him at times to jump too rapidly to a conclusion, and he occasionally acts too hastily; but he has grown too clear-sighted to commit any great mistakes." ‡

This year saw the Prince elected Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. The circumstances of that election were remarkable. The Prince, when originally asked to allow himself to be put in

Warden of the Stannaries. It is dedicated to the Prince as Lord Warden, and is described as "*primam hanc in suo munere judiciali sententiam.*" The court of the Vice-Warden of the Stannaries of Devon and Cornwall is an ancient court, having jurisdiction both at law and in equity over all miners and matters relating to mines and mining within the Stannaries.

* Vol. ii. p. 290.

† See his mischievous letter of 27th December 1845, vol. i. p. 315.

‡ Vol. i. p. 384. It is worth while to compare Mr. Martin's translation with that of the same document in Stockmar's *Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 206.

nomination, declined on the ground that there did not exist that degree of unanimity in the University which alone would leave him at liberty to assent to the request. He referred to the candidature of Lord Powis, who had been put forward by St. John's College, and whose supporters were determined to go to the poll. The request to the Prince had come mostly from Trinity College. It originated, indeed, with Dr. Whewell, who was said, truly or otherwise, to be actuated by the desire to obtain a mitre for himself rather than by any desire to promote the interest of the University. The Prince's refusal left the field in possession of the Johnian nominee. To this result the Trinity men neither could nor would submit; and, as the Prince himself stated, "entirely without his sanction or privity," they decided that their royal candidate should go to the poll. The battle of Trinity *v.* John's was fought with quite as much heat and animosity as any Parliamentary election, and an unprecedented number of members of the University recorded their votes. The total number of votes given was 1790, of which 953 were for the Prince and 837 for his opponent. The Prince, therefore, was elected by a majority of 116. Lord Powis was supported mainly by the country gentry and clergy, whose connection with the University was merely nominal, while the Prince received the votes of 16 out of the 24 Professors, of 19 out of the 30 Senior Wranglers, and of 3 to 1 of the resident members of the University. His supporters were described by Sir Robert Peel as comprising "a very large proportion of the most eminent men in the University, and almost all the chief academical authorities." The Prince, after consulting Lord Lansdowne, Sir Robert Peel, and others, "resolved to accept the trust which the University was willing to confide to him." In his inaugural address, he assured the University that his new duties "would engage his constant and earnest attention."*

With characteristic thoroughness, and equally characteristic caution, he proceeded to make good this assurance. He was the first to suggest, and the most determined to carry out, the reform of the Cambridge system. "The student of Saxe-Gotha, it was said at the time, weighed Cambridge in the balance, found it to be a sham, and resolved that some truth should be put in it." The details given by Mr. Martin of the firm but cautious manner in which the Prince set about the task of reforming the Cambridge curriculum are highly interesting. He consulted not only the University authorities, but Lord John Russell, the then Premier, and Sir Robert Peel. The Prince had to restrain the reforming zeal or radical impetuosity of the Premier, who, anticipating the measures of 1853 and the present time, was for at once issuing a

* Vol. i. pp. 388-390.

Royal Commission to "inquire into the state of schools and colleges of royal foundation, in order that her Majesty might be informed how far the benevolent views of her predecessors had been carried into effect, and what improvements could be made either by royal authority or by Parliament." The Prince, aware of the susceptibility of the academic body, and their dread of any innovations, besought the Premier "to pause" and not spoil his more cautious, though more limited reform, by anything so startling to the academic mind as a commission of inquiry nominated by a Whig Government. The great opponent of the Prince's educational reform was the Master of Trinity (Dr. Whewell). The grounds and motives of his opposition appear from the following admirable refutation of them, contained in a letter on the subject from Sir Robert Peel to the Prince:—

"I think Dr. Whewell is quite wrong in his position that mathematical knowledge is entitled to *paramount* consideration, because it is conversant with indisputable *truths*; that such departments of science as chemistry are not proper subjects of academical instruction, because there is controversy respecting important facts and principles, and constant accessions of information from new discoveries, and danger that the students may lose their reverence for professors when they discover that professors cannot maintain doctrines as indisputable as mathematical or arithmetical truths. The Doctor's assumption that a century should pass before new discoveries in science are admitted into the course of academical instruction, exceeds in absurdity anything which the bitterest enemy of university education would have imputed to its advocates. Are the students to hear nothing of electricity and the speculations concerning its mysterious influence, its possible connection with the nervous and with muscular action, till all doubts on the subject are at an end? Will they be at an end after a lapse of a hundred years? If the principle for which Dr. Whewell contends be a sound one, it will be difficult to deliver a lecture on theology. But the fact is, that adherence to the principle, so far from exalting the character of professors and heads of houses, would cover them with ridicule. There can be nothing more useful to a young mind than to know the progressive discoveries of science, to have a history of error, and the slow process by which it was corrected, to hear of the conflicting theories of the present day—the points on which learned men differ, as well as those on which they are agreed; and the professor who told the students these things, who cautioned them against hasty conclusions, who boldly avowed that the light was not yet separated from the darkness, would be much more estimated than one who lectured about nothing but the conic sections and quadratic equations, and such matters, although the latter proved everything that he asserted." *

* Vol. ii. pp. 117, 118.

One noteworthy incident of the Prince's Chancellorship was the offer he made to Lord Macaulay of the Regius Professorship of Modern History. "The Prince, to my extreme astonishment," notes Lord Macaulay in his Diary, "offered me the professorship, and very earnestly, and with many flattering expressions, pressed me to accept it. I was resolute, and gratefully and respectfully declined. My temper is that of the wolf in the fable; I cannot bear the collar, and I have got rid of much finer and richer collars than that." *

Had Lord Macaulay accepted the professorship, the historical literature of England would have been enriched by some courses of lectures, corrected, elaborated, and polished, as we know Lord Macaulay, and he alone, could and would have corrected, elaborated, and polished them; and for the sake of this gain we could have afforded to spare the brilliant fragment of Lord Macaulay's "History of England." †

One of the Prince's earliest essays in practical English politics was, at the request of Bishop Wilberforce, to give his ideas on the "proper functions of a bishop in the House of Lords," with a view, we suppose, of making the Dean of Westminster, as Dr. Wilberforce then was, a model bishop when—as was shortly afterwards the case—he should become one.

"A bishop," wrote the Prince, "ought to abstain completely from mixing himself up with the politics of the day, and, beyond giving a general support to the Queen's Government, and occasionally voting for it, should take no part in the discussion of state affairs (for instance, Corn Laws, Game Laws, trade or financial questions); but he should come forward whenever the interests of humanity are at stake, and give boldly and manfully his advice to the House and country—I mean questions like negro emancipation, education of the people, improvement of the health of towns, measures for the recreation of the poor, against cruelty to animals, for regulating factory labour. As to religious affairs, he cannot but take an active part in them; but let that always be the part of a *Christian* man, not of a mere *Churchman*. Let him never forget the insufficiency of human knowledge and wisdom, and the impossibility for any man, or even Church, to say, 'I am right; I *alone* am right.' Let him, therefore, be meek and liberal, and tolerant to other confessions." ‡

In the abstract this seems sensible advice, but it is so in the abstract only, and when we come to examine it closely, we find in it German dreaminess, ignorance of the real state of things in

* Life of Lord Macaulay, vol. ii. pp. 261.

† Lord Macaulay's inaugural address at Glasgow as Lord Rector of the University gives an idea of what such lectures might have been expected to be.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 133.

England, and confusion of thought. A bishop is not only an ecclesiastic, but he is a peer of Parliament, whose duty it is to take part in affairs of state, and if this duty of a bishop as a peer be inconsistent with his duty as an ecclesiastic, the ecclesiastic should be relieved of the functions of a peer, and such men as are the common run of bishops should not be placed in the position of a peer of Parliament on the tacit understanding that they are not to meddle with questions of state. What, moreover, are questions of state with which bishops may not interfere, and what are questions affecting the interests of humanity with which they may? In the latter, the Prince places negro emancipation and the education of the people. The bishops of George III.'s reign, for reasons of state, opposed negro emancipation. The education of the people, owing mainly to the existence of the State Church amongst us, is a question of state, and it has always been so treated by the votes and proceedings of Parliament in relation to it. In which class would the Prince have put the Irish Church question? With what test does the Prince supply a bewildered bishop to enable him to distinguish one class of questions from the other? An occurrence that took place within a year of the date of this letter is a practical comment on the worth of the Prince's ideas as to episcopal duties in Parliament. Bishop Wilberforce, animated perhaps by ideas derived from his father, who, we know, agreed in the Free Trade opinions of his friend William Pitt, or perhaps animated by the conviction held by many, that the repeal of the Corn Laws was a measure affecting the interests of humanity, rather than a question of state, supported Sir Robert Peel's Corn Bill of 1846, in a speech as terse and vigorous as any of Mr. Bright's on the same question. Whatever motive actuated the Bishop, therefore, he went directly contrary to the Prince's ideas of what a bishop should do on the question, for the Corn Laws is expressly included in the class of "things with which bishops should not meddle." The result is thus described by Mr. Hayward: "It is unfortunate that a tacit convention or understanding excludes the Episcopal bench from secular topics of debate, for it is rich in eloquence of a high order. The late Lord Fitzwilliam, meeting the late Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce) soon after his celebrated speech on the Corn Laws, told him that such a display of episcopal eloquence in the House of Lords was altogether contrary to rule."* So far as the Corn Law question was concerned, the Prince had, if the tacit convention of the House of Lords be right in principle, stumbled on the correct opinion. The fact, however, that the Bishop who had sought his

* *Vide Essays, 3d Series, p. 25.*

guidance went on this occasion directly contrary to it, derogates from the title of this paper to the high praise bestowed on it by Mr. Martin.*

The Prince's ideas of the political position of the sovereign cannot fail to interest our readers. That our constitution requires that political events should be regarded by the Sovereign with indifference, was in the Prince's view a gross misconception.

"Nowhere," he states in a private memorandum, "would such indifference be more condemned and justly despised than in England. Why," he continues, "are princes alone to be denied the credit of having political opinions, based upon an anxiety for the national interests, their country's honour, and the welfare of mankind? Are they not more independently placed than any other politicians in the state? Are their interests not more intimately bound up with those of their country? Is the Sovereign not the natural guardian of the honour of the country? Is he not necessarily a politician? Ministers change, and, when they go out of office, lose the means of access to the best information which they had formerly at command. The Sovereign remains, and to him this information is always open. The most patriotic Minister has to think of his party. His judgment is often therefore insensibly biassed by party considerations. Not so the constitutional Sovereign, who is exposed to no such disturbing agency. As the permanent head of the nation, he has only to consider what is best for its welfare and its honour; and his accumulated knowledge and experience, and his calm and practised judgment, are always available in council to the Ministry for the time, without distinction of party.†

This was written in 1852, in which year, as every one remembers, the Russell Ministry went out and the first Derby-Disraeli came in. In passing, we may remark that, in connection with this Ministry, we are given, what is rarely done by our author, the free and unrestrained expression of royal opinion on the party politics of the day. "Our Protectionist Ministry," writes the Prince to the Duchess-Dowager of Saxe-Coburg in May of that year, "hardly ventures to name the word Protection, and goes to the next election upon Free Trade principles. This furnishes the most brilliant confirmation of Peel's statesmanship, though he has not been spared to enjoy the triumph."‡ On the 29th June following, the Queen writes to King Leopold:—"Lord Derby himself told us that he considered Protection as quite gone. It is a pity they did not find this out a little sooner; it would have saved so much annoyance, so much difficulty."§ The Prince's memorandum, from which we quote, was probably written in reference to the changes in the Ministry in that year, and is described by Mr. Martin

* Vol. ii. pp. 132, 153.
‡ Ibid., p. 448.

† Vol. ii. pp. 159, 160.
§ Ibid., p. 451.

as "private." Whether it was when first written, or at any time after, shown to Lord Beaconsfield, if known, can be known only to a few ; but there is a remarkable coincidence between the thought of the memorandum and that of a memorable speech of Lord Beaconsfield's. This coincidence, it will be seen, is not only in thought, but occasionally in expression. Said Lord Beaconsfield—

"The principles of the English constitution do not contemplate the absence of personal influence on the part of the sovereign, and if they did, the principles of human nature would prevent the fulfilment of such a theory. I need not tell you that I am now making on this subject abstract observations of general application to our history. But take the case of a sovereign of England who accedes to his throne at the earliest age the law permits, and who enjoys a long reign—as, for instance, George III. From the earliest moment of his accession that sovereign is placed in constant communication with the most able statesmen of the period, and of all parties. Even with average ability it is impossible not to perceive that such a Sovereign must soon attain a great mass of political information and political experience. Information and experience, whether they are possessed by a Sovereign, or by the humblest of his subjects, are irresistible in life. No man, with the vast responsibility that devolves upon an English Minister, can afford to treat with indifference a suggestion that has not previously occurred to him, or information with which he had not been previously supplied. But pursue this view of the subject, the longer the reign the influence of the Sovereign must proportionately increase. All the distinguished statesmen who served his youth disappear. A new generation of public servants rises up. There is a critical conjuncture in affairs—a moment of perplexity and peril. Then it is that the Sovereign can appeal to a similar state of affairs that occurred, perhaps, thirty years before. When all are in doubt among his servants, he can quote the advice that was given by the illustrious men of his early years. And though he may maintain himself within the strictest limits of the constitution, who can suppose when such information and such suggestions are made by the most exalted person in the country that they can be without effect? No, gentlemen. A Minister who could venture to treat such suggestions with indifference would not be a constitutional Minister, but an arrogant idiot." *

If one could really believe this was the genuine conviction of the speaker ; if one did not see the sketch of the present Sovereign, and the circumstances of her reign, scarcely concealed by the thinnest veil of speech, and by the half-mask of "abstract observations of general application;" if one could persuade oneself

* Speech of Right Hon. B. Disraeli, M.P., at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, April 1872. Published by authority. Pp. 5, 6.

that the speaker did not know that the words spoken in Manchester would be read at Windsor or Osborne; if one did not now read these words in the light thrown on them by a recently created Earldom, and the manner in which it was avowedly granted; if one could suppress the suspicion that the Prince's memorandum had been communicated to the speaker, and reproduced by him to give pleasure in a quarter where he would be regarded merely as a prophet speaking from the inspiration of another mind,—then we should regard the memorandum and the speech as severally expressing a remarkable coincidence of opinion on a constitutional question of the highest importance between two singularly gifted but widely different minds. Be this as it may, as in the Prince's letter on the Parliamentary duties of bishops, so in this memorandum, the opinion there expressed and echoed in Lord Beaconsfield's speech is more specious than sound. The memorandum works from this universal, that every Sovereign is wiser and more experienced than any Minister. As might be expected, the fallacy is more dexterously concealed by Lord Beaconsfield; but, nevertheless, it runs through the whole of the passage we have taken from his speech. Let us try the theory common to the Prince and the Premier by reference to events which have occurred in modern times. In 1801, George III. had reigned for forty years; he had acquired a great mass of political information and experience. The distinguished statesmen who had served his youth had disappeared, and a new generation of public servants had risen up. The King, however, had still at the head of his Cabinet the Minister who in 1783 had been the object of his personal choice. William Pitt, though only twenty-four when he formed his first Cabinet, had by 1801 gained experience by eighteen years of uninterrupted office; and he also had attained a great mass of political information and political experience. "There was a critical conjuncture in affairs—a moment of perplexity and peril." "The Minister had," to borrow Lord Macaulay's words, "formed a scheme of policy so grand, so simple, so righteous, so humane, that it alone would entitle him to a high place among statesmen. He determined to make Ireland one kingdom with England, and at the same time to relieve the Roman Catholic laity from civil disabilities, and to grant a public maintenance to the Roman Catholic clergy. Had he been able to carry these noble designs into effect, the union would have been a union indeed." This plan, equally benign and statesmanlike, was defeated by a stroke of that kingcraft which George III. began early and practised late. The crisis was of vital importance, not only to the honour of the Minister, but to the nation, engaged in a desperate struggle, and to whom it was of the last importance that the estrangement of the Irish, from whom a large proportion of our

soldiers was drawn, should be brought to an end. The King, with all his accumulation of "knowledge and experience," could not bring "a calm and practised judgment" to the council of his ministers. He was half insane; nevertheless, he insisted on being what, according to Stockmar, the English Sovereign is and ever should be, "the permanent Premier, who takes rank above the temporary head of the Cabinet." The result is known to all. Sir James Graham used to say, "Mr. Pitt wished to do the right thing at the right moment, but genius gave way to madness, and two generations in vain deplored the loss of an opportunity which never returned." It was not till after Ireland had endured more than another quarter of a century of Protestant ascendancy, that another Sovereign of nearly twenty years' experience* submitted to be dragooned by a military Premier into giving an unwilling assent to Catholic emancipation. The measure had been so long delayed that it failed to produce the healing fruits which were hoped for, and which it would have produced had it been passed at the time of the Union.†

It may be said that neither the Prince nor Stockmar contemplated the case of a half-mad Sovereign; but, according to these authorities, had George III. been in full possession of his faculties, he would have been justified in taking the course he did take. Take another illustration. William IV. came to the throne towards the close of his life, not altogether without experience of public affairs, but with a limited experience only. His successor speaks of him in terms of equal kindness and frankness. "Whatever his faults may have been, it was well known that he was not only zealous, but most conscientious in the discharge of his duties as king. He had a truly kind heart, and was most anxious to do his duty. This was the character given of him by Lord Melbourne to the Queen, and by others who had served him."‡ Yet who that reads the attempts of the "Sailor King" at personal government recorded in Mr. Greville's "Journal,"§ or remembers his self-willed dismissal of the Melbourne Government in 1834, but must see that his actions were ludicrous, and might have been disastrous. Take another illustration from the constitutional time of the French monarchy, which we will give in Mr. Martin's own

* *i.e.*, taking George IV.'s regency and reign together.

† *Vide* Goldwin Smith's "Three English Statesmen: Pitt," p. 105; Sir G. C. Lewis's "Administrations of George III.," p. 213, editor's note; Lord Macaulay's "Miscellaneous Works: Pitt," "Life of Prince Consort," vol. ii., p. 549.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 177, note by the Queen.

§ *Vide* Greville, Vol. ii. pp. 298, 307, 364, 383; vol. iii. pp. 33, 81, 84, 137, 144, 148, 184, 231, 245, 257, 265, 272, 276, 277, 279, 286, 311, 358, 363, 366, 375.

words:—"Lulled into false security by the facility with which he had been for many years able to impress his own views and wishes upon his Ministers, Louis Philippe had forgotten that, as it is they who in all constitutional governments are primarily responsible to the people, their freedom of action must not be overborne by the dictates of the sovereign; and that, if forgetful of their own prerogatives, they suffer themselves to become his subservient agents, they do so at the hazard of dragging him down with their own fall."* All, therefore, that can be properly drawn from the Prince's universal is the cautious and limited particular drawn by Lord Beaconsfield, that where (which in ordinary reigns is not likely to happen) the sovereign has more political knowledge and experience than the Minister of the day, the Minister would be an "arrogant idiot" to venture to treat the sovereign's suggestions with indifference. To this proposition, we presume, no one will refuse to agree.

We have yet again an illustration of the want of practical knowledge of English politics alike in the Prince and in his "silent guide." M. Stockmar's memorandum as to the position of the Sovereign in reference to the Ministers, to which we have referred, and to "every word of which" we regret to say that the Prince assented, contains this passage:—"Your task is to lend all the aid in your power towards the assumption by the Lords of their right position in the Legislature, and the fulfilment of their vocation as sagacious, liberally-minded and honourable men."† Sir Robert Peel, with all his experience of the working of the constitution, found it, as he confessed, "no easy task to ensure the harmonious and united action of monarch, aristocracy, and a reformed House of Commons." But a certain class of persons "rush in where angels fear to tread;" and Stockmar had no scruple in advising the Prince to instigate the peers to set themselves in dogged opposition to the "absurd," "usurping" House of Commons; for his advice either means that or nothing.‡ Yet, to use Mr. Bright's words, "we know, everybody knows, nobody knows it better than the peers, that a house of hereditary legislation cannot be a permanent institution in a free country; for we believe that such an institution must, in the course of time, require essential modification."§ As an illustration of such a needed modification, Mr. Bright referred to the then recently defeated attempt of the Whigs to create life-peerages, a measure which, eighteen years afterwards, we have just seen passed by the Lords, with that submissiveness which is "the badge

* Vol. ii. p. 2.

† Vol. ii. p. 553.

‡ This is clear from the whole context, *vide* p. 545, *et seq.* The epithets "absurd" and "usurping" are elsewhere applied by Stockmar to the House of Commons. *Vide* Stockmar's Memoirs, vol. ii. 545, 546, 547.

§ Speech at Manchester, December 10, 1858.

of all their tribe" when Liberal measures are proposed to them by their Conservative leaders. The judgment of the practical Englishman is, we submit, sounder than that of the German theoriser. Unlike the last preceding consort of a Queen regnant, Prince George of Denmark, who regularly attended the House of Lords, Prince Albert had no knowledge of the inner life of Parliament, although, as the Queen herself truly says, "to hear a debate is so useful to all princes."* The Prince never was present in the House of Commons until 27th January 1846, when Sir Robert Peel brought forward his measure for the abolition of the Corn Laws. The occasion was injudiciously chosen. The Protectionists were furious at their desertion by Sir Robert Peel, and the Prince's presence during the Premier's speech was construed into an "unfair and unwise manœuvre of the Minister," Lord George Bentinck openly saying, "I cannot but think he (the Prince) listened to ill advice when, on the first night of this great discussion, he allowed himself to be seduced by the First Minister of the Crown to come down to the House to usher in, to give *eclat*, and, as it were, by reflection from the Queen to give the semblance of a personal sanction of her Majesty to this measure." This suspicion, though unfounded, was natural. In consequence of the feeling so expressed, the Prince, says the Queen, "felt unable again to be present at a debate." This want of knowledge of the inner life of Parliament was remarkably displayed on the only occasion when the Prince *openly* took part in advising as to the formation of a Ministry. On the breakdown of the Russell Ministry in the early part of 1851, negotiations were set on foot for a coalition between the Whigs and the Peelites. The followers of Peel, led by Sir James Graham, refused to enter into it, on the ground of their irreconcilable difference from the Whigs with regard to the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. The Prince, in a memorandum addressed to the Duke of Wellington, proposed a "junction of the two parties now, leaving the Papal measure an open question, allowing Lord John to bring it forward and Sir James Graham to oppose it, while it may be further modified to meet the views of Lord Stanley and the Protectionists.† This bill passed, there will be nothing left to interfere with an identity of opinions in the new coalition."

Even Mr. Martin does not attempt to praise or even defend this advice. His comments on it we cannot hope to improve, and therefore transcribe:—"The spectacle of the members of Government speaking and voting against each other on this, the most prominent and vehemently-agitated question of the day, would have been humiliating to the actors in it and to public feeling. Who,

* Vol. i. p. 322, note by the Queen.

† Who would have made the bill more stringent.

moreover, might say that discord on this topic would not extend to other questions."* Mr. Martin might have added, that the proposal showed the Prince's inability to advise on such purely Parliamentary questions as the formation of a Cabinet, and that his attention had better have been confined to the many subjects of which he was perfect master. Such a Cabinet as the Prince proposed would certainly have been no exception to what Lord Holland's experience taught him was the universal practice in Cabinets—viz., "That its members disputed more among themselves during their council than they disputed with their antagonists in the House of Commons."† The harmonious working of such a coalition would not have been improved had the Prince's idea been carried out of placing Mr. Roebuck in office, if not in the Cabinet.‡ The occurrence of the Papal aggression led the Prince, *more suo*,§ to write a memorandum on the Church crisis, in which, after referring to the intense excitement and animosity of parties, and the heterogeneous elements, views, and interests joining in the outcry against the Pope, and particularly against the Puseyites, and the necessity of those who meant to lead the movement asserting some intelligible and sound principle, he proceeds:—

"The *principle* will easily be found if the *common cause* of discontent which has occasioned the *excitement* has been ascertained. If strictly analysed, this cause appears to be the introduction of Romish doctrines and practices by the clergy of England, contrary to the wills and feelings of the Protestant congregations, under the assumption that the clergy alone have any authority in Church matters. If this be the fundamental evil, against this ought the remedial principle to be directed, and this principle might be thus expressed—'That the laity have an equal share of authority with the clergy; that no alteration in the form of divine service shall be therefore made by the clergy without the formal assent of the laity, nor any interpretation given of articles of faith without their concurrence.' This principle once recognised as law, a whole living Church constitution will spring from it, including Church government and doctrines."

This is another illustration of the bent of the Prince's mind to dwell on abstract principles without regard to the actual institutions and circumstances amongst which he dwelt, and to which his abstract principles of reform would have to be applied. Carelessly read, this paper seems judicious and sensible. A very little

* Vol. ii. pp. 352, 353.

† Lord Dalling's "Life of Lord Palmerston," vol. i. p. 250.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 353, note.

§ The Prince, mindful of Lord Bacon's saying that writing makes an exact man, was in the habit of committing to writing his thoughts on many, if not all, important questions.

reflection, however, will show that carrying out its principles is inconsistent with the existence of the Church Establishment in its present, and, most probably, in any other form. This reform could not be carried into effect without the authority of Parliament; and if the present Establishment were once cast into the crucible of a reforming House of Commons, little knowledge or foresight is required to see that the dissolution of the existing Establishment which the process would involve is not likely to be followed by the rise of another, Phoenix-like, from the ashes of the destroyed one.

Not the least interesting part of the book is its account of the relations between the Queen and the Prince on the one hand, and Lord Palmerston on the other. We agree with a contemporary, "that there is throughout the book a marked hostility to Lord Palmerston, and that not on account of his less generous characteristics."* Rightly to understand the relative positions of these illustrious and distinguished persons, it is necessary to bear in mind the account of them given by the biographer of Stockmar, derived, no doubt, from Stockmar himself. "A certain antagonism had long existed between Palmerston and the Prince Consort. The Prince could not approve of the restless, interfering, and demonstrative line of policy, which the Minister, since 1848, had adopted more and more, which *offended the Continental Governments*, injured England, and benefited nobody. The Prince stood up for the right of *supervision belonging to the crown in foreign politics*. This was again displeasing to the self-willed Lord, and the means and artifices he employed to escape from that control did not improve matters."† Writing in June 1849 to Lord John Russell in reference to a statement made by him as to the number of despatches received and sent out by the Foreign Office in 1845, the Prince observed, "These 28,000 despatches in the year, Lord Palmerston must recollect come to you and to the Queen, as well as to himself."‡ We now know that these words, as we read them by the light which after-events throw upon them, meant a great deal. Lord Palmerston, speaking of his ejection from office in December 1851, told his brother that his removal "was due to a cabal of despotic courts of the Continent in concert with our own;" and writing seven years after the time of his removal, when the anger naturally caused by it had had time to cool, and he had had opportunity to correct his first impressions as to its cause, had they been erroneous, he wrote, "The real ground for my dismissal was a weak truckling to the hostile intrigues of the Orleans family, Austria, Russia,

* "The Nonconformist."

† Stockmar's *Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 458.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 64.

Saxony, and Bavaria, and in some degree of the present Prussian Government. All these parties found their respective views and systems of policy thwarted by the course pursued by the British Government, and they thought that, if they could remove the Minister, they would change the policy. They had for a long time past effectually poisoned the mind of the Queen and Prince against me, and John Russell, giving way, rather encouraged than discountenanced the desire of the Queen to remove me from the Foreign Office.* Although Mr. Martin affects to find it "hard to believe that Lord Palmerston himself would have wished this letter to appear as embodying his final convictions,"† we see no grounds for Mr. Martin's difficulty. The "*silent guide* of the English court" was constantly passing to and fro between the Palace and Germany, and probably secret, unofficial messages from the despotic courts were brought by the irresponsible Minister, with the intention, and in the end the result, of poisoning the minds of the Queen and the Prince against the *responsible* Minister, who was emphatically the Minister of England. On the 4th May 1850, Lord John Russell, in a letter to the Queen, from which Mr. Martin extracts two sentences, informed her Majesty of his determination "no longer to remain in office with Lord Palmerston as Foreign Secretary."‡ In the same letter he said, "I feel strongly that the Queen ought not to be exposed to the enmity of Austria, France, and Russia, on account of her Minister."§ It is remarkable, and not very consistent with this feeling, that within a short time after writing these words, Lord John gave in the House of Commons his well-known description of Lord Palmerston as Foreign Secretary. "My noble friend," he said, "will not be the Minister of Austria, he will not be the Minister of Russia, he will not be the Minister of France; he will be the Minister of England." This was understood by Sir Robert Peel as intended to contrast the conduct of Lord Palmerston with that of Lord Aberdeen.|| The majority in favour of Mr. Roebuck's resolution, that the foreign policy of the Government had been calculated to maintain the honour and dignity of the country, and the demonstrations of Lord Palmerston's

* Vol. ii. p. 422, quoted from Mr. Evelyn Ashley's "Life of Lord Palmerston," vol. ii. pp. 316, 317.

† Ibid., note. ‡ Vol. ii. p. 278, note. § Vol. ii. p. 278, note.

|| "What was the meaning of that declaration? The noble Lord has too much prudence and discretion to point a sarcasm against three of the greatest powers of Europe, but he could afford to be very liberal with such weapons when directed against his predecessors. My construction of that passage was, that the noble Lord meant to contrast the conduct of the noble Lord the member for Tiverton with the conduct of Lord Aberdeen."—*Sir R. Peel's last Speech*, 28th June 1850.

popularity both in Parliament and the country to which the vote of the House of Commons gave rise, baffled for the time any intention of his removal from the Foreign Office. That this was a mortification to the Court can easily be understood, and it was determined to make Lord Palmerston feel the different estimation in which he was held in the Palace from that in which he was held in the country. In the previous year, 1849, the Queen had reminded the Foreign Secretary that the ultimate control of his office rested with the Prime Minister, and that the despatches submitted for her approval should therefore pass through the hands of Lord John Russell. Complaints continued to be made by her Majesty of Lord Palmerston's want of attention to this rule, and the vote of the House of Commons was quickly followed by the Queen's well-known memorandum of 12th August 1850. The courtier mind of Mr. Martin is startled at Mr. Evelyn Ashley* plainly describing this paper as "the Queen's angry memorandum," and again as "a paper written in anger by a lady as well as by a Sovereign."† We will transcribe the memorandum, that our readers may judge for themselves how far the epithet is justly applied:—

"With reference to the conversation about Lord Palmerston," writes the Queen to Lord John Russell, "which the Queen had with Lord John Russell the other day, and Lord Palmerston's disavowal that he ever intended any disrespect to her by the various neglects of which she has had so long and so often to complain, she thinks it right, in order to prevent any mistake for the future, to explain what it is she requires from the Foreign Secretary. She requires—1st, That he will distinctly state what he proposes in a given case, in order that the Queen may know as distinctly to what she has given her royal sanction. 2nd, Having once given her sanction to a measure, that it be not arbitrarily altered or modified by the Minister. Such an act she must consider as a failure in sincerity towards the crown, and justly to be visited by the exercise of her constitutional right of dismissing that Minister. She expects to be kept informed of what passes between him and the Foreign Ministers before important decisions are taken based upon that intercourse; to receive the foreign despatches in good time, and to have the drafts for her approval sent to her in sufficient time to make herself acquainted with their contents before they must be sent off. The Queen thinks it best that Lord John Russell should show this letter to Lord Palmerston."

The paper was accordingly shown to Lord Palmerston, who took a copy of it, and assured the Premier he "would not fail to attend to the directions which it contains." ‡

* Vol. ii. p. 395.

† Ashley's "Life of Lord Palmerston," vol. i. p. 305.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 305, 306.

“The voice was Jacob’s voice, but the hands were the hands of Esau.” It is impossible not to see that this memorandum, if not written or dictated, yet was inspired, by the Prince, “guided,” no doubt, by Stockmar, for the purpose of obtaining the “supervision and control” which they claimed for the Crown in foreign politics. The whole tone of the letter, and the somewhat undignified threat of dismissal it contains, justify the application to it of the term “angry.” More serious is the question, how far was this memorandum in its spirit and principle constitutional?

The memorandum was thought by some of Lord Palmerston’s friends to imply an affront which he ought not to have borne. From the Prince’s memorandum, to which we shall immediately refer, it appears that Lord Palmerston himself deemed “the accusation that he had been wanting in respect for the Queen was an imputation on his honour as a gentleman, and if he could have made himself guilty of it,* he was almost not fit to be tolerated in society.” He therefore requested an interview with the Prince, and they met on 17th August 1850. The Prince, in the very interesting memorandum to which we have referred, and which we regret the limits of our available space prevent our quoting in full, thus records what took place:—“Lord Palmerston was very much agitated, shook, and had tears in his eyes, so as quite to move me, who never under any circumstances had known him otherwise than with a bland smile on his face.” A long conversation followed, and it is abundantly clear that Stockmar’s biographer was fully justified in saying that “a certain antagonism” had long existed, not only between Lord Palmerston and the Prince, but that he might have added, between Lord Palmerston and the Queen herself. “The Queen had often latterly almost invariably differed from the line of policy pursued by Lord Palmerston. She had always openly stated her objections, but when overruled by the Cabinet, or convinced from political reasons that it would be more prudent to waive her objections, she knew her constitutional position too well not to give her full support to whatever was done on the part of the Government. She never found a matter ‘intact’ nor a question in which we were not already compromised when it was submitted to her. She had no means of knowing what passed in the Cabinet, nor what passed between Lord Palmerston and the Foreign Ministers in their conferences, but what Lord Palmerston chose to tell her, or what she found in the newspapers. She now lost much time in disputing with Lord John and Lord Palmerston about the wording of despatches

* We presume the memorandum was in German, and that the Prince is not responsible for this singular phrase.

which was most unprofitable." The interview closed with an attempt on the Prince's part to obtain a categorical answer to a question as to what Lord Palmerston would do should a certain emergency arise in reference to the affairs of Schleswig-Holstein. "After a full hour's conversation on this subject we were, however, interrupted *without my being able to get a positive answer.*" Though nothing decisive came of this discussion, Lord John told the Prince "that he thought what had passed had done a great deal of good." * It is clear from this that the relations between the Sovereign and her Consort, on the one hand, and her Foreign Minister on the other, were so strained that at any moment a rupture between them might take place. Nor were additional circumstances tending still further to increase the strain long wanting. In the autumn of this year (1850) General Haynau came to England, and paid a visit to Barclay's brewery, where he met with a rough reception by the men employed by the firm. This gave rise to fresh complications between the Queen and her Foreign Secretary. Lord Palmerston submitted to Lord John Russell the draft of a note, expressing to the Austrian Government the regret of her Majesty's Government at what had occurred. It contained, however, a paragraph which Lord John Russell, in writing to the Queen, stated that he regarded as "derogatory to the honour of the nation, as if no one could be safe in this country who was obnoxious to the public feeling, and discourteous to Austria, as it charged General Haynau (a distinguished Austrian) with showing a want of propriety in coming to England." In this opinion the Queen concurred, and the Premier communicated to the Foreign Secretary her Majesty's views and his own. It then appeared that the note had, without waiting for the royal approval, been sent to the Austrian Minister. Lord John Russell advised her Majesty to insist on its withdrawal, and the substitution of another note, omitting the objectionable paragraph. After some resistance, and a threat of resignation on the part of Lord Palmerston, he quietly submitted to the course advised by the Premier. † After this, things seem to have gone on quietly until the arrival of Kossuth in England in the autumn of 1851. The Hungarian leader some time after his landing denounced in unmeasured terms the Sovereigns of Russia and Austria, with whom England was at peace. Notwithstanding this, Lord Palmerston was willing to give Kossuth the interview which he naturally desired, for the purpose of thanking our Government for their active and successful interference on his behalf. The Austrian Minister was desired to leave England should this interview take place, and in deference to the views of the Cabinet, Lord Palmerston re-

* Vol. ii. p. 307 *et seq.*

† Vol. ii. p. 324-26.

luctantly intimated he would avoid a meeting with Kossuth. Kossuth left England, but some of his English friends presented addresses to Lord Palmerston, thanking him for what he had done towards securing the safety and freedom of "the illustrious patriot and exile." In some of these addresses the Emperors of Russia and Austria were spoken of as "odious and detestable oppressors," and "merciless tyrants and despots." Lord Palmerston expressed himself "extremely flattered and highly gratified" by these addresses, but he added that it could not be expected that he should concur in some of the expressions they contained. The Queen took alarm. She wrote to Lord John Russell, "It is no question with the Queen whether she pleases the Emperor of Russia or not, but whether she gives him a just cause of complaint or not;" and at her Majesty's request the matter was brought under consideration of the Cabinet, "which strongly expressed its opinion that, in receiving these objectionable addresses, Lord Palmerston had shown a want of proper caution."* The Prince took no ostensible part in these transactions, but his real views on them are revealed by Stockmar, then resident in England. "Ever since I returned here," he wrote to a foreign correspondent, "therefore, for the last two months, he [Lord Palmerston] has been guilty of follies, which confirm me more and more in my former opinion, that he is not quite right in his mind. The Prince might have felt strongly tempted to rush in and throw him out, but he quite agreed with my advice, which was, that he ought to remain a mere spectator, as I feel certain, if Palmerston requires another thrust his colleagues themselves will give it."† This letter admirably illustrates the craft and subtlety of the writer.

The opportunity for the "thrust," so long and eagerly desired, soon arrived. The *coup d'état* by Louis Napoleon in December 1851, and the approval of that step expressed by Lord Palmerston without consulting the Cabinet, afforded an occasion to get rid of the "Minister of England." Lord John Russell, after passing a painful week, such as, he told the Queen, in the course of his long political career he had never before passed, most reluctantly came to the conclusion that the conduct of Foreign Affairs could no longer be left in Lord Palmerston's hands with advantage to the country. "You will readily imagine," writes the Prince to the Premier, "that the news of the sudden termination of your difference with Lord Palmerston has taken us much by surprise, as we were wont to see such differences terminate in his carrying his points and leaving the defence of them to his colleagues, and the discredit of them to the Queen."‡ Stockmar's biographer, no doubt on Stockmar's

* Vol. ii. p. 407-11.

† Stockmar's Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 458.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 411-18.

authority, reveals the fact that "immediately after the *coup d'état*, the Queen and Prince discussed the line to be observed by England with regard to this event. *It was settled* that it must be a policy of abstinence and neutrality."* This is quite consistent with Mr. Martin's narrative of this transaction. † If the facts be so, no wonder that a man of high spirit and high feeling like Lord Palmerston, the Minister responsible to Parliament and the country for England's foreign policy, should feel aggrieved that her policy on so important a matter as our relations with France should be *settled* by the Queen and Prince without reference to him, but with the aid and advice of their "silent guide" and irresponsible minister. It was very generally believed that Lord Palmerston's dismissal was chiefly due to Prince Albert and partly to foreign intrigues. In consequence of this popular belief, Baron Brunnow, the Russian ambassador, thought fit to write to Lord John Russell expressly disclaiming that Russian "representations had anything to do with the recent change in the Foreign Office." Lord John replied that "the change had taken place on grounds entirely connected with the dignity of the Crown and the character of the country." Baron Brunnow's letter, the Queen wrote, "is very presuming, as it insinuates the possibility of changes of Government in this country taking place at the instigation of foreign Ministers, and the Queen is glad that Lord John gave him a dignified answer." ‡ That official representations were ever made on the subject of a change of any English Minister we do not for a moment think, but, nevertheless, we believe that Lord Palmerston, with his great experience of foreign Courts and their policy, was not likely to be wrong in the judgment which he formed as to the causes of his removal, and which judgment there is no reason to think he ever altered up to the close of his life.

It is clear that soon after the outbreak of the Crimean war, the antagonism between the Prince and Lord Palmerston revived, § and it must therefore have been galling to the Prince when, in 1855, in a dark and terrible day, and on the disastrous failure of the Crimean war, under the control of his favourite Minister, Lord Aberdeen, the "nation, guided by unerring instinct, reposed its confidence in Lord Palmerston at a time when no one seemed left to confide in." Whatever the mutual feelings of the Prince and the Premier might have been at the outset of their new relations, they rapidly improved on better acquaintance. "After all," said Richard Cobden on his deathbed, "Palmerston was always a very generous enemy." It is in perfect keeping with this character of

* "Stockmar's Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 460.

† *Life*, vol. ii. p. 411.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 423.

§ *Ibid.*, pp. 534, 535, 539, 540.

Lord Palmerston that we find him, during the first year of his first premiership, saying of the Prince, "Till my present position gave me so many opportunities of seeing his Royal Highness, I had no idea of his possessing such eminent qualities as he has, and how fortunate it is for the country that the Queen married such a Prince."*

The second volume closes at the opening of 1854, in the earlier stages of the Crimean war, and while the Prince's unpopularity, caused by the discovery that he had long taken part in the government of the country, was at its height. The same letter from which in an earlier part of this paper we quoted the Prince's description of his position on his first arrival, very accurately describes the state of affairs in 1854: "As I have kept quiet, and caused no scandal and all went well, no one has troubled himself about me and my doings, and any one who wished to pay me a compliment at a public dinner or meeting extolled my 'wise abstinence from interfering in political matters.' Now, when the present journalistic controversies have brought to light the fact that I had for years taken an active interest in political matters, the public, instead of feeling surprise at my reserve, and the tact with which I have avoided thrusting myself forward, fancies itself betrayed because it felt it had been self-deceived."† It is evident that the Queen and the Prince felt deeply aggrieved at the outburst of popular suspicion and distrust, of which the Prince was the object.‡

The following testimony from the Queen herself to the Prince's capacity for business is interesting: "Albert grows daily fonder of politics and business, and is wonderfully fit for both, showing such perspicacity and courage." Her Majesty adds, "And I grow daily to dislike both more and more. We women are not made for governing, and if we are good women, we must dislike these masculine occupations." Amidst much to which we should like to call attention, we have space only for one more extract, which we make on account of its bearing on the events of this time, and on the present phase of the Eastern Question. It is taken from a memorandum on the subject of the then approaching Crimean war, written by the Prince in October 1853, for the consideration of the Cabinet:—

"In acting as auxiliaries to the Turks, we ought to be quite sure that they have no object in view foreign to our interests and duty; that they do not aim at war while we aim at peace; that they do not, instead of merely resisting the attempt of Russia to obtain a protectorate over the Greek population incompatible with their own independence, seek to obtain themselves the power of imposing a

* Vol. ii. p. 429.

† Vol. ii. p. 560.

‡ Ibid., pp. 541, 542, 563.

more oppressive rule of two millions of fanatic Mussulmans over twelve millions of Christians ; that they do not try to turn the tables upon the weaker power, now that, backed by England and France, they have themselves become the strongest. There can be little doubt, and it is very natural that the fanatical party at Constantinople should have such views; but to engage our fleet as an auxiliary force for such purposes, would be fighting against our own interests, policy, and feelings. From this it would result, that if our forces are to be employed for any purpose, however defensive, as an auxiliary to Turkey, we *must insist* upon keeping not only the conduct of the negotiations, but also the power of peace and war in our own hands, and that Turkey refusing this, we can no longer take part *for her*. It will be said that England and Europe have a strong interest, setting all Turkish considerations aside, that Constantinople and the Turkish territory should not fall into the hands of Russia, and that they should in the last extremity even go to war to prevent such an overthrow of the balance of power. This must be admitted, and such a war may be right and wise; but this would be a war, not for the maintenance of the *integrity of the Ottoman Empire*, but merely for the interests of the European Powers of civilisation. It ought to be carried on unshackled by obligations to the Porte, and will probably lead, in the peace which must be the object of that war, to the obtaining of arrangements more consonant with the well-understood interests of Europe, of Christianity, of liberty, and civilisation, than the reimposition of the ignorant, barbarian, and despotic yoke of the Mussulman over the most fertile and favoured portion of Europe." *

In the opinions here expressed, Lords Aberdeen and Clarendon and Sir J. Graham fully agreed. Lord John Russell "very much agreed" with the memorandum. Lord Palmerston, on the other hand, thought we ought "at all hazards to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire." He scouted the idea that we should make the war the means for securing from the Porte such a recognition of the rules of European civilisation in respect to the treatment of her Christian subjects as the Prince foresaw would, unless granted and acted upon, be the fruitful source of future disquiet and warfare in Europe. The concluding portion of the Prince's memorandum pointed, in Lord Palmerston's judgment, at "expelling from Europe the Sultan and his two million of Mussulman subjects." A reconstruction of "Turkey, he thought, meant neither more nor less than its subjection to Russia, direct or indirect, immediate, or for a time delayed." † The view taken by the Prince and the other distinguished men we have named, was, as the events of the present time show, the statesmanlike view of the question. With such conflicting opinions as to the end and objects for which they were about to go to war, no wonder the

* Vol. ii. pp. 525-27.

† Ibid., p. 528.

Crimean war was the occasion of the break-up of the Aberdeen Cabinet.

Here then we pause. The third volume, completing the work, is announced as advancing towards completion. On its appearance we hope to resume and conclude our review of the remarkable career, the memory of which is enshrined in this biography.

ART. V.—THE TURKISH QUESTION : RUSSIAN DESIGNS
AND ENGLISH PROMOTERS OF THEM.

1. *Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Turkey, presented to Parliament in 1876.*
2. *Bulgarian Horrors, and the Question of the East.* By the Right Honourable W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.
3. *The Times.* 1875 and 1876.
4. *The Pall-Mall Gazette.* 1875 and 1876.

WHEN in the early part of 1875 disturbances on the Montenegrin frontier, followed by insurrection in Herzegovina, were announced, few probably anticipated the threatening state of affairs which now exists throughout Europe, owing, in some measure, to proceedings in England avowedly taken on the plea of humanity, but really calculated gravely to imperil it, and to enable Russia to attain a position more menacing to Europe than that which the Crimean war forced her to relinquish. So it has happened, however; popular indignation, justly excited by outrages execrable, but by no means unprecedented, has been most improperly fomented and directed, with the result of dangerously weakening the influence and action of the British Government, serving the purposes of Russian aggression, inflaming Mahometan fanaticism, and prolonging a sanguinary and useless struggle until the passions roused, and the hopes created, threaten Europe with war previously in the last degree improbable.

The wretched condition of European Turkey, now, probably, little, if at all, better than it was before the Crimean war, is, we believe, in a great measure due to Russian intrigue, incessantly directed to the destruction of Turkey, and to neglect on the part of England to exercise over the Turkish Government control which it was her right and duty to exercise. Placed as Turkey has been, her regeneration would have been miraculous.

The decadence which has steadily progressed was to be expected, and it has now to be determined whether the Crimean war is to prove so much blood and treasure wasted, and whether the object which France and England fought hard to secure is to be relinquished without even an effort to retain it.

The history of Russian aggression ought to be an instructive one to every other power. Going back no further than the commencement of the present century, we find her in 1804 pursuing in respect to Servia a course very similar to that which she has recently taken; until in 1809 Turkey was regularly invaded. Relief came in 1812, in the shape of Napoleon's march to Moscow. During the six years following the Greek revolution of 1821, Turkey was the scene of massacres and atrocities which led to English interference, and to an alliance in 1826 with Russia against Turkey, entered into on the understanding that neither contracting power should seek any exclusive territorial or commercial advantages. How this engagement was violated by Russia has been well described in the last "Edinburgh Review" (page 561). By a convention extorted from Turkey in October 1826, Russia gained the semi-independence of Moldavia, Wallachia, and Servia; and opening the Dardanelles to Russian merchant vessels—changes which "secured to the commercial interests and religious influence of Russia advantages as great as she could have obtained by war." Turkey suffered severely; she lost Greece, and, for a considerable time, her military power in Asia, as well as in Europe. A little later, after France had joined the alliance, and the Turkish fleet had been destroyed at Navarino, Russia again invaded Turkey (April 1828); was only prevented from marching on Constantinople by the threatened action of England; and, even then, wrung from Turkey the disastrous peace of Adrianople, which gave to Russia "complete command of the navigable mouths of the Danube," and "the whole eastern coast of the Black Sea."

Thus was England outwitted, and Russia aggrandised. Such was the result of a close, cordial, and disinterested alliance with Russia, in the interests of justice and humanity.

Next came the struggle in 1832 between Turkey and her own subject, the Pasha of Egypt, whose successes were cut short by Russia, who assumed the character of the protector of Turkey. This state of things came to an end in 1840; when the allies intervened, and effected the restoration of Syria to the Porte.

Little more than ten years later Russia was again moving towards Turkey; her action being this time denounced by all Europe. Lord Palmerston thus described * her proceedings—

* Letter to Lord Clarendon, 22d May 1853.

“The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as fast, and as far, as the apathy or want of firmness of other Governments would allow it to go; but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance, and then to wait for the next favourable opportunity to make another spring on the victim. In furtherance of this policy the Russian Government always has had two strings to its bow; moderate language and disinterested professions at St. Petersburg and London; active aggression by its agents on the scene of operations. If the aggressions succeed locally, the St. Petersburg Government adopts them as a *fait accompli*, which it did not intend, but cannot in honour recede from. If the local agents fail, they are disavowed and recalled, and the language previously held is appealed to as a proof that the agents have overstepped their instructions.”

In the summer of 1853 the intention of Russia to attack Turkey was evident, and England determined to assist in repelling the aggression—in defending not Turkish misrule (then as now known to be excessive), but Turkish territory from Russian encroachment. England acted, wrote the Prince Consort, “in the interests of the European Powers, and of civilisation.” The Turks were to be preserved, not for their own value, but as a necessity imposed by the requirements of Europe and of civilisation—a necessity existing to-day perhaps more strongly than it then existed. Then as now, Russia, while professing peace, so acted as to endanger it. Then as now she disclaimed aggressive intentions, while her every act was one of aggression, direct or indirect. On the 25th September the Queen wrote—“It is evident that Russia has deceived us in pretending that she did not aim at the establishment of any new right.” The Russian Minister, Nesselrode, had at last shown his hand. “He has,” said the Prince Consort, “shown his cloven foot, and let the cat out of the bag. . . . But how to avoid an European war, for only with the most dishonourable cowardice on the part of the Powers could the demands be conceded by them which are set up.” The same game was played by Russia up to the last moment. Between the Vienna note and the Berlin memorandum there is no little similarity. Demands then made find their counterpart in those which were to be enforced had the Sumarakoff mission succeeded. Even when the Pruth was crossed all intention of war was disclaimed. Lord Clarendon wrote—“Thus the Court of St. Petersburg proceeds under the name of peace to obtain all the advantages of war”—an operation which has been again witnessed during the last few months. In many respects, indeed, history appears to be now repeating itself. Mr. Gladstone seems now to have acted very much as Lord Aberdeen (with perhaps far greater justification) acted in 1853—action to which

the Prince Consort thus referred *—"Aberdeen is quite right, and is to be honoured and applauded for maintaining, as he does, that we must deal with our enemies as honourable men, and deal honourably towards them; but that is no reason why we should think that they are so in fact; this is what he does, and maintains that it is right to do so." All that is now known in respect to the extremely beneficial influence which Prince Albert exercised on important affairs of State, points to the probability that, had he lived, some of the questionable Liberal foreign policy of late years would have been avoided. He clearly saw that a policy of selfish isolation is likely to recoil upon England, whatever may be her insular advantages. Already the existing state of Europe threatens embarrassment, and perhaps danger, to England, arising in a great measure from the refusal to act upon this principle.

It has been said, and we believe not without considerable truth, that the Crimean war was blundered into, blundered through, and blundered out of. However this may be, it is now clear that of the errors committed, not one has been more disastrous in its effects than that pointed out by the Queen to Lord Clarendon, entering on such a task without previously imposing conditions on the Turks—an error virtually repeated at the close of the war. It is, however, possible to look back with legitimate satisfaction at the course followed by the political party (Conservative) then in opposition; it was thus noticed by the "Times"—"It has been greatly to the credit of our people that, under circumstances of no small irritation, they have forborne from embarrassing the course of negotiation by an indiscreet exercise of their right of public meeting, and have left diplomacy every opportunity for averting the scourge with which we are threatened." It would have been indeed well had equal discretion been observed during the past autumn, when the "Times" might with signal advantage have repeated the sound and salutary advice—"that there was much more at stake than their blind guides chose to admit"—given to the people when the pressure of the Crimean war had begun to be felt—advice eminently needed during several weeks of September and October last, during which imprudent and misleading language was almost the only language that could make itself heard.

The Treaty of Paris affirmed the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire, and placed it under the protection of Europe; the Turkish Government on their part undertaking to reform the administration of the Empire; and the promise being recorded in the treaty. It is not credible that when this

* Letter to Baron Stockmar, September 1853.

arrangement was made, it was supposed that the necessary reform would be spontaneously effected; indeed, Lord Palmerston held and declared that the treaty sufficiently provided the means of enforcement. How far this has been the case, and how far the arrangement has proved sufficient, will be apparent as we go on.

The following extracts are from a remarkable letter which lately appeared* in the "Times." It will be seen that the tactics of Russia before the Crimean war were very similar to those which were on the point of succeeding in May last.

"Eleven years ago I left Turkey, where I had been residing in an official capacity for twelve years. During that time I was in constant communication, first, with Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and, afterwards, with Lord Dalling (then Sir Henry Bulwer), and also with Rashid Pasha, and his two successors, Fuad and Aali Pashas. . . . In whatever character Russia may now seek to appear, anxiety to force on the rulers of Turkey a better system of government, or to win for the Christian populations greater privileges or a greater amount of civil or religious liberty, was not then her object. She desired rather to render all government impossible, and then to replace the Sultan by the Czar. To this end all her intrigues were directed, and so confident was she at one time of success, that her agents made no secret of their intentions. I believe firmly that war then became a necessity, and that if it had not been made, a series of internal revolutions, more or less openly supported by Russia, would have accomplished the object her Government had in view. . . . The war was over; and with its close one of the main objects for which it was undertaken seemed forgotten; and Turkey, instead of being forced into a groove of progress, and kept there, was allowed to go on in her old way. . . . Had Lord Stratford de Redcliffe been allowed to have his own way, matters might have taken a different course. . . . The letters of the 'Roving Englishman' blinded both public and Government to the sterling value of their representative, and he was recalled; and in a few short months the prestige, not only of English arms, but of English diplomacy, was utterly gone. The great Eltchee . . . was replaced by Sir Henry Bulwer, whose chief aim seemed to be to prove that all his predecessor had done, or attempted to do, was wrong. . . . Russia came again to the front, and by a systematic neglect of opportunities we lost all the advantages which the war had created. . . . Sir Henry Bulwer, who believed that every difficulty could be financed through, gave an impetus to the taste the Turks had already acquired for borrowing, . . . and the result was increased facilities for raising the wind, and increased ingenuity in devising new methods of taxation. . . . I ventured then to raise my humble voice against this, to me, unutterable folly, and I well remember, in two interviews I had with Earl Russell, when he

* Under the initials E. H., 21st September 1876.

was Minister for Foreign Affairs, how his Lordship, to use a mild term, ridiculed my want of faith in the regeneration of Turkey, and the wisdom of my objections to the course we were pursuing. . . . I am certain now, as I was then, that had England after the Crimean war sternly and unrelentingly insisted upon the performance of only half the promises so lavishly made, instead of being contented with flimsy promises and flowing despatches, we should not now have to bewail, and perhaps to resent, the terrible atrocities of the last few months."

The lately deposed Sultan, Abdool Aziz, came to the throne in 1861. An imperial proclamation enjoining financial order and economy was at once issued; other administrative forms were gone through; and to a question put on the 27th June by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe in the House of Lords, Lord Wodehouse's reply was that a new era of practical and salutary reform was about to commence for the Turkish Empire.

In 1862 the Turkish strongholds in Servia were given up, and in 1867 Belgrade was abandoned by the Turks, but the Servians were not contented; they demanded Svornick, an important strategic point on the Drina. Thus was the Panslavic game being played, while Russia was working according to her wont. In 1863 Lord Palmerston thus wrote *—

"As regards the Russian Government, I look upon the insurrection (in Poland) as a just penalty awarded by Heaven for the intrigues fomented by that Government in instigating rebellion against the Sultan in Moldavia, Wallachia, Servia, and Bosnia, in the coming spring. . . . For the present Russia herself suffers the evil she wishes to inflict upon a harmless neighbour. In this I refer to the 100,000 rifles the Russian Government has clandestinely sent to Servia and Bosnia, and to the host of *agents provocateurs* likewise dispatched by Russia to stir up rebellion in Turkey."

Six years later the whole Panslavic plan was unfolded in a work † (published in Russia) by General Fadaieff. Austria was described as the most formidable enemy, because able to prevent a Russian attack on Turkey, and to excite, through Galicia, insurrection in Russian Poland. It was, therefore, laid down that "Austria must be destroyed." Speedy action was insisted on, Russia being, it was argued, bound to fight Austria and Prussia while the Slavonians in those two countries yet remained un-Germanised. Even defeat in such a cause was described as a gain, inasmuch as it would "draw tighter the bonds between Russia and kindred races, and fortify Russia for the future."

* Letter to Baron Brunnow.

† "Opinion on the Eastern Question"—translation published in London in 1871.

The events of 1870, however, created new forces which, for a time at any rate, upset General Fadaieff's calculations. The Russian policy which had permitted notorious Slav agitators and sympathisers from Austria to be received at St. Petersburg by the Czar himself with marks of honour, was put in abeyance; the Russian press changed its tone accordingly; and a little later was announced that Northern alliance of which some of the fruits are beginning to be visible to Western Europe. Elsewhere, however, the Panslavic game went on as theretofore. Central agencies at Moscow and Vienna sowed insurrection in the provinces of Turkey, while at Constantinople General Ignatieff played the part of the disinterested supporter of the Sultan against his rebellious subjects, and obtained such influence over the incompetent Abdool Aziz, that the plans of Russia were on the very point of realisation when the refusal of England to assent to the Berlin Memorandum, the dethronement of the Sultan, and the presence of a powerful British fleet, forced operations into another channel.

The war of 1870 enabled Russia to repudiate one of the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris, England not resisting, and the form of solemn general acquiescence in the remainder, with which it did not suit Russia *then* to interfere, being gone through. In Central Asia Russian aggression had for many years progressed steadily and successfully, until at last England interfered to the extent of obtaining from the Russian Government a distinct pledge that Khiva should not be annexed—a promise scarcely given ere it was "Shamelessly broken," England remaining quiescent.

The Turkish Government appears from the date of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe's departure to have progressed steadily towards ruin. Nothing was done to retard the pace, but much was done to accelerate it. The Koran forbids debt, and the Turks had kept clear of it until taken in hand by European financiers, who supplied them, on ruinous terms, with money of which much never reached the public treasury, and very much that did reach it was recklessly squandered. A story told by Lord Russell of six millions sterling, or thereabouts, embezzled by one Pasha, at one operation, illustrates the culpable neglect of the protecting Power as well as the wretched condition of the Turkish Government. Foreign loans, however, might have benefited Turkey had England properly fulfilled the trust undertaken. That this could, and ought to, have been done is beyond reasonable doubt. Turkey virtually was, and long had been, in a state of "tutelage, which," as Lord Stratford de Redcliffe* has pointed out, "if

* Letter to the "Times," 3d January 1876.

it had been steadily, as of right, enforced, would have saved the Porte from its present embarrassments." As was natural under the circumstances thus created, or allowed to exist, the Turkish Government viewed the recommendations and remonstrances which they received as made simply in conventional deference to principles acknowledged elsewhere, and treated them accordingly.

"Since 1772 she [Russia] has doubled her territories. Within eighty years she has advanced 350 leagues on the road to Vienna and to Paris. She has swallowed up half Sweden, and of Poland as much as would make another Austrian Empire. She has conquered from Persia about as much as the area of Great Britain. From Turkey she has wrested, by successive wars and treaties, States as large as Prussia was before the war of 1866."*

The foregoing description of the result of Russian aggression, up to the time when the Crimean war checked it, is given by a Russian, M. de Boukharow, who boasts that such extension, in such a time, is unexampled in history. And now the forward movement has recommenced, effected by means as tortuous as ever, and disavowed as long as disavowal remains possible; while further progress has perhaps been facilitated by recent proceedings in England, which will presently be described.

In the early part of 1875 there were apparent on the Montenegrin border symptoms of disturbance which gradually increased, and had by the middle of the summer extended to Herzegovina and the Bosnian frontier. Three months later the inability of the Porte to fulfil the engagements contracted with foreign creditors was announced. The nature of these disturbances was thus described in a memorandum forwarded to Lord Derby by Sir H. Elliott:—

"There can be no doubt that the insurrection was first brought about, and afterwards supported, by foreign influence. There was no particular reason, or any excess of oppression, to justify, or occasion, a rising of the people in 1875, beyond what has existed at any time since 1860. . . . Both the Montenegrins and the Dalmatians have openly given every possible aid to the insurgents, and have, in fact, done everything that declared enemies to Turkey could have effected, short of sending their regular troops to take part in the insurrection. The so-called insurrection in Bosnia might be better termed an invasion by bands openly formed in Austrian Croatia and Servia; it has never extended beyond the range of their operations."†

The Turkish Government had from the first protested against the means by which these disturbances were fomented, and had

* The "Edinburgh Review" for October 1876, p. 567.

† Blue Book, No. 3, p. 40.

pointed out that the movement was really one designed, with the countenance and connivance of adjoining States, to "initiate and promote a Slavie insurrection on the Austro-Ottoman borderland, aiming at the dissolution of both the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires."

At the beginning of the year just closed there appeared in the "Times"* a letter from Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, which may well be studied by those who advocate the suicidal policy which he there denounces:—

"The 'Times' reopened the Eastern Question by advising a policy of total inaction on the part of England. You have since laboured in many leaders to justify that opinion, by dressing Turkey in the most humiliating colours. That Turkey is weak, fanatical, and misgoverned, no one can honestly deny; but to my apprehension it would be a great and hazardous mistake to infer from its condition in those respects that the best way for England is to leave it entirely alone. Among the Turkish statesmen are some, at least, who, in spite of their religious prejudices and defective knowledge, have sagacity enough to feel their wants, and prudence enough to bend rather than to break under the force of reasonable pressure. Nor are the Sultan's Mussulman subjects so unmanageable as to give serious alarm to his Government when reforms of an unpopular kind are to be carried into effect. . . . For England to be an idle looker-on seems hardly credible. Such an attitude with reference to interests so positive, and perils so imminent, would be a virtual abdication of her high position and its attendant duties. True it is that of two evils she has only to choose the lesser, but the choice of either would be better than indifference alike degrading and dangerous. . . . There is no reason to distrust Russia at present, but Russia is, nevertheless, one of the same triumvirate which partitioned Poland; and the retirement of England might be taken as her opportunity. . . . In a religious sense no Christian can sympathise with a Mussulman Government. It is on very different grounds that the Porte enlists on its side the good-will of some of, and the forbearance of all, the European Powers. Their interference, to the degree, and in the manner, proposed, has no other object but that of saving Europe at large from a general war, and some of the States from the injurious effects of a rival's special aggrandisement."

So far as we can gather from the published despatches, and from all that has transpired since Lord Stratford de Redcliffe wrote, the one thing which has really prevented the pacification of the Turkish provinces has been the attitude of Russia, whose aim appears to have been, and whose proceedings appear to have been directed, to prevent any peaceable solution really calculated to preserve and strengthen the integrity of the Turkish Empire.

* 3d January 1876.

This appears to be the one real difficulty with which Lord Derby has had to deal, and which those who have censured his proceedings have either failed properly to appreciate, or unfairly kept out of sight.

This difficulty was probably sufficiently evident to Lord Derby when, in accepting, with certain reservations, the proposals embodied in the Andrassy Note, he expressed doubts regarding the success of a scheme—to obtain a *modus vivendi* between the Christian and Mahometan populations—which would, everything showed, be opposed, and which was in fact effectually frustrated, by those whose projects would have been foiled by such success. This was no secret; it was discussed in many of the newspapers. The causes of failure were well and clearly described in the excellent letters of the "Times" Berlin and Vienna correspondents. The Austrian Government sincerely desired the pacification of the disturbed districts, but the object of Russia was to detach them as much as possible from Turkey, while Germany confined her efforts to the prevention of an open rupture between her two allies. Proposals emanating from three Powers thus situated were little likely to prove practicable, and so it turned out. The attempts to treat with the insurgents, made by the Consular Commission established in August 1875, had failed owing to the same causes. The conditions offered had been refused by the insurgents, as was to be expected, unless, indeed, the Russian agents undid with one hand that which they had effected with the other. Lord Derby has been blamed for want of faith in the efficacy of these proposals; the Blue Books show what they really amounted to. On the 14th February last Sir H. Elliott* told Lord Derby:—

"The account of the encouragement and countenance given to the insurgents at Ragusa greatly exceeds all that I was prepared for. The Russian consulate is the open resort of the insurgent chiefs; their correspondence is sent to the consul, who is a party to all their projects, and associates himself intimately with them. He does not appear to make an attempt to conceal the part he is playing, for on the occasion of the death of the chief Maxime, in one of the encounters, the Russian flag at the consulate was hoisted at half-mast, and M. Jonine himself joined the funeral procession. . . . Some of the wounded, when asked why they continue to struggle when the Porte is ready to grant all their demands, having answered plainly that they are bound to go on as long as they are told by Russia to do so. The assurances given at St. Petersburg of the wish of the Imperial Government that the insurgents would lay down their arms, must naturally go for nothing, as long as its official

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 13.

representative, with whom they are in communication, encourages them to go on."

What was the reply of the Russian Government to Lord Derby's remonstrance? Prince Gortchakow "did not deny the facts," but observed that "he could not interfere with the feelings of humanity which had led M. Jonine to succour the wounded, and pay the last tribute of respect to a deceased friend; nor could he disavow him on account of these sentiments. . . . That the policy of the Imperial Government could not be misinterpreted; it was clear and open as noonday; . . . that M. Jonine had considerable influence in those parts, which could be usefully exercised by inducing the insurgents to submit, and the refugees to return to their homes." *

At the same interview with the British ambassador, the Prince said "that M. Jonine had been most instrumental in preventing the Prince of Montenegro from openly co-operating with the insurgents; and that he had strictly and successfully carried out his instructions to warn the Prince of Montenegro of the danger he would incur by acting against the pacific efforts of the European Powers." When this assurance reached Lord Derby he was able to test its value by the following description, received six weeks earlier from Sir H. Elliott, of the Montenegrin Chief's appreciation of the danger referred to by Prince Gortchakow:—

"The Prince furnishes (punishes?) all those who join the insurgents without authorisation; but he sends about a fifth part of his effective forces into the Herzegovina. Not to overture these poor people, His Highness takes care to change them at the end of each expedition, or when their provisions are exhausted. Reforms alone, it is stated, will never put an end to the insurrection, so long as the insurgents and their Montenegrin friends have only to cross the frontier to be in safety." †

From Vienna, Sir A. Buchanan pointed out to Lord Derby (18th March) the impossibility of pacification without "the troops and the money" which were "evidently indispensable for re-peopling the country," but which it was not in the power of the Turkish Government to furnish. It was also stated—"There is much reason to fear that the insurrection, which Count Andrassy considers is already under his control, may continue to be a serious drain on the resources of the Porte, if it does not lead to the more disastrous eventualities desired by the enemies of the Ottoman Empire." ‡

That speedy pacification was the last thing desired, or in-

* Blue Book, p. 13.

† Ibid., No. 3, p. 1.

‡ Ibid., p. 45.

tended, by those who held the insurrection in hand, had been so early as the 5th February pointed out by Consul-General White, who wrote from Belgrade—

“That appearances in Servia pointed to anything but the success of Count Andrassy’s project, and that with the return of spring a supreme attempt would probably be made to enlarge the area of the insurrection, and to delay a pacific solution in the Herzegovina, by importing into the shifting sands of Eastern politics a Bosnian, and Servian, and, possibly, a Bulgarian and other questions.” *

Three days later (8th February) Sir H. Elliott placed before Lord Derby facts proving the Servian movement to be simply one of national ambition, and not one “to help a kindred race to obtain redress for its grievances.”

“The Prince of Servia,” said Sir Henry, “has stated his views with frankness. The strongholds of the insurrection are close to the frontiers of Montenegro, to which the people wish to be annexed, but if they are ceded to that Principality, he will at once declare war. He would do so also if an Austrian force were to occupy any portion of Bosnia, for the purpose of insuring an equitable treatment of the people; and he would resent the grant to them of an autonomy, or the appointment of a Christian governor. If doubt were before possible, after the declarations of the Prince none can remain, that the object of Servia is simply one of national aggrandisement.” †

On one point, to which reference was not made by Sir H. Elliott, Prince Milan’s conversation is very instructive; it foreshadows the probable condition of several small Balkan States, protected by Russia, and breathing menaces which but for such protection would be ridiculous.

On the 22d February Consul-General White reported ‡ that the Russian Consul’s “pacific representations” to the Prince of Servia had produced neither result, nor “abatment of warlike preparations.” On the 24th March Sir A. Buchanan reported § that the Austrian Government had “in energetic language” demanded from Servia a positive engagement to discontinue military preparations. This was much too real for Russia, who declined to co-operate, the consequence being the evasion, with impunity, of the Austrian demand. Eight days later Prince Gortchakow told Lord Loftus that he doubted the possibility of any successful issue to negotiations with the insurgents, owing to the Porte’s want of money, troops, and competent adminis-

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 1.

† Ibid., p. 7.

‡ Ibid., p. 4.

§ Ibid., pp. 49, 50.

trators. He then added *—"I can say sincerely that we wish to maintain the Turkish Empire. It is our object and interest to do so, but we cannot struggle against destiny, and although we have used all our diplomatic efforts for the pacification of the insurgent provinces, we have no means of remedying the internal decay of the Empire."

Just before this conversation took place, one of the pacific warnings of the Czar had been addressed to Servia and Montenegro. This was communicated by General Ignatieff to Sir H. Elliott,† who wrote to Lord Derby—"The terms are certainly stringent;" and so, indeed, they were, both Chiefs being told that their future relations with Russia would depend on the reply they gave. Their reply is not among the published papers; but what they eventually did—what, in truth, they were surreptitiously doing at that very time—is sufficiently well known.

Anything more oppressively unjust than the treatment received by the Turkish Government from the commencement of the disturbances can scarcely be conceived. It was treatment clearly calculated, and in all probability intended, to produce desperation. Open war with Servia and Montenegro would have been infinitely less injurious to Turkey than the underhand and unavowed hostilities which, under Russian protection, these States carried on with perfect impunity. Warned that she must not pursue the insurgents whenever they chose to retire into the protected Principalities, Turkey was, and felt that she was, being bled to death. And all this time the Press was flooded with Russian semi-official assurances that Russia had turned over a new leaf, and had ceased to desire any part of Turkey. The Russian Chancellor, too, was, as we have just shown, lamenting the exhaustion of diplomatic efforts to effect pacification. This was the Russian "destiny"—the Turks tied up and baited; to be worried to death if they could not break loose; to be attacked by Russia if they could.

Meanwhile, the British Parliament had re-assembled, and the Prime Minister had, during the debate on the Address, declared that Turkish misgovernment could not be allowed to continue, though the difficulties of dealing with it were very great. Mr. Gladstone passionately denounced that which he described as systematic misrule inseparable from "a want of executive power," paralysing and defeating "the best intentions of the Government;" and the "Times" (10th February) pronounced it to be in the highest degree satisfactory that "the chief representative of the Liberal party should have stigmatised

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 56.

† Ibid., p. 58.

Ottoman misrule, and proclaimed English responsibilities, with a plainness worthy of himself and his country,"—responsibilities which, however, it must in fairness be pointed out, had weighed lightly during the preceding twenty years, and became intolerably only when a Conservative Ministry suddenly had to deal with them under circumstances of exceptional difficulty.

In Turkey matters were getting worse ; the insurgents having again refused the terms offered, and having this time advanced counter-proposals which the Austrian Government at once declared to be in many respects quite inadmissible. It must be borne in mind that the terms offered were virtually terms laid down by the Powers, inasmuch as they were the terms contained in the Andrassy Note. Russia, however, forthwith pressed upon the Porte the insurgents' counter-proposals. Sir Henry Elliott, in representing this to Lord Derby, said that the Turkish Government complained of having new demands thus brought forward after making concessions "which had been approved and considered sufficient by both Austria and Russia, which had promised to recommend their acceptance by the insurgents."* In this matter, as in others, Austria was obliged to succumb to Russia, and to support the counter-proposals which she had objected to. On the 20th April Lord Loftus, referring to these counter-proposals, wrote—"Count Andrassy has recognised the force and justice of the views of Prince Gortchakow, and has acceded to them." †

Lord Loftus' report ‡ of an interview with Prince Gortchakow on the 26th April is very remarkable. We read it as clearly showing the Russian Government to have, after rendering the suppression of the disturbances by the Porte impossible, demanded engagements clearly impossible of fulfilment. On Lord Loftus observing that the European Powers could not possibly say to the Porte—"We have asked you to undertake an impossibility," the Prince's reply was—"That is true; but at the time those proposals were made we conceived the Porte had more resources, more vitality ; that she was not so powerless as she has since proved herself to be." The proposals referred to were those contained in the Andrassy Note ; to these the Porte had agreed, but, according to Prince Gortchakow, without the power of fulfilling the agreement. Yet, holding this opinion, the Prince had not hesitated to press upon the Porte other, and harder demands, which the Porte, already believed to be incapable of meeting less onerous ones, was required to accept. It did not, however, suit the Chancellor to explain what he really wanted, or thought could be effected ; for, on Lord Loftus'

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 104.

† *Ibid.*, p. 97.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

endeavouring to elicit "an opinion as to the future arrangements which might be come to," the only reply given was that the Prince "could not look into the future; all he could do was to guard against the dangers of the moment."

In the same dispatch Lord Loftus thus referred to one of the great difficulties in the way of any settlement—"I could perceive that although there is a cordial wish, and, moreover, a decided intention, to act and co-operate with Austria in these Eastern complications, there is no harmony of views in regard to the mode, or basis, on which such an arrangement can be come to." Where the objects in view were so widely different, cordial agreement was most unlikely. The Russian Government aimed at weakening Turkey; Austria desired nothing of the sort, but on the contrary made it a *sine qua non* that the territorial integrity of Turkey should be preserved. "Following any other course,"* said Count Andrassy to Sir A. Buchanan (2d May), "the scramble for the Turkish provinces will begin, and it will be impossible to prevent or postpone eventualities which are to be expected from a dissolution or dismemberment of the Turkish Empire."

Austria was at this time endeavouring to bring about an armistice, as the first step towards pacification. A short truce had been arranged, and was in operation, when proceedings of the Montenegrin Chief caused the sudden resumption of hostilities. The responsibility for this was placed, most unjustly, as will be seen, by Russia on the Porte; and Prince Gortchakow declared that, as the Turkish Government had appealed to arms, he considered all negotiations with the insurgents to be ended, and would no longer attempt to restrain Servia or Montenegro. As soon as Sir Henry Elliott learnt this, he explained † to Lord Derby that Prince Gortchakow's statement of the case was "very inaccurate," the truth being that one of the conditions of the truce had been the revictualling of an important fortress from Montenegro; that this condition had not been fulfilled; that, as supplies were urgently required, the Turks had been obliged to send them under a military escort; and that this convoy had been immediately attacked by the insurgents.

After this the Russian Government induced Austria to close the port of Klek to the Porte for all military purposes; the Russian plea being ‡ that as the Austrian frontier had been closed to the insurgents, Klek should be closed to the Porte; the insurgents being thus apparently placed on the same footing with the Government against which they had revolted.

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 123.

† Ibid., p. 119.

‡ Ibid., p. 142.

To a request from Lord Derby that the Russian Government would restrain Montenegro from commencing regular hostilities, Prince Gortchakow's * reply was that no further steps could be taken, the Porte having appealed to arms, and having failed to carry out any of the reforms promised. It seems singular that this reply should have been accepted without at least an exposure of its real character. Sir Henry Elliott had shown that for the resumption of hostilities the Porte could not be justly held responsible; while the reforms which the Porte had failed to carry out were those of which the execution had been, on the Prince's own showing, impossible. But apart from this stands the almost incredible fact that while the Russian Chancellor was thus denouncing at St. Petersburg the proceedings of the Turkish Government, the Russian Ambassador had only six weeks earlier † told the Sultan, the incompetent Abdool Aziz, that he (General Ignatieff) "felt gratified, in his turn, to be able to state that Mahmood Pasha's administration had met with general satisfaction in Europe."

On the 2d May Sir Henry Elliott further explained ‡ to Lord Derby that the circumstances under which hostilities had been resumed were due very greatly, if not mainly, to the action taken by General Ignatieff.

Early in May the murder of the French and German Consuls took place at Salonica. Great excitement prevailed at Constantinople, and Sir Henry Elliott telegraphed to Admiral Drummond to bring the Mediterranean squadron to Besika Bay—a measure which Lord Derby sanctioned. At a later date strong reinforcements, consisting of a number of the most powerful vessels in the British Navy, were sent to the same locality. The published papers do not show why this was done; but it is reasonably certain that the measure was taken in connection with reported intrigues at Constantinople, and the treaty stipulations regarding the entry of foreign vessels of war into the Bosphorus—stipulations which Lord Derby was most anxious should not be infringed.§

The advent of the Berlin Memorandum was foreshadowed in a dispatch || of the 9th May from Lord Loftus, who described an interview at which he had found Prince Gortchakow "evidently indisposed to compromise himself by enunciating his views previous to an exchange of opinions with Prince Bismark and Count Andrassy," but had learnt enough to show that the proposals about to be made were in many respects identical with those contained in the Andrassy Note—proposals, be it remem-

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 141.

† Ibid., p. 52.

‡ Ibid., p. 152.

§ Ibid., pp. 129, 135, 275, 328, 371, 461, 525.

|| Ibid., p. 143.

bered, which Prince Gortchakow had already declared to be, as they undoubtedly were, in many respects quite beyond the power of the Porte to carry out. Bearing in mind this, and the fact that the Porte's inability had been mainly caused by action on the part of Russia which had rendered the pacification of the insurgent districts impossible, we are unable to share Lord Loftus' conviction, strongly expressed in the same dispatch, of the perfectly disinterested nature of the Russian policy and proceedings in respect to Turkey.

On the 13th May Lord Odo Russell received from Prince Bismark, and forwarded to Lord Derby, the Berlin Memorandum, which, though presented by the three Northern Powers, was "the work of the Russian Cabinet only." So much was stated* to Sir A. Paget by the Italian Minister. Lord Odo Russell had previously reported that "the German Government, having no special interest beyond the maintenance of peace in the matter, would be willing and glad to give their moral support to any pacific solution of the question their Russian and Austrian allies might agree upon." The proposals now put forward were, however, so obviously likely to lead to anything but a pacific solution, that it is difficult to understand the readiness of the German Government to accept them, and to press their acceptance upon the Government of Great Britain.

The propriety of declining to accept the proposals contained in the Berlin Memorandum has never, we believe, been questioned in England. It is, nevertheless, desirable to consider the grounds on which these proposals were held to be unacceptable, as such consideration suffices, we think, to show that the Russian scheme contained nothing on which counter-propositions, which Lord Derby has been blamed for not having made, could reasonably be based. An armistice was to be forced upon the Porte, but there was no provision whatever for ensuring its observance on the other side. The Turkish troops were to be concentrated in certain places, the insurgents retaining their arms—a measure "delivering up the whole country to anarchy." Consular or other foreign supervision was to ensure the due execution of the reforms insisted on—supervision which, to be effective, required to be supported by force, and which thus supported "would reduce the authority of the Sultan to nullity." The Porte was to be required to furnish the returning refugees with costly assistance, of which the means were notoriously not forthcoming. And, lastly, the Powers were, in the event of their ends not being attained within two months, to take such

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 193.

efficacious measures as might be found necessary in the interests of general peace.

To accept; and act upon, such proposals was virtually to treat as non-existent engagements in force; to require from the Turkish Government the performance of that which they were known to be, and which Prince Gortchakow had already declared them to be, unable to perform; to encourage the insurgents to refuse any terms offered by the Porte; and to create a general right of unlimited interference, reasonably certain to bring into collision Powers whose widely divergent views indicated the exceeding danger of replacing existing treaties by a vague engagement on which each Power could, and in all probability would, place a different construction—the one best suited to promote its own aims and interests.

Bearing in mind the immense importance of such proposals, and the fact of their having been framed by Russia, and adopted by Austria and Germany, without any consultation with, or previous communication to, the other Powers, it was not to be expected that these latter would be asked to express an opinion on the telegraphic summary of them within something like six-and-thirty hours. Yet this was the request of the Russian Chancellor.* The telegram could not have left Berlin till late in the afternoon of the 13th May, and a reply was asked for by the 15th, the one intervening day being a Sunday. Replies were, however, sent on the 15th; the French and Italian Governments agreeing to support the proposals; and Lord Derby stating that his first impressions, which he explained at some length, were not favourable; but that a definite answer could only be given after careful examination by the Cabinet.† Four days later this answer was sent,‡ to the effect that the British Government, for reasons mainly those to which we have adverted, declined to co-operate in the policy laid down by the three Northern Powers. In the same dispatch a significant reference was made to “the considerable naval force assembled at Salonica,” and to the necessity of taking care “that the naval forces of foreign Powers are not employed in any manner contrary to the treaty rights of the Porte, or subversive of the Sultan’s authority.”

The foregoing dispatch was supplemented by one of the same date, also addressed to Lord Odo Russell, pointing out the inconvenience of such proposals as those contained in the Andrassy Note and Berlin Memorandum being submitted for the acceptance of Great Britain without any opportunity having been afforded for a preliminary consideration of the details, or

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 137.

† Ibid., p. 143.

‡ Ibid., p. 171.

for the consideration of any possible objections. It was at the same time explained that the British Government, attaching little value to forms in such matters, would have readily accepted the Berlin proposals had they appeared to be feasible; but it was added, "they cannot accept, for the sake of the mere appearance of concert, a scheme in the preparation of which they have not been consulted, and which they do not believe calculated to effect the object with which they are informed it has been framed." It was left to the Ambassador's discretion to indicate these views to the German Government; and similar instructions were issued to the British representatives at Vienna and St. Petersburg; copies being sent to Constantinople, Paris, and Rome.*

On the 30th May Mr. Adams wrote to Lord Derby from Paris that the general feeling there appeared to approve the rejection of the Berlin proposals by England, and to blame the precipitate action taken by France. Sir A. Paget had eight days earlier referred, in conversation with the Italian Minister, to "the hasty manner in which the Italian Government had rushed into views which they could have had barely time to examine." †

Lord Derby, while steadily refusing to acquiesce in the Russian proposals, pointed out, ‡ clearly and strongly, to the Turkish Government the consequences of "the administrative collapse" into which the country had been allowed to fall; and warned them that England "could not control events to which the neglect of the ordinary principles of good government may expose the Turkish Empire."

While the Berlin Memorandum was under consideration, the attempt, three months before foreshadowed by Consul-General White, to add a Bulgarian question to the existing difficulties, was made. Considerable numbers of Russian, Servian, Croatian, and other agents succeeded in the beginning of May in lighting in one part of the province a flame which would, had it not been at once extinguished, have rapidly blazed throughout the whole country. The Servians had been arming for months past, and only awaited the result of operations in Bulgaria. As these did not succeed, the Servian attack was postponed. It was at this time that the Turks committed in Bulgaria the atrocious outrages which four months later produced in England the outburst of just popular indignation so unduly inflamed and misdirected.

England having declined to assent to the Berlin proposals, the other five Powers determined to carry them out. The Porte was prepared to refuse to entertain them; and the situation had

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 173.

† Ibid., pp. 194-205.

‡ Ibid., p. 174.

become most critical, when changes took place at Constantinople which gave breathing-time to the Turkish Government. It had long been felt throughout Turkey, and especially at the capital, that Abdool Aziz and his Minister, Mahmood Pasha, were completely in the hands of the Russian Ambassador, and that under the system pursued—inconstant changes of officials of every grade being one of its features—improved administration could not be expected. There were Turks at Constantinople who at last determined to make a supreme effort to remedy these evils. The occurrences at Salonica roused them to immediate action; and on the 11th May a change of Ministers was effected. Mahmood's downfall was followed, twenty days later, by the deposition of Abdool Aziz, and General Ignatieff's plans were for the time frustrated.*

Sir H. Elliott's part in these transactions can only be properly appreciated when much information, which the Government have evidently thought it necessary to withhold, shall be given to the public. It cannot, however, be doubted that for a very long time past—long before the advent of Sir H. Elliott—English policy at Constantinople has been weak in the extreme—one purely of paper, and of unheeded remonstrance and advice. Had it been otherwise, Russia would long ago have been compelled to abandon, or more probably would never have laid down, the programme which General Ignatieff so nearly carried out. In respect to occurrences in Bulgaria Sir H. Elliott has been most unjustly attacked, though in this matter the people appear to have been little to blame, the real culprits being those whose position and education ought to have prevented them from hounding the people on. Sir H. Elliott in a great measure foresaw these occurrences, and did what he reasonably could to avert them. How he, or any one else in his place, could have prevented them, we are at a loss to conceive. The very existence of the Turkish Empire appeared at that time to hang on a thread, which would have snapped had the agents at work in Bulgaria succeeded. At Constantinople the Government was in abeyance, and no man knew what would happen next. Those who did exercise authority hastened to meet the new danger with little or no regard to the means employed. To the use of some of those means Sir H. Elliott objected, but his objections were overruled. Dealing, as he then was, with men who at least believed that they were struggling for very existence, what

* That the frightful state of the administration, and the great dangers hanging over the country, had for some time past been evident to many who desired, but feared, to grapple with them, seems clear from the Manifesto of the 9th March 1876, addressed to all the great Powers excepting Russia, which was published in the "Times" of the 17th June following.

could he have done more? It must be remembered, too, that at this time General Ignatieff was all-powerful, and that his plans appeared to be on the point of succeeding. What part would he have played had Sir H. Elliott attempted anything like forcible interference, had this been—we do not see that it was—in his power? Yet, short of such interference, Sir H. Elliott appears to have done what was possible. Later on his hands were strengthened by the presence in Besika Bay of a powerful British fleet, which afforded “moral and material support,” not to the Turks in resisting advice given to them, but to the British representative in making it prevail.*

The deposition of Abdool Aziz had the effect of deferring the presentation to the Porte of the Berlin Memorandum, on which, after England’s refusal, the other five Powers had determined to act. Prince Gortchakow stood alone in desiring to press the matter at once upon the new Sovereign.† A few weeks later General Ignatieff left Constantinople, ostensibly on leave of absence; to return, however, a little later, when fresh complications had been created. Shortly after the accession of the new Sultan, Sir H. Elliott was instructed † to press upon him “the urgent importance of taking advantage of the opportunity afforded by the change of Government to establish the administration of the country on a sound footing,” as the only means by which he could “hope to forestall the designs of the enemies of the Ottoman Empire, and to secure for the new Government the confidence which under the rule of the late Sultan had been so disastrously forfeited.” It was added that the British Government felt themselves to be “in a position, from the circumstances of the political situation, in which their counsel should carry with it peculiar weight.”

The following excellent description of the political situation appeared in the “Cologne Gazette” in the beginning of June:—

“The melancholy position of Turkey has been but too often described; yet it is not so desperate as painted by those interested in the decay of the Ottoman Empire. To prove this we need only refer to the astonishing increase of the revenue, which, despite maladministration and extravagance, has doubled in the last twenty years. . . . Setting aside the Paris treaty of 1856, Russia again presumes to claim the patronage of the Christian subjects of Turkey. Europe is so divided that she hardly dares resent the revived arrogance of the Menchikoff period. . . . Austria is too weak to resist Russian cunning on the Lower Danube. . . . Thus, England

* Blue Book, No. 3, pp. 86, 145, 212, 216, 230, 232, 267, 344.

† Ibid., p. 418.

‡ Ibid., p. 254.

is left alone to speak out openly upon Russian doings, and to resist them in case of extreme necessity. English statesmen decline to feign belief in Russia's sincerity, when she speaks of her wish to preserve Turkey; they call a spade a spade, and designate it as an outrage on common sense that the Servians and Montenegrins are allowed to assist the insurgents, and to boast of doing so, while the Turks are forbidden to go to war with the two recusant Principalities. . . . The German press is differently situated from the German diplomacy; the German press has not to spare Russia's feelings, and, with all deference to Alexander II. and the many excellent qualities of his reign, may yet deem it necessary to tear the veil from Russian intrigue in the East."

There appeared in the "Journal des Débats" at this time a remarkable article, not signed, but believed to be the production of *une plume autorisée*, and to express the views of a portion of the French Cabinet. The position of Russia was thus described:—

"The insurrection in reality is only a local manifestation of a profound evil from which Europe is suffering. It is possible that the evil is precisely what the English, and some of the German papers call an increase of political influence disproportionate with the moral capacity of the Russian nation of the nineteenth century. Russia has, in fact, reaped the fruits of the victories of Sadowa and Sedan, which cost her nothing. . . . To-day, thanks to the breach which the war of 1870 caused between the two great civilised nations of the Continent, the Russians have become the arbiters of Europe, and they will remain so as long as Germany permits it."

Never was contrast more marked than that now existing between the diplomatic language of the Russian Government and the utterances of the Russian press; the Ministerial papers surpassing even the Slavophil journals in violent denunciation of Great Britain. It must be borne in mind that not a line can appear in the Russian papers unless directly or indirectly authorised by the Government. This has been very clearly explained in a work by M. de Kosheleff, who long filled a Ministerial post in Russia. He shows that public writing there is, in reality, simply the expression of views which the Government desire, or allow, to be expressed; and that on every important subject the public journals are warned by Ministerial circular what may, and what may not, be said. The violence of the Russian press was severely criticised by foreign journals, the "Cologne Gazette" especially condemning the conduct of Russia during the recent negotiations, and pointing out that the advocacy of religious liberty was a transparent pretext on the part of a Power which persecutes all Dissenters with great cruelty.

The general condition of the disturbed Turkish provinces at this time may be inferred from a report* from Consul Holmes (15th June), who, after describing the sufferings inflicted by the insurgents on Christian inhabitants who, under the amnesty proclaimed by the new Sultan, had returned to their homes, wrote—"Surely it would be much better for the Turkish authorities to cease their efforts to bring back the refugees, and declare the simple truth—that it is impossible either to provide for them, or to protect them, until tranquillity is restored." Christians, however, were not the only sufferers. Mr. Holmes stated that the conduct of the Mahometan population in the interior of Bosnia had been up to that time most praiseworthy, but that they were becoming "wearied and exasperated;" several had admitted to him that "in talking among themselves there had been sometimes a disposition to take measures into their own hands, and either to perish, or to drive the Christians out of the country."

The next move of Russia was very soon to declare itself. The Montenegrin official organ † had in the beginning of June announced the approach of hostilities, to be taken in conjunction with the whole Servian race; the work had commenced in Bulgaria; a Russian, General Tchernaeff, had taken the command of the Servian army; Lord Loftus had been told by the Russian Minister ‡ (24th May) "that this incident was not well viewed by the Imperial Government, for undoubtedly it foreboded no pacific purpose, but the Imperial Government were without responsibility, and were powerless to prevent it;" Consul-General White had reported § his belief that General Tchernaeff's "opinion of the attitude that Russia will ultimately take in this question had more to do with this bold act than any excessive confidence in the military resources of Servia;" Lord Loftus had forwarded (20th June) the text of a letter from General Tchernaeff, which had appeared in the St. Petersburg "Ruski-Mir"—a paper belonging to him—describing, among other things, "the vast preparations made in Bulgaria for an insurrection against the Porte;" the Servian army had taken the field, and was drawn up on the frontier; and the Turkish forces watching Servian movements had been greatly weakened by the detachment of strong bodies of troops sent into Bulgaria.

While the Servian preparations for attacking Turkey were thus being made with all deliberation and publicity, Russia was going through the diplomatic form of protesting against them. Of the so-called warnings, which were always made known to

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 325.

† Blue Book, No. 3, p. 201.

‡ The Glas Tchernagortza.

§ Ibid., p. 209.

other Powers, one, sent about the 8th June, from Eins, where the Czar then was, deserves special notice, because it records with singular distinctness professions of which the utter insincerity was almost immediately to be demonstrated. On the 16th June Lord Derby was informed* that the Russian Emperor "had warned the Prince of Servia that if, contrary to advice, he involved himself in a war with Turkey, not only had he no material assistance to expect from Russia, but moral support and sympathy would equally be withheld."

We have already drawn attention to the singular confidence of the British representative at St. Petersburg in the intentions of Russia; we find another striking instance afforded by his statement † (21st June) to Lord Derby:—

"I am persuaded that Russia is most anxious to prevent the present insurrection from extending and assuming larger proportions; and that, should such be the case, Russia will not interfere herself, nor will she permit any other foreign Power to interfere; she will advocate the principle of non-intervention, and will be satisfied to let the parties fight it out, in the confident hope that the Christian element will come out victorious."

The Russian Ambassador had, on the 12th June, ‡ complained to Lord Derby of the "general distrust which appeared to be felt in England as to the designs of his Government;" and had been reminded that though the desire of the Czar for the maintenance of peace had never been doubted, "the language and conduct of the Russian agents had not always been in accordance with what" he (Lord Derby) "could not doubt was the intention of the Government." Count Schouvaloff afterwards, referring to Turkish affairs, asked—"What was the solution of the difficulty which England desired to see adopted?" and was told that as the insurgents appeared to be fighting, not for administrative reforms, but for independence, or autonomy in some form; as the Porte, though willing to grant reforms, would certainly not concede autonomy unless compelled; and as the British Government were not prepared to use compulsion against either party, they thought that the struggle must continue unless success should have declared itself on one side or the other; that the insurgents, if successful, would have acquired for themselves a position similar to that of Servia or Roumania; that, on the other hand, if the Sultan succeeded in even partially re-establishing his authority, some such arrangement as that made in Crete in 1866-67 would probably be feasible; and that in either event

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 244.

† Ibid., p. 329.

‡ Ibid., p. 260.

the Powers might at no distant date usefully and successfully mediate.

Referring to the foregoing conversation, the Russian Ambassador, on the 21st June,* communicated to Lord Derby the substance of a dispatch from Prince Gortchakow suggesting the institution of measures which might at once put an end to the insurrection—the measures being (1) the formation of “vassal and tributary † autonomous states;” (2) the cession to Montenegro of “a part of some adjacent portions of territory;” and (3) that the Porte “should hand over Little Svoornick to Servia.” It was suggested that these measures should be at once pressed on the Porte, “especially by England.”

On the 27th June Count Beust communicated ‡ to Lord Derby the strong objections of Austria to the formation of autonomous states—objections already made known by Austria to the Russian Cabinet, who had been told—“In a word, the plan of autonomy, if put in execution, so far from re-establishing security, would only serve to shake to its foundation everything that it was desired to consolidate. If ever there was a case in which the cure might be said to be worse than the disease, this would be it.” The next day Lord Derby informed Count Schouvaloff of the objections entertained to autonomy by the Austrian Government, and added that the Government of Great Britain would “gladly concur in any practical proposal for the amelioration of the local government of the disturbed provinces.” Lord Derby adverted to the menacing attitude of Servia, and to the prevalent belief that Prince Milan intended to claim the Governorship of Bosnia—a request certain to be refused by the Porte. Count Schouvaloff’s assurance that he had never heard of such a proposition Lord Derby had to place beside the fact that it had six days previously been made.§ On the following day Lord Derby gave to Count Schouvaloff a written reply || to Prince Gortchakow’s dispatch, of which the substance had been communicated on the 21st June. In this reply it was stated that the suppression of the insurrectionary movement appeared to be necessary before proposals of administrative reform could be advantageously treated, especially bearing in mind that the struggle going on was shown by reports received to be one “obviously of a general and political, rather than of a local and administrative character,” and that fugitive inhabitants wish-

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 313.

† This was subsequently explained not to mean sovereignty, which was to remain with the Sultan intact. Blue Book, p. 350.

‡ Blue Book, No. 3, p. 332.

§ Ibid., pp. 338, 354.

|| Ibid., p. 340.

ing to return were prevented from doing so, not by "fears of their Mahometan neighbours, but by the action of the insurgents;" that the proposed concessions to Montenegro appeared possible; that the menacing attitude of Servia seemed to render it manifestly inopportune to urge upon the Porte concessions to that Principality; that the result of the large concessions made by the Porte to Servia in 1862 and 1867, with the object of securing friendly relations, "did not seem encouraging for the future;" and that pacification would be rendered an easy task were Prince Milan desired by the Russian Government, in a tone not admitting of misconstruction, to abandon his policy of aggression, and were "the Turkish provinces freed from the instigation to revolution of the foreign Slav committees and agitators."

This last communication of Lord Derby was answered by the invasion of Turkey by Servia and Montenegro on the 1st and 2d July; Russian officers in considerable numbers having joined the Servian army, and General Tchernaieff having issued a proclamation calling all Christian subjects of the Porte to arms, and assuring them that in case of failure, Russia would invade Turkey. From Moscow the Slavonian Committee sent an address promising arms, money, volunteers, and, in case of need, Russian troops. The "Golos" said—"Though she may remain a mere spectator at first, Russia will set all Europe on fire rather than suffer the sister tribes of Balkan to be put down in the coming strife." The "Ruski-Mir" declared the discussion of Turkish reforms to be out of the question, the Sick Man being not merely sick, but certainly dying, and the only question being how to put out of sight the half-dead body. The Holy Synod of the Orthodox Church—a Russian semi-clerical body under the strictest control of the political authorities—published an address declaring General Tchernaieff's task to be approved and envied by every Russian. And—General Ignatieff had shortly before, under cover of the Treaty of Paris, demanded from the Porte an assurance that Turkey contemplated no attack on Servia!!!

On the 1st July Count Schouvaloff, inquiring from Lord Derby whether in the event of war between Turkey and Servia England intended to "adhere to a policy of absolute and strict non-intervention," was * told by Lord Derby that such was undoubtedly the case, so long as a different course should not be pursued by other Powers. Ten days later Lord Loftus telegraphed † that the Emperors of Austria and Russia had mutually agreed, at Reichstadt, "that non-intervention should be maintained in the Eastern

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 351.

† Ibid., p. 358.

struggle, and that, when necessary, the European Powers should be consulted with."

On good grounds, we think, did Lord Hammond, in the House of Lords, on the 27th June, strongly condemn the proceedings of Russia, and significantly refer to Mr. Canning's declaration in 1826, when Portugal was threatened by Spain, that England would "not endure that foreign force, or foreign intrigue, should produce confusion or civil war" in the country of a peaceful ally. Lord Napier and Ettrick, too, well insisted that nothing would so much contribute to the preservation of peace as the clearly proclaimed determination of England to oppose "a positive and determined resistance to an aggressive and ambitious policy," and the knowledge elsewhere that such a policy "could only be persevered in at the risk of inflicting upon Europe and Russia the dreadful evils of an European war." Lord Derby's explanation on this occasion of the policy of the Government was, we think, most satisfactory. He said:—

"No one supposes that the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire in any form within Europe is possible if there is to be permanent disaffection and discontent among the Christian races. They are in European Turkey a majority too numerous and too powerful, by intelligence and wealth, to be kept down by mere force. That is as well understood by any person who has any claim to be called a statesman at Constantinople as it is here. The problem to be solved is how to reconcile their reasonable wishes and claims with the maintenance of the general system to which all Europe is pledged, and which cannot be overthrown without a general convulsion extending far beyond European limits, and leading to many complications which we can hardly foresee. It is one thing to say at any given moment, 'We will not try to mediate because our interposition would probably do no good;' and it is quite another to lay down as a general rule that we have nothing to do with the matter, and will let events take their course. The former course may be one dictated by reason and prudence; the latter is the language, as it seems to me, not of statesmanship, but of mere indolence and despair."

On the 14th July Lord Derby, replying to an influential deputation introduced by Mr. John Bright, explained that the Government would observe a policy of strict neutrality between Turkey and her revolted provinces, and that, owing to the declared intention of Austria and Russia to observe a policy of "rigid and absolute non-intervention," any extension of the war appeared to be in the last degree improbable. Mr. Bright at once declared this reply to be calculated to give general satisfaction. The very next day, however, there appeared a small cloud—the precursor of the agitation which was to assume the dimensions of a national calamity—in the shape of a letter to the "Times"

from the Bishop of Manchester, suggesting that the presence of the British fleet in Besika Bay constituted "moral and almost material support" afforded to the Turks in the perpetration of atrocities, and entreating the English people to declare their mind in the matter.

It is remarkable that up to this time the policy pursued by the Government had commanded general approval. Its main features were thoroughly known. The "Times" had published the proposals of the Northern Powers, and the whole matter had been discussed. On one point—the high-handed double dealing of Russia—the public had little information until the publication of the official papers later on. That Bulgaria had been the scene of horrible outrages had long ago been matter of notoriety. The occurrences there had been described * in the "Times" of the 21st June as something "the reality of which it would, by all accounts, be impossible for the utmost stretch of imagination to exaggerate." A detailed account appeared in the "Daily News" two days later. Yet it did not then, or till long afterwards, occur to any one to insist that because the Turks had been guilty of criminal excesses in their country, the British Government should invite Russia to take it. The policy and past proceedings of the Government had been thus referred to in the "Times" of the 23d June—"The success is conspicuous; it is recognised both by friend and opponent—by the former in tones of satisfaction mingled with surprise; by the latter by a demeanour in which the excess of irritation sometimes overcomes courtesy."

On the evening of the 27th July Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, deprecating postponement of the forthcoming discussion on Turkish affairs, contended that priority should be given to it, as it would "assume distinctly and unequivocally the character of a vote of confidence in the Government." Mr. Gladstone on being asked by the Prime Minister whether he had given notice of any such motion, replied in the negative, and the matter dropped; and when four days later (31st July) the discussion took place, neither a vote of confidence, nor anything bearing that character, was even hinted at. Mr. Gladstone himself arraigned the Ministerial proceedings and policy at length, and the Prime Minister went through, and met, as we think fairly, every one of Mr. Gladstone's objections. We need here refer to but one of them—that taken by Mr. Gladstone to the policy of re-establishing the *status quo* in the disturbed provinces. He had strongly insisted on the necessity of providing some sort of local self-government; and on his reiterating this opinion, the Prime Minister remarked that there would be found,

* Letter from Therapia Correspondent.

he believed, the greatest difficulty in separating the *status quo*, to which Mr. Gladstone objected, from the territorial integrity of Turkey, which Mr. Gladstone thought should be preserved. We think that Mr. Gladstone was right; but however this may be, it was surely his duty, if he attached to his proposition the importance which when Parliament was no longer sitting he gave to it, to bring, as he certainly could have brought, the question to a constitutional and final issue during the period of the session which remained. The course taken by Lord Hartington on this occasion was a very different one. He strongly objected to some of the measures taken by the Government to attain the objects they had in view, but he described those objects as "in the main just," and "such as the country would be disposed to approve;" he further disclaimed any "desire to place upon record any condemnation of the conduct of the Government," and thus made fair allowance for the drawback—of which Mr. Gladstone admitted the existence, but for which he made no allowance whatever—that "nothing could have been more difficult than the circumstances in which Her Majesty's Government were placed." Some of the objections taken by Lord Hartington, especially his objection to the insufficient treatment of the glaring and most injurious breaches of neutrality by Powers professedly neutral, appear to us to be just; but it may be that they admit of sufficient explanation withheld in the interests of the general peace, which was, and is, so essential to the attainment of the other objects sought.

On the same evening (31st July) the Turkish question was discussed in the House of Lords, where Lord Derby explained that the Government did not object, in principle, to local self-government for the disturbed provinces, but that the difficulties of carrying out such a measure were enormous; that whatever might be done must be as far as possible done in co-operation with the other Powers; and that the main endeavour of the Government had been, and was, to effect such a settlement of the whole question as would effectually remove the continually impending danger of a general war. This most reasonable explanation did not satisfy the Marquis of Bath, who warned Lord Derby that if England attempted, either by diplomacy or by force, to interfere with "any other Power" choosing to help the insurgents, such action would be held by the country to be "action in support of the Turkish Government with all the atrocities of which it had been now and aforesaid guilty," and would be protested against in "every church in England, whether High or Low, and every chapel of whatever sort."

Towards the end of July it had become evident that the Servians unaided could not much longer continue the struggle,

and there seemed to be approaching the end which the Powers had pledged themselves to await. The "Golos," however, announced—

"There is nothing in the official neutrality of Russia to prevent Russian society showing their ardent sympathy with the Servian cause. . . . Russian society can effectually support the Slavonic warriors without the slightest infraction of national law. . . . The Slavonic war is our war, but it is only circumstances that place us in the hindmost ranks. If we profit by the advantages of this situation, we should be all the more willing to assist those fighting in the front."

The condition to which by this time a very great part of Turkey had been brought was thus described by the "Times" Therapia correspondent, writing on the 5th July—

"All the authority of the Government has come to an end in Bosnia and Bulgaria. . . . The teachers are everywhere hunted down and barbarously murdered as the instigators of revolt. . . . The ripening crops are forsaken. . . . In Asia Minor the raising of the *ban* and *arrière ban* of the reserve has left none but women to work in the fields. The produce of the interior is suffered to lie and rot on the ground owing to the want of the beasts of burden pressed into the service of the army, as well as every able bodied man. . . . All the Asiatic and large districts of the European provinces are left to the keeping of a scanty police, insufficient even for the ordinary purposes of checking the outrages of common malefactors."

Against the foregoing description may in justice be placed that given by the "Times" (26th August) of the Bulgarians *before* Russian agents had exposed the province to the horrors of civil war. "Bad as the Turkish rule is, it has enabled them to grow rich, to enjoy considerable religious freedom, and to make themselves far superior in education to the mass of the ignorant Mussulmans." Would Russia, once in Bulgaria, accord to the Mussulmans—nearly half the population—as much as the Turks have accorded to the Christians?

At Constantinople matters had progressed but badly. General Ignatieff had left on the 24th July; but the new Sultan was losing, or had lost his reason, and was said to be incapable of giving even formal sanction to the decisions of his Government. Turkey was, virtually, without a sovereign. There were, however, Turkish statesmen who under unexampled difficulties laboured on. The war seemed to be drawing to a close. So little were subsequent events in some quarters anticipated, that the "Times" discussed (25th August) arrangements by which Russia "should become security that Servia should keep the peace for a definite number of years." Meanwhile, however, the

Bishop of Manchester's appeal had been responded to. The first public meeting which to some extent indicated what was coming took place in London at Willis's Rooms (27th July). Lord Shaftesbury presided, and resolutions were passed, (1) Protesting against "moral and material support" being given to Turkey; (2) Requiring the British Government to call upon the Porte to put a stop to atrocities going on; And (3) recognising the necessity of giving the inhabitants of the insurgent provinces the full right of self-government. Lord Shaftesbury described Turkish rule as "utterly beyond remedy," and declared that he would rather "see the Russians on the Bosphorus than the Turks in Europe." The Rev. Mr. Denton told the meeting that "the English Consuls were instructed to shut their eyes to atrocities, and not to report them, so that Ministers might say they had no information on the subject." Mr. George Dawson (since deceased) was of opinion that "some one should turn into a Peter the Hermit, and preach a crusade throughout Europe." Mr. Poole, of the British Museum, maintained that the British Government possessed the power of disarming all the Turkish irregular troops, and were bound to effect the measure. Mr. E. Beales pointed out that "there was not an English holder of Turkish bonds whose ears would not ring with the agonised cries of the perishing Bulgarians." Mr. Howell concluded an otherwise reasonable speech by warning the people that they had to deal, not with Lord Derby, but with "a man of mystery, whose sympathies would go with Islamism in preference to Christianity." And Lord Shaftesbury, in acknowledging a vote of thanks, said—"You have given me the opportunity of bringing out what has long been in my heart, and I thank God the thing is well out."

The subject was rapidly "improved." At Hackney a meeting was held for the purpose, it was publicly announced, of denouncing the Ministry for "the support which it had given to the Ottoman Government in its unholy attempt to exterminate the Christian population of Turkey in Europe." Mr. Gladstone does not appear to have attended this meeting, but he sent to it a letter recommending agitation to prevent the re-establishment of the *status quo* in Bulgaria—a question little likely to be benefited by discussion at such a meeting. Moreover, Lord Derby had repeatedly declared, in and out of Parliament, that the Government were ready and anxious to do all that they found possible. The published papers had shown all those who chose to inform themselves that the tortuous and aggressive policy of Russia, the weakness of Austria, and the peculiar position of some other Powers, constituted the real obstacle to measures which no British Ministers could object to in principle. But neither this, nor anything else, for a time sufficed to make

reason heard. The prudent warning* given to the people by a member of the late Administration, Mr. Grant Duff, not to allow just indignation at atrocities, unfortunately by no means for the first time heard of, to lead them to confound two very distinct objects—preserving European Turkey in Turkish hands, and keeping it out of those of Russia—was denounced by the Bishop of Manchester in a letter (4th September) to a Manchester indignation-meeting. Mr. John Bright, Mr. Fawcett, and other leading members of the Liberal party, encouraged the outcry raised against the Government, but failed to present to the people both sides of the question. Every speech, every letter, every statement invited the people to believe Turkish misrule persistently upheld by Conservative Ministers, possessed of, but determined not to use, the means of terminating it. The designs of other powers; the hostility of some of those designs to British interests; their conflicting nature, and the consequent difficulty of obtaining common action—all this, and everything else explaining the real position of the Ministry, were invariably kept out of sight, and the people thus instructed were urged to declare themselves against a foreign policy which was misrepresented to them, and of which the momentous issues could at the best be but partially determined by England. Even the Bishop of Manchester in one and the same breath exhorted them to have, “come what may,” nothing more to do with the Turks, and told them—“of course, it is for statesmen to provide for the possible eventualities of the situation;” apparently unconscious that he was urging them to take matters out of the hands of statesmen altogether.

On the 11th August, when there remained not a shadow of reasonable doubt that horrible outrages, on a large scale, had been committed by the Turks in Bulgaria, the subject was brought before the House of Commons by Mr. Ashley, and there ensued an animated discussion, in which Mr. Gladstone took no part—an omission which, viewed in the light of his subsequent proceedings, appears to be inexcusable. Whatever he thought of the Prime Minister’s conduct, or of the complicity of the Ministry, or of the necessity before everything else of extinguishing Turkish rule in every spot on which Bulgarians had suffered, this was surely the time and place for making it known; yet he was silent—indeed, we believe, absent from the debate.

So matters stood, when, on the 6th September, Mr. Gladstone issued a pamphlet entitled, “Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East,” but really, an indictment of the Ministry,

* The Contemporary Magazine for September 1876.

and of Ministerial proceedings, couched in language of the most bitter invective, and containing statements of which some ought, we think, never to have been made; while the rest ought obviously to have been made in Parliament, where he could have obtained for his opinions, proposals, and accusations, any amount of discussion on which he chose to insist; and they would have been placed before the country at their proper value, and in an unobjectionable manner. That some such outbreak as the publication of this pamphlet was to be expected had, however, a fortnight earlier, been foreshadowed in the "Times."* It was then stated—

"Mr. Gladstone must feel towards the Eastern Question what Lord Stratford de Redcliffe is understood to feel—that what is happening now cannot be disconnected from what was done twenty years since; and that as each of them is in no small degree responsible for the past, neither can be indifferent to the present. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe has shown this in his letters in our columns. Mr. Gladstone has shown it in Parliament. But it is not in the nature of Mr. Gladstone at least to be satisfied with one delivery of his soul, and it may well be that, laying aside the disputes of ecclesiasticism, and neglecting the charms of literature, the ex-Prime Minister may be drawn to pour forth before a Greenwich audience his views on the policy and duty of England at the present crisis."

We believe these remarks to be unjust to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, for though he and Mr. Gladstone are doubtless responsible for much of the policy of the Crimean war, the partnership ends there, inasmuch as after the war Lord Stratford de Redcliffe energetically performed his duty towards Turkey, while Mr. Gladstone has not done so. The former has even now placed before his countrymen his views of present requirements, calmly and practically stated, while the latter has put forth hasty, and in some respects impracticable, proposals, in a manner condemned from one end of Europe to the other—Russia always excepted.

Mr. Gladstone maintains that his knowledge of the outrages committed in Bulgaria was insufficient, to enable him, while Parliament was sitting, to speak strongly on the subject. We do not think that this can be admitted. Long before Parliament broke up matters stood materially just as they now stand, excepting that the extent of the outrages is now, on Lady Strangford's authority, known to have been greatly over-estimated, even by Mr. Baring. But admitting Mr. Gladstone's plea; with what semblance of justice could he denounce the

* 23d August 1876.

Government for not taking definite action on evidence which he considered insufficient to warrant his even speaking strongly? And, again, admitting the responsibility of silence "for one who was among the authors of the Crimean war" to have been supportable while Parliament remained sitting, and to have become intolerable only a little later, the necessity of at last breaking silence cannot justify the manner in which it was broken.

The Prime Minister's early treatment in Parliament of the question of these outrages may have been—we think that it was—injudicious and unfortunate. Mr. Gladstone would probably apply a stronger term. But the stronger the term justly applicable, the more inexcusable becomes Mr. Gladstone's silence when he was face to face with his political adversary, and when the subject was specially discussed. If the Prime Minister's language was to be described as that "of ignorance or of brutal calumny;" if his reference to the Turkish excesses, as scenes from which civilisation naturally recoils, was to elicit the remark, "What fine feelings we have!"—surely such charges ought to have been made when and where they must have been promptly met, and ought not to have been reserved for the use to which they have been turned.

And so, in respect to the charge against the Ministry of "moral complicity in the blackest and basest outrages on record." Whatever excuse might have been found for such an expression used in the heat of debate, there seems none for its deliberate application to the purpose of inflaming the minds of the people. In the first place, Mr. Gladstone must have known that Turkey has been, and can be, maintained by England, not for its own sake, but simply and solely for the protection of British interests, which would be seriously compromised by its acquisition by Russia. It is not credible that Mr. Gladstone can have supposed any Minister of the British Crown to be desirous of perpetuating, or even supporting, notoriously bad and oppressive government; yet without desire or intention where is culpable complicity of any sort to be found? Even substituting the term "responsibility," it ought to have been explained that whatever responsibility may exist lies, not with Ministers suddenly required to deal with Turkey in her extreme agony, when such government as she has ever had was paralysed; but with those who during long years allowed Turkish misgovernment to progress to its inevitable and cruel issue—neglect very insufficiently acknowledged by the brief allusion which is all that Mr. Gladstone has vouchsafed to it—"It is time, then, to close an account which we have long, perhaps too long, left unsettled and almost unexamined." We ask attention to the

following description,* which we believe to be strictly correct, of the position which since the Crimean war England has occupied at Constantinople :—

“Has Turkey really been dealt with since the Crimean war on the footing of an independent Power? And, in particular, has this been the case as between Turkey and England? The contrary is notorious. It is well known in the East that the real centre of affairs at Constantinople is the British Embassy, or that we can make it so whenever we choose. Turkish Ministers, new to the game of playing at civilised government, go to the English Ambassador to be instructed in the duties of their department, and to him petitions for redress of grievances are sent by private persons from remote parts of the Ottoman Empire. If these things were better known in England, the public conscience would have been far sooner awakened to the extent of our power and responsibility.”

The use made in the pamphlet of Lord Derby's reply to a deputation, that the British fleet was sent to Besika Bay for the protection of the Christian populations, appears to be unfair. Mr. Gladstone refers to the fact that when serious disturbances in Constantinople were apprehended, the danger was held to be sufficiently met by the presence of a squadron of no great strength, and that it was when the danger had become less threatening that the Government “progressively increased the squadron to a fleet” of exceeding power. We presume that Mr. Gladstone when he wrote knew nothing of the circumstances, since publicly referred to,† which thoroughly account for this measure; but apart from such knowledge, he had before him quite enough, we think, to show that reasons other than those admitted by Lord Derby had existed. The very character of the demonstration, the reticence obviously imposed upon the Foreign Secretary, and the explanation already given (31st July) in Parliament by the Prime Minister, ought surely to have indicated the impropriety of endeavouring, on the strength of Lord Derby's reply, to persuade the people that the Government had been guilty of either almost incredible folly or most culpable recklessness.

Bearing in mind that Mr. Gladstone, when a Minister of the Crown, engaged the country in a difficult, bloody, and costly war, to resist Russian aggression, it seems almost inconceivable that he should now stigmatise as disgraceful “moral and material support” afforded for the same, and for no other, purpose. In 1853 Mr. Gladstone doubtless sought, not the preservation of the Turks, but the attainment of an object—

* Letter published in the Pall Mall Budget, 22d September 1876.

† The Edinburgh Review for October last, p. 563.

to shut out from the limits of the Turkish Empire another sovereignty—which involved such preservation. To that object he attaches now the importance which he attached to it then. Such being the case, in what does the position of the present Ministers differ from his own in 1853, except, perhaps, in the fact that they question both the correctness and the policy of his wholesale denunciation of the Turkish race?

The policy and proceedings of the Ministers, who have been, Mr. Gladstone alleges, "moved too little by an intelligent appreciation of prior obligations," must be in a great measure regulated by national engagements which he seems to have ignored, although this is a point on which he was surely required to be most explicit when insisting on action apparently impossible without disregarding the very treaties and international relations which he had helped to create. Mr. Gladstone, when he determined to bring popular passion to bear upon important and intricate questions of foreign policy, ought, we think, to have instructed the people as to the extent to which national action is imposed or prohibited by existing treaties; the meaning of the balance of power in Europe; and the extent to which its destruction or serious derangement must sooner or later injuriously affect all classes of the British community.

In denouncing the action of the British Government as the sole obstacle in the way of a satisfactory solution of existing difficulties, in describing the "happy approach to unanimity" prevailing among the Powers, and in declaring perfect unanimity to be not difficult of attainment, Mr. Gladstone appears to have ignored the evidence afforded by the published papers, to which we have already referred—evidence showing that the British Government have had to deal, not with unanimity, or with any reasonable prospect of it, but with differences of which the irreconcilable character became at each successive move more and more apparent—to deal, in fact, with Russian duplicity and Austrian weakness; with Russia professing one thing through her Government, and effecting another through her agents; with Austria opposing Russia as far as she dared, and at last according an unwilling acquiescence in unpalatable proposals when tolerably certain that England could not accept them.

Mr. Gladstone's description of the Turkish race appears to be very incorrect and unjust, inasmuch as he exaggerates everything that can be truly said against the Turks, and withholds all—and there is very much—that can be truly said in their favour. That their history contains much that is noble and praiseworthy, Mr. Butler Johnstone has fairly shown in a slight historical sketch contained in a published letter to Mr. Glad-

stone. General Wyndham, General Vaughan, and other distinguished British officers, have come forward to do justice to the many excellent qualities of Turkish soldiers. The "Times" lately gave publicity * to the experience of an English gentleman who, having passed through a Servian district visited by the Turks, "had many opportunities of talking with people whose homes had been altogether in the hands of the enemy. He met with not a single case of gross outrage." It has been shown that thousands of peaceable inhabitants driven out of the disturbed districts were prevented from returning to their homes, or were, on attempting to return, injured, not by Mahometans, not even by Turks, but by the insurgents—men of their own creed. "Mahometan, it must be remembered, does not mean the same as Turk." We believe that this statement of Mr. Gladstone is calculated to mislead. There are good and bad Mahometans, and there are good and bad Turks; and the difference between them is in either case very much the same. It is, we believe, contrary to experience and reason to allege that the Turks are unfit to rule solely on account of the religion they profess. That their religion is not inflexible in practice even Mr. Freeman admits; he has shown in his "History and Conquests of the Saracens" that the Great Akbar won "his title to be considered a great and beneficent ruler by renouncing his claim to be considered a loyal and consistent Moslem." That which long ago took place spontaneously may surely now take place under the extreme pressure of a stern and exacting necessity. It is certain that there have been, and are, Turkish statesmen quite alive to the necessity. They probably could, if properly supported, successfully introduce the reforms which alone can, as they well know, preserve the Empire. Such men as Rali Pasha, whose remarkable paper drawn up in 1867 was recently noticed in the "Times," † would, if given fair play, soon find followers and imitators. The Turks have many virtues and many vices; their religion inculcates, and many of them practise, much that is excellent and useful; its intolerance is effectively controlled in British India, under arrangements which can hardly be impossible in European Turkey. Fair security to life and property once effected there, the rest would gradually follow. If it is, and it seems to be, within the power of England to assist humanity and civilisation to this extent, it is surely both her duty and her interest to do so. The substitution of Russian semi-barbarous intolerance for Turkish misgovernment would be no gain to civilisation, while it would

* The Times Belgrade Correspondent, 11th September 1876.

† 20th September, 1876.

render Russian aggression a greater menace to Europe than at present. We contend that Mr. Gladstone, and English humanitarians of every type, ought, if they are true to their principles, to join the other sections of the English people in resisting the acquisition by Russia of any portion of Turkey, and in insisting that England's "rights and duties," which the Crimean war created, shall now be thoroughly recognised and performed, not merely in the interest of the Christian populations, but equally in those of the other inhabitants of European Turkey.

Appealing to the reason, and not to the passions, of the people, Mr. Gladstone would hardly have dwelt on horrible atrocities without at the same time explaining what could be fairly said in extenuation of the measures which mainly led to them. The fatal error of arming the whole Mahometan population produced consequences which were in a great measure to be expected; but it should be borne in mind that when this error was committed, there was much to lead the Turks to believe that the rising in Bulgaria threatened the very existence of the Empire, and that they must at once crush the attempt or perish themselves. They had at this time begun to feel, and not without good reason, that they were being bled to death. Sir H. Elliott then wrote * (7th May) to Lord Derby—"The effect of the long-continued insurrection is felt by every class of the community, whether Christian or Mussulman; but the latter regard themselves as sufferers from a Christian movement for supremacy, countenanced by the Christian Powers, which have allowed every kind of assistance to be given to the insurgents, while the Porte has been prevented from adopting the measures considered necessary to put it down by attacking it at its source."

The Turks committed brutal and barbarous crimes, under the influence of religious and race hatred stimulated by fear. There is hardly reason to believe, judging from the manner in which the rising was attempted, that had it succeeded they would have fared very much better. At the very commencement of the outbreak in Bulgaria, Sir H. Elliott wrote †—"The organisers of the movements pursue the same atrocious policy as was followed in the Herzegovina, by burning and ravaging all villages, whether Mussulman or Christian, if the inhabitants refuse to join them;" and he pointed out the extreme danger of these attacks on the peaceful Mahometan portion of the population leading to fearful retaliation. The treatment of Turks by victorious Bosnian insurgents was thus described by Consul Holmes ‡—"They were huddled together, and were absolutely butchered by the insur-

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 144.

† Ibid., p. 145.

‡ Ibid., p. 54.

gents. It is said that 800 noses were cut off." From Ragusa, Mr. Monson reported * "an undertaking by both parties to discontinue the mutilation of the killed and wounded." A consular agent at Constantinople, writing to Mr. Cave, described the return from the war of 500 disabled Turkish soldiers without their ears. It has been pointed out by German writers that only a few years ago Austrian officers and soldiers captured by Dalmatians, then in insurrection, had their eyes thrust out, their noses cut off, and other limbs atrociously mutilated; and that if such horrors could be perpetrated by Slavonians after sixty years of Austrian rule, the Turks are little likely to have fared better at the hands of more savage tribes of the same race. The following description was given by "an English officer" writing to the "*Allgemeine Zeitung*" †—

"It is a melancholy truth that the war is now carried on with pitiless cruelty, and that shameful horrors are committed; but it is equally true that the Servians act with just as much fanaticism and barbarity as the Turks. Whether a man is a Circassian or Bazi Bazook, or a Servian or a Montenegrin, he commits quite as atrocious deeds when his fanaticism is excited. I have seen with my own eyes at least forty or fifty Turkish dead bodies, whose heads were cut right off their shoulders; and once I found in Bulgaria a dozen Turkish soldiers whose eyes had been plucked out, whose noses and ears had been cut off, and who were hanging by their legs from the branches of trees. Only the other day Prince Nicholas' Montenegrins massacred upwards of 400 Turkish prisoners in cold blood, and some of the Montenegrin officers made bets as to the number of Turks they could dispatch with their handjars within a given space of time."

The exaggeration ‡ which pervades much of Mr. Gladstone's description is very apparent in his references to the outrages committed in Bulgaria. He describes them as utterly exceptional and unprecedented; whereas, there is no country in Europe that has been free from such horrors. Russia is cer-

* Blue Book, No. 3, p. 224.

† The *Pall Mall Budget*, 8th September 1876.

‡ The "*Revue des Deux Mondes*" thus criticises (October last) Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet—"The last pamphlet of the honourable gentleman resembles one of those melodramas in which we see angelic beings struggling with frightful vagabonds; the persons put on the stage are either perfections or devils; none of them half and half. . . . Is Mr. Gladstone sure that his manner of writing history is not romantic? Mr. Gladstone is persuaded that the Sublime Porte will never reform itself, and even if it felt disposed to do so, could not. We believe more in the power of bad habits than in the Koran. There is no religion that has not quarrelled with progress, and that has not in the end accommodated itself to the new style of things."

tainly no exception; her history, even up to a very recent date, little accords with Mr. Gladstone's description. Russia occupied "in resistance to tyranny, in befriending the oppressed," may be a thing of the future; it is certainly not of the past or present. Mr. Gladstone is a warm advocate of religious toleration; but how much of this is to be found in Russia, where outside the Orthodox Church there is nothing but bitter persecution. The Turkish excesses in Bulgaria are cast into the shade by those committed by Russian troops at Ismail. The frightful treatment of Poland not very long ago roused the indignation of Europe; and since then, the measures taken to efface the nationality of a high-spirited race have been cruel in the extreme. The Circassians tell a similar tale, and now Russia is said to desire to deprive them of the asylum which Turkey gave to those who escaped fire and sword at home. Very lately indeed the probable consequences of leaving Turkey to be dealt with by Russia, as recommended by Messrs. Lowe, Bright, and others, have been brought vividly to mind by Mr. Schuyler's description of the massacre of a tribe in Turkestan by Russian regular troops acting under the express orders of the military governor-general of the province—orders enthusiastically received by the officers, and literally carried out by the soldiery. In Bulgaria revolutionary agents commenced the horrid work, and their success meant the destruction of the Turks. In Turkestan the object of wholesale massacre is said to have been the obtainment of military decorations, and these are said to have been bestowed. Those who view with complacency the prospect of the occupation of European Turkey by a race very little, if at all, more civilised than the Turks themselves, may well bear in mind the fact, recently pointed out by Sir Lawrence Peel,* that "the Turk has never treated Christians worse than Christians have treated Jews, . . . than Christians have treated infidels, or than Christians have treated each other;" and the humane recommendation that, in invoking humanity, care should be taken not to "expel one devil, and leave the space void for seven worse to enter." Lord Palmerston had to deal with Turkish excesses at least as culpable as those committed in Bulgaria; and they were redressed without sacrificing British interests, or ignoring British engagements, or playing into the hands of Russia.

As we read Mr. Gladstone's arguments and proposals, the inconsistency of some of them is very great. The territorial integrity of Turkey is described as a thing well worth preserving, yet measures most likely to destroy it are advocated, Russian

* Letter to the Times, 16th October 1876.

aggression being virtually lauded and invited. While unanimity among the Great Powers is declared to be essential to any beneficial action, we find allegations and proposals calculated to increase the discord known already to prevail. The dispatch of huge ironclads to the Levant is ridiculed and blamed, on the ground that vessels of quite another description ought to have been sent; but the retention there of every one of those ironclads is insisted on. And though Mr. Gladstone declares that he will avoid even an "infinitesimal share of responsibility" for inviting a crisis of which the dimensions "may be almost illimitable," he, nevertheless, in the very next paragraph, disclaims all desire "to avert or to postpone" such a crisis "at the cost of leaving room for fresh outrages in Bulgaria." He here, apparently, refers only to outrages committed by Turks.

We might multiply instances; but our space warns us to forbear. "The overcharged emotion of a shuddering world"—Russia "labouring for the happiness of mankind"—the exhortation "to emulate Russia by sharing her good deeds"—the disavowal of any intention to impute to Conservative Ministers "a purposed complicity in crime,"—such passages abound in a pamphlet of which the publication must, we apprehend, have been viewed with regret by those who recognise and appreciate Mr. Gladstone's high character, great acquirements, and eminent services. At a time when European Turkey is, as has been well stated,* charged with combustible materials of which the general ignition would, in all probability, be so fearfully calamitous that "it is the duty of every English sound politician, and every rational man, not to seek to fan the flame, but, if possible, to extinguish it," it surely was not for Mr. Gladstone to cast into the midst of an excited people an incendiary production, replete with unjust accusation and exaggerated description, couched in powerful language, thoroughly adapted to the purpose, which has been effected, of inflaming to the utmost popular ignorance, prejudice, and passion. It is owing, mainly, to this vituperative appeal that Europe has been brought to witness, with surprise and scorn, the humiliating extent to which masses of Englishmen can be made to unite in action vaunted as superlatively humane; but, really, full of intolerable pretensions to a monopoly of virtuous feeling, and covering an amount of ignorant intolerance and injustice which true humanity abhors.

If it was reasonable to expect that any one Englishman would refrain from embarrassing Ministers suddenly required to deal with tremendous difficulties, that man was Mr. Gladstone, who, having been during nearly twenty years a member, and during

* The Edinburgh Review, October 1876, p. 537.

five of those years the head, of the Government of the country, was especially bound to apply the influence and knowledge thus acquired to the calm solution, and not to the perilous aggravation, of those difficulties. Having rejected the means within easy reach of submitting his opinions to the supreme and constitutional test of thorough Parliamentary discussion, he ought to have accepted the position which he had chosen, and ought not to have taken action politically dangerous, and withal very unjust—action ignoring his own large share of responsibility for the miserable condition of Turkey, threatening to open to Russian aggression the door which the Crimean war closed, and which would have remained closed had he, instead of remaining year after year a silent auditor of promises made, on his own showing,* only “to be shamelessly broken,” insisted, as his great influence and authority would have enabled him successfully to insist, on that proper exercise of “the rights and duties” created by the Crimean war which he now charges the present Government with having failed to understand; the truth being that such exercise was really neglected during the long period of tranquillity when he could have enforced it, but has not been within the reach of Ministers more than sufficiently occupied in dealing with the perilous state of affairs bequeathed to them—revolt, anarchy, and most menacing foreign aggression—a state of affairs requiring them to endeavour, in the first instance, to secure, not the execution of administrative reforms, but the existence of the Turkish Empire, and the enormous interests—those of humanity not being the least important—seriously endangered by its threatened destruction. Even at such a crisis, the absolute necessity of thorough administrative reform was not lost sight of; it was, on the contrary, very distinctly admitted, by both the Prime Minister and Lord Derby, long before the Turkish excesses in Bulgaria had been heard of.

And for what purpose did Mr. Gladstone think it necessary or justifiable to throw himself into the van of a movement which may yet be recorded as a national calamity? For no other, it must be presumed, than that of ensuring the punishment of several great Turkish criminals, and of insisting on the measures which he deemed necessary for the effectual future prevention of similar crime. Surely the attainment of these objects neither required, nor justified, the means used. Mr. Gladstone’s views might surely have been effectively and sufficiently made public in the manner adopted by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe—in the clear and prudent language of a statesman. Believing the action of the Administration insufficient and their policy wrong,

* The debate on the Address.

Mr. Gladstone was not only justified in assuming, but was, indeed, bound to assume, an attitude of criticism and opposition; but both right and duty forbid his remaining silent until Parliamentary discussion had ceased to be possible, and then bursting into unmeasured invective, haranguing excited multitudes, insisting on Governmental action deprecated by a majority of the educated portion of his countrymen, unfairly arraiging the Government, and urging unlimited popular agitation, certain, as he must have known, to let loose every element of political discord, and to rouse, in all its virulence, political animosity, at a time when everything pointed to the extreme danger of weakening and discrediting Ministers endeavouring, at a great European crisis, to preserve general peace without sacrificing the interests of the country—Ministers as anxious as himself to substitute good for bad government in Turkey, and prepared to press this object; though not as he has pressed it, regardless of all consequences, and of every one of the enormous risks to be considered; but with a clear and statesmanlike perception of both these perils.

The publication of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet was followed by his addressing (9th September) an open-air meeting at Blackheath, where he repeated much of the substance of his pamphlet, omitting, however, some—those which appear to us to be the most unjustifiable—of the accusations against the Ministry previously made.

The course taken by some of the London journals seems to us to have greatly aggravated the injurious effect of Mr. Gladstone's proceedings. The "Times," having just before proclaimed the conspicuous success of the Ministerial policy and proceedings, now encouraged, most unfortunately as we think, agitation against them. Some of the newspapers, however,—notably the "Pall Mall Gazette,"—well endeavoured to stem the tide of misdirected popular indignation, by exposing the folly, injustice, and danger, of crippling the Government of the country at such a time—efforts which deserved success; though whether it has been attained is, unhappily, extremely doubtful.

Of the English public men who have come forward to denounce the agitation, one of the first, if not the very first, was Mr. Roebuck, who pointed out * (7th September) that it was most likely to lead to general war little calculated to alleviate past, but certain to create enormous additional, misery; warned the people not to play into the hands of those who were "merely making a row for their own party purposes;" and denounced

* Speech at the Sheffield Cutlers' Feast.

as shameful statements accusing Ministers of "participating in any way with the atrocities of Turkey."

On the 9th September there appeared in the "Times" a letter from Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, suggesting the establishment of a chain of autonomous provinces from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, the Porte retaining the titular sovereignty, and receiving a tribute—the plan to be carried out by a mixed Commission (appointed for a term of years), in which each of the guaranteeing Powers should be represented.

A careful and explicit Ministerial explanation was, on the 11th September, given by Lord Derby to a deputation of working men. It was pointed out that the outrages in Bulgaria could have no connection with the dispatch of the British fleet to Turkey, as the dispatch was not known to be even contemplated when the outrages were committed; that the savage perpetrators of those outrages would, in the utterly improbable event of their having been at all influenced by any thought of the relations between the Porte and England, have been still more likely to run into excesses had they believed all Europe to be against them, and felt that they had nothing to lose, and that they could only look to the gratification of their revenge; that the outrages had greatly increased the difficulties of a situation fraught with danger to the peace of Europe; that no English Minister could be indifferent to such occurrences, which, however, had taken place when, with an insane ruler, war and revolution impending, and officials everywhere incessantly changed, Turkish administrative power and authority were in abeyance; that it was as necessary as ever to preserve the territorial integrity of Turkey—a thing, however, quite different from the relations of the various races with the Turkish Government; thus these relations repeatedly have been, and could again be modified, the British Government not being opposed to any further modification found practicable; that no worse service could be done to the Christians in Turkey than to insist on extreme measures, certain, by exciting race animosity, fanaticism, and despair, to lead to massacres infinitely worse than any yet heard of; and that those regarding the Turkish question from a purely philanthropical point of view should bear in mind that foreign Powers and statesmen did not thus exclusively regard it.

Lord Derby's explanation was very favourably received in France and Germany, where his treatment of "the demands of public opinion excited to an imprudent pitch" was approved. The Russian press well responded to Mr. Gladstone. The "Golos" wrote—

"The protest of the British nation against the Turcophil policy of Lord Derby and Lord Beaconsfield assumes the proportions of a great

political event. If the British Cabinet listens to the demands of English public opinion, Russia will be most happy to act in concert with England; when both will direct the course of European events as formerly, and, *restraining the aggressive propensities of other and more ambitious Powers,** establish an era of peace and progress."

Mr. Lowe, at Croydon, on the 13th September, made a remarkable speech, in which he pointed out that England, with a full knowledge of the character of the Turkish Government, and with full power to reform it, had during twenty years done nothing whatever, and had thereby incurred "the heaviest responsibility with regard to the Turks." Thus far his speech was a scathing, but just, condemnation of past neglect, which, however, Mr. Lowe proposed not to make even an endeavour now to remedy, but to obliterate by an act of which the gross injustice would, to our apprehension, be equalled only by its danger—"to throw Turkey overboard;" to "break off all connection with Pandemonium;" to leave, in short, Turkey to protect herself as best she may against Russia, who can, according to Mr. Lowe, claim to be "the refuge of the afflicted, the protector of the unprotected, and the father of the fatherless"!!! Later on, at Manchester, Mr. John Bright endorsed (2d October) Mr. Lowe's recommendation to let Turkey drift to her ruin. "It is no business of ours," said Mr. Bright, "to be sending ships and troops nearly 3000 miles to effect territorial changes in which we have no great, and no direct, interest. If we had left it to the course of nature—nature as explained to us by historic facts—the question would some way no doubt settle itself." Of the historic facts referred to no explanation or specification was given. The mode of self-settlement Mr. Bright apparently considers unimportant from any English point of view; though it seems to us not impossible, not even improbable, that it might be one followed by some such national humiliation as that inflicted by the settlement of the Alabama question, where a fault originally committed by England was long improperly disavowed, and at last atoned for in a manner which few Englishmen approve, and fewer still would care to see repeated.

Lord Derby's statement to the deputation of working men was criticised by Mr. Gladstone in a letter published in the "Times" of the 16th September, the main point dwelt upon being the necessity of abandoning "unlimited doses of protest and remonstrance"—doses which had so long been administered without protest from Mr. Gladstone—and of now *forcing* the Turkish Government to reform the administration; *how* this could be at once done being, however, left to conjecture. The

* The italics are our own.—ED. W. R.

vital necessity of obtaining European concert was again insisted on; but how it was to be obtained was not explained. If Mr. Gladstone, instead of throwing crude and undigested proposals to an excited populace, had clearly explained in Parliament how the system of protest and remonstrance could be advantageously changed for one of force, while the existence of Turkey hung in the balance, and how European concert could be ensured, it is not conceivable that he would have spoken in vain. But the Government could receive neither assistance nor instruction from mere allegations contradicted by facts before them. Lord Derby had already, on the 13th June, pressed as strongly as he could then press upon the Turkish Government the vital necessity of a total change of administration. But how was it possible at once to effect this? Can any rational person believe that the Turks could properly consider, much less carry out, sweeping reforms, or that Lord Derby had the means of effecting them, while a life-and-death struggle was going on, and when the one thing to be effected was to frustrate Russian plans intended and calculated to deprive the Turks of even breathing-time during which reforms might have been digested? Had even such breathing-time been gained, Lord Derby might have acted in the direction indicated by Mr. Gladstone; but, otherwise, any attempt to do so could only contribute to the Governmental chaos of which the creation had been, just as it was before the Crimean war, Russia's special object.

At the Mansion House, on the 18th September, a stormy meeting was held, and it was determined again to interrogate Lord Derby. A letter, from which the following extract is taken, from Lord Salisbury was read at this meeting:—

“Every one must concur in reprobating the abominable crimes which have been committed in Bulgaria; and a desire to relieve the Christian populations of those regions from a renewal of the atrocious oppression under which they have suffered is felt as strongly by members of the Government as by any other Englishman. Though the difficulties are very great, I do not doubt that a result on which England is so earnestly bent will be attained.”

On the same evening there was a meeting of working men in Exeter Hall, where Mr. Fawcett made a violent speech, little in accord, we think, with the reputation which he has earned, and with his just claim to be considered one of the very few able and independent members of the House of Commons.

At Glasgow, on the 19th September, Lord Shaftesbury again spoke; this time in company with the Duke of Argyll, who, appealing to the published papers, described them as substantiating against Lord Derby charges which these very

papers clearly, we think, disprove. Here again were preferred grave accusations which clearly ought, if made at all, to have been brought forward in Parliament, and not before a Glasgow audience, at a time of unwholesome popular excitement. Everything relied on by the Duke to support his allegations had been in his hands while Parliament was sitting, and when calm and thorough discussion was possible. Lord Shaftesbury, after assuring the meeting that all fears of Russian aggression were groundless and idle, made the astonishing statement—"Half the world is crying out for her (Russia's) intervention."

Mr. Baring's report on the outrages committed in Bulgaria was published on the 19th September. It was naturally a confirmation of the terrible story already well known. It concluded as follows:—

"The deeds of blood I have spoken of, and the misery I have witnessed, must rouse just indignation in every mind; but the infamous conduct of those agitators who, to serve the selfish ends of States whose only object is territorial aggrandisement, have not shrunk from exciting poor ignorant peasants to revolt, thus desolating thousands of homes, and leaving to a fine rich province a legacy of tears, should not be allowed to escape without their share of public execration."

How the Turkish question was at this time treated by too large a portion of Christian England is fairly deducible from the manner in which Mr. Baring's report was in some quarters noticed. One weekly paper wrote—"It is desirable that the unconscious bias should be recognised, in order to assure ourselves that Mr. Baring, however little he may know it himself, was very well disposed to throw as much guilt on the insurrection, and as little on the ruffians who suppressed it, as a man of rectitude and honour could." Further on it was said of the Prime Minister—"He loves the Turk, and hates the Christian States because they have persecuted the Jews;" consequently, "difficulties of the heart" stand in the way of his adopting a humane policy.

The Prime Minister now * (19th September) gave an explanation of the policy and proceedings of the Government; but he marred a statement otherwise well calculated to satisfy rational men by describing Mr. Gladstone's connection with the existing agitation in language quite unjustifiable; and he thus furnished a weapon to those ready to make not too scrupulous use of any coming to hand. He explained that it might possibly be necessary, in order to avoid a general war, to tolerate the continued existence of Turkish rule in certain localities; but

* At Aylesbury.

only with the safeguard of efficient securities, far more effectual than heretofore, for its control and proper exercise; and he dwelt on the fact, utterly ignored by the majority of the agitators, that in public affairs it is frequently impossible to do that which is best or most just, and necessary, therefore, to accept as much good, and as much justice, as may be found practicable.

The following interesting extracts * explain the view of the situation taken at this time in Germany. There—in a country England's equal in religious feeling, intellect, culture, courage, and detestation of cruelty—neither the people nor the press allowed Turkish atrocities to blind them to the enormous difficulties of the situation, and to the fact that a false step hastily taken might cause throughout Europe infinitely greater bloodshed and suffering:—

“People are horrified, but not surprised. . . . The Germans recall the horrors of Turkish inroads in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as vividly as they remember the sack of Magdeburg by Tilly, or the French dragonades. . . . What people in Germany who take an interest in politics talk about most frequently at present is, not Turkey, but England. . . . The friends of England—and England has still many friends and admirers in Germany—who had long regretted her silence in the councils of Europe, rejoiced at the appearance of a powerful English fleet in Besika Bay. . . . The tone of the German newspapers, particularly those who are supposed to be connected by subterraneous wires with St. Petersburg, became suddenly changed. It was the real turning-point in the Eastern Question; for Russia quickly perceived that the question which could not be solved without England, might possibly be solved with England. . . . Then came the extraordinary outburst of national indignation in England, roused by graphic letters, and fanned by eloquent speeches; and those who had accused the English people of secret sympathies for the Turks were at their wits' end how to explain the new phase. What does it all mean? they said. Is England to go to war, or is her former Prime Minister, like a new Bernard of Clairvaux, to lead an army of boys and children to Constantinople? . . . Complications may doubtless arise in the East which would make it necessary for Germany to protect her interests; but all that German statesmen think of at present is how to prevent such complications, instead of bringing them about, by exciting the passions of a whole nation. People ask what would happen if Lord Derby were to resign, and Mr. Gladstone were borne to power by the wave of popular excitement in England, either pledged to war, or doomed to a helpless inactivity against whatever Russia might do at Constantinople. . . . No one in Germany seemed to doubt as to

* Letter to the “Times,” from a German correspondent, 19th September 1876.

what Lord Derby meant, though he said little ; but no one can understand what Mr. Gladstone's policy would be if he had suddenly to undertake the responsibilities of Prime Minister of England, and to sit at the same table with Gortchakow, Bismark, and Andrassy."

That the popular excitement would not be turned to party purposes few rational men probably ever expected ; though for a time the promoters and leaders of the agitation, in the press and elsewhere, generally commenced their harangues by a strong disavowal of any party motives whatever, often followed by an exhibition of the most bitter partisanship. This affectation, however, did not last long, for on the 23d. September Mr. Gladstone publicly expressed * his approval of the endeavours made "to obtain an advantage from the discussion of this sad and painful question," and declared such a course to be perfectly justifiable and proper.

It has been well said that deputations often place a Foreign Minister in the dilemma of either stating that which may prejudicially affect negotiations with other Powers, or injure the popularity of his party ; and that such deputations are too frequently blind to, or heedless of, the extent to which pressure exercised by them may prejudice their Government in dealing with others not subjected to such pressure—truths very forcibly illustrated by the conduct of the Mansion-House deputation received by Lord Derby on the 27th September. These gentlemen, in whatever else they may have failed, certainly succeeded in well testing the calmness, courtesy, and patience of the Foreign Minister, who in vain explained to them the real difficulties with which the Government had to deal. They went away dissatisfied, although they were told that a Foreign Minister can often be fairly judged only by what he effects, and not by what he is at liberty to say ; that to drive the Turks out of Europe would, apart from the enormous injustice and difficulty of the operation, deluge Europe in blood, and be attended by frightful cruelty, as would also be the case were Turkey allowed to drift ; that the difficulties of dealing with the Turkish provinces were very great, but that some effort must be made, and that local self-government might be found feasible ; and that there at last appeared to be a strong probability of immediate peace, which would render possible the consideration of these questions. Lord Derby concluded by begging his hearers to bear in mind that the real question was, not what they, or he, thought most desirable, but what was practicable.

Towards the end of September there seemed to be every prospect of peace. The Servians, from the first overmatched,

* Speech delivered in South Durham.

had been very soon driven back upon their own territory, and at length sustained a crushing defeat, which led them on the 24th August to solicit the intercession of the Powers. This was accorded, and the consent of the Porte was with some difficulty obtained to a suspension of hostilities from the 17th to the 25th September. The terms of peace were then actively discussed; but for their settlement further time was found necessary, and the Porte, again pressed, consented to a prolongation of the truce until the 2d October. When, however, this was communicated to Servia, it was rejected, and hostilities were resumed just when Lord Derby was expressing his conviction of the strong probability of immediate peace.

The action taken by Servia has now to be explained. It was clearly the result of the agitation in England which had encouraged the Servians, and still more the promoters of the war, to prolonged resistance. The "Daily News" correspondent had some time previously published in the Servian official journal (the "Istok") an appeal* to the Servian people, deprecating the very idea of immediate peace, declaring the political prospects to be "more prosperous even than the military," and concluding thus:—

"Probably Russia would have interfered before now but for the attitude of the English Government. The 'Daily News' exposure of the Bulgarian atrocities has tied the hands of the English Government. With one unanimous voice England would rebel against an effort on the part of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Derby to support Turkey against such intervention, either actively or morally. Rather with one unanimous voice would England hail the interposition of Russia. Servian fortunes, then, have the chance of the double event—either success single-handed, or success with the aid of Russia."

This was the sort of agency at work in Servia, while most of the Powers were anxiously endeavouring to effect the cessation of hostilities, without which no settlement could be attempted. Besides this, the furious impulse given to the agitation in England by Mr. Gladstone's manifesto and proceedings, and by the tone of an influential portion of the English press, had engendered so strong a belief in the paralysis of the British Government, that Russian officers and soldiers began to pour into Servia in numbers previously considered neither safe nor advisable, and the control of matters gradually passed into Russian

* This was published in the "Times" of the 2d October 1876, together with a letter (enclosing it) from the "Daily News" correspondent, questioning the correctness of a statement previously made by one of the "Times" correspondents.

hands. The war was to be carried on with the aid of the enormously increased, and daily increasing, Russian force, which had become the virtual ruler of Servia; and thus it came to pass that General Tchernaiëff, and those about him, were able to effect their object, and to frustrate the endeavours elsewhere being made to put an end to the war. Little secrecy was attempted, for on the 25th September General Tchernaiëff's Chief of the staff wrote to the "Times," stating that recent occurrences in England had revived Servian aspirations; that the conditions of peace contemplated by the Powers—the *status quo* in Servia and Montenegro, and local administrative autonomy for Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria—would be a mortal blow to Servia; and that the Servian people were in despair at seeing Russian, and especially English, public opinion disregarded by diplomacy. Meanwhile, Mr. Gladstone's charges of "moral complicity" had not been lost sight of in Russia, where there had appeared a composition—a passionate imprecation against England—which at once became the war-song of the Russian soldiers proceeding to Servia.* This production represents the Queen of England and her maids of honour playing croquet with the heads of the Bulgarian victims, and then goes on:—

"See, the youngest of the Queen's daughters, a charming child, sends one of these heads further away from the others, and makes it reach her mother's feet—a child's head, with curly locks; its livid little mouth murmurs reproaches. The Queen utters a cry of horror; an indescribable terror veils her eyes. The Queen enters her palace; she is alone, and begins to dream; her eyes close. Horror! the whole skirt of her dress is soiled with a bloody stain. Let it be taken away immediately. Wash it out for me, rivers of England. Never will the Royal House of England be cleansed of the stain of innocent blood."

Sir H. Elliott had, as a matter of course, come in for a share of the "righteous indignation"—a term terribly misapplied during these proceedings. He was denounced in England in language injurious only to those making use of it without any justification. Letters were sent to him from England containing virulent newspaper articles,† and speeches at public meetings, crossed in red ink with, "Tremble, wretch!" or, "See, assassin! what England thinks of your bloody work."

The history of the two months ending with the resumption of hostilities by the Servians is instructive when contrasted

* Noticed in French and German newspapers, and in the "Times" of the 21st September 1876.

† The Standard, 19th September 1876.

with the Russian engagements to adhere to a policy of absolute non-intervention between Turkey and Servia. At the end of July the Turks had attained a position opening an easy road to Belgrade; but this advantage was not followed up owing to the threatening attitude immediately assumed by Russia. A few weeks later the Turks again moved, and Alexinatz was all but captured; when Russia's attitude induced the Turks to accord a suspension of hostilities. Servia then requested the intercession of the Powers; and during some weeks the Turks, though no truce or armistice existed, remained quiescent. At the close of this period a short truce (14th to 25th September) was announced. During the whole of this interval (24th August to the 25th September) the Powers were negotiating the conditions of peace; but the Servians were bringing up troops to the front, and Russian soldiers were arriving, at last in large compact bodies, several hundreds reaching Belgrade daily; while the Turks, awaiting the result of the negotiations, expected to result in peace, faithfully refrained from aggressive movements. The transit of Russian soldiers through Austria and Roumania, more than once objected to by the local authorities, had been allowed on the representations of the Russian Consuls. Even iron churches and consecrated banners arrived from Russia, the latter being received by the Belgrade authorities with much pomp and ceremony. Well, under such circumstances, did the "Times" correspondent ask—

"What would Russia say to England or to Austria if hundreds of volunteers in English or in Austrian uniform were daily arriving at Constantinople, and were there being duly told off by an English or Austrian official, and forwarded, fully equipped from the Turkish military stores, to the headquarters of the Turkish army? Would she not be rather sceptical if asked to believe that all this meant strict neutrality?"

In Germany the press drew attention to both the indefensible character of the Russian proceedings, and the grounds on which every nation was bound to protest against them. The "Cologne Gazette" wrote—

"We have complained since the beginning of the troubles of the duplicity of Russia. In all official documents Russia declared that she cared for nothing but the preservation of tranquillity and order in Turkey. Now it is proved by numberless facts that Russia, as on many former occasions, has this time also secretly aided the insurrection in Turkey; and even that the action of the Russian agents was, if not the sole, yet a principal, cause of the disturbances in Turkey. The Emperor Alexander has till now honestly resisted the popular feeling, and we only support him by stating decidedly that

the shortsighted hatred of the Turks, on which the Panslavonian party in Russia reckon, is in no wise general among us in Germany, and certainly does not go so far as not to condemn a Russian declaration of war against Turkey as a grievous wrong. . . . Is such an excitement of a population, still but little matured for political judgment, to be decisive for the whole of Europe? Are the law of nations, and the customs of civilised nations, to have no value for Russia alone? Is she to be allowed to declare war, to-day on Turkey, to-morrow on Germany, simply because the excited population demands it?"

In France, while very similar sentiments were expressed, the terrible mistake committed in England was severely condemned. The "*Journal des Débats*" said—

"Verily, we were not wrong to blame severely the conduct of the English Liberals. The false national excitement got up by Mr. Gladstone and his friends is beginning to bear its inevitable fruits. The meetings in London and elsewhere have made the Servians resist the will and wishes of Europe. If, in spite of the accord of the Powers, peace is still in danger, the responsibility must fall on the shoulders of the imprudent philanthropists who have compromised with unpardonable levity the policy of their country, and who have not perceived that, in deploring too noisily excesses already committed, they have perhaps prepared the way for others far more horrible and extensive."

From Austria came sounds of disapproval quite as strong. The following extracts are from a letter* from the well-known traveller, Dr. Arminius Vambéry, who, in deprecating our inexcusable want of information regarding the condition of Eastern Europe, almost repeats a strong remonstrance long ago publicly made by Mr. Grant Duff on the same subject:—

"The old Oriental proverb—'When passion comes, good sense must retire'—has but rarely found such a proper illustration as during the present agitations which excite public opinion in England. History has not yet furnished us an example to show that a nation has turned her arms against herself, out of the mere impulse of humanitarian benevolence. . . . It is a great pity that the geographical science of Great Britain, to which we owe most of the discoveries in Africa, America, and Australia, has so utterly neglected the south-eastern corner of Europe; and that, while lots and lots of books are written on the outlet, extension, and site of some Central African lake, the accurate description of the motley population which inhabits Roumelia, and the fate of which is now discussed in every corner of the United Kingdom, is still sadly missing in English literature. Were it otherwise, and were the ethnical and social

* The Daily Telegraph, 2d October 1876.

conditions of Bulgarians, Bosnians, and Herzegovinians as much known as those of our fellow-creatures in the remotest parts of the world, I am almost sure that many of your politicians and statesmen would not have fallen into the gross mistakes which form the basis of their political schemes on the future of European Turkey. . . . I beg to urge that Russia is not at all the Power to whom the Latin saying '*Sic vos non vobis*' may be quietly applied. . . . Russia is on the eve of earning the fruits of her wearisome, costly, and assiduous labours; she is almost sure of the prey; when we see suddenly emerge an English statesman in the north-western corner of Europe saying—'Would you not like to accept me as a partner; and why should we not go together on the same path?'

Almost simultaneously with the Servian renewal of hostilities, Russia proposed the occupation of Bulgaria by Russian, and of Bosnia by Austrian troops; and the entry into the Bosphorus of the united fleets of the Powers—a proposal pressed upon Austria in an autograph letter from the Czar, sent by General Sumarakoff. Here, at last, as in 1853, was distinctly visible "the cloven foot." Neither Austria nor England were blind, and they declined an offer very clearly showing, as the "Times" remarked, the pass to which Europe had been "brought by the fruits of Turkish misrule, by the headlong rashness of Servia, and by the underhand war of the Russian people against the Ottoman Empire;" and, there ought to have been added, by English neglect of the first, and encouragement of the second and third of these things. The military occupation of Bulgaria simply meant, and means, possession of European Turkey.

Mr. Gladstone's Russian "hobgoblin" had now become a very fair reality; but the darkened political horizon checked neither the agitation nor his fomentation of it. On the 30th September he wrote to a public meeting,* "I cannot say that I think that the necessity for pressure on the Government has yet passed by." Russia avowedly ready to seize Bulgaria; yet more pressure considered necessary by an advocate of the territorial integrity of Turkey!! The Duke of Argyll, following again Mr. Gladstone's example, now published his Glasgow speech, with the addition of a preface, in which he attempted to justify the agitation by alleging the Government of England to have persistently deprecated and thwarted the united action of the Great Powers, and to have thus rendered prompt and determined opposition to so dangerous a policy a paramount duty. Even had such been the case, the means used to avert the danger were calculated only to aggravate it. But that such was not the case appears to be conclusively shown by the pub-

* At Blaydon-on-Tyne.

lished papers, and by everything bearing upon the same subject that has transpired since their publication. It is abundantly clear, we think, that the fault of the Government, if fault there be, lies not in having thwarted the united action of the rest of Europe, but in having too long indulged the hope of eventually obtaining such action—in other words, in having too long refrained from denouncing the glaring insincerity of Russian professions, belied by proceedings utterly incompatible with them; and in having too long tolerated those proceedings, instead of obliging Russia either to abandon or to defend them.

Russia was now, in the beginning of October, said to be arming—preparing, slowly and deliberately, for a further development of her plans. The Berlin Memorandum had really meant just that which it was the object of the Sumarakoff mission to effect—the unopposed location of a Russian army in the heart of Turkey. Both memorandum and mission having failed, other means had become necessary. At this time the whole of the valuable furniture and fittings of the Russian Church at Constantinople were removed to Odessa; * and it was stated in the Slavonic papers † that in a letter to his son, the Grand Duke Alexis, then at Smyrna, the Czar had stated—“Do not be alarmed about our Servian brethren; Russia is prepared, and will act at the proper moment.”

At this crisis several eminent Liberal statesmen, who had hitherto viewed with silent disapproval the mischievous agitation in progress, came forward publicly to condemn it. The Duke of Somerset, speaking at Warminster on the 6th October, reminded his hearers that the Crimean war had been waged, not to protect any purely English interest, but to enforce the opinion of united Europe; that the blustering of the so-called Peace party had greatly contributed to bring about that war; that Mr. Gladstone's Russian hobgoblin was, unfortunately, a stern and dangerous reality; and that the danger now to be faced was greater than that existing in January 1854, when the late Lord Derby, then in Opposition, and not in favour of the war, had said that Russia “proceeded, not by open conquest, but by sap and by mine; she fomented disturbances in neighbouring provinces; she then offered to mediate, and sent a little assistance, merely to keep the peace; then she proposed a little military occupation; having obtained that, she required a material guarantee; and the next step was incorporation with the Empire of Russia.” The Duke described the cry of turning the Turks out of Europe as the cry of those who really wanted to

* The Times Berlin Correspondent, 4th October 1876.

† Ibid., 9th October 1876.

turn out the Ministry; deprecated as worse than useless an autumnal session; and expressed great faith in the judgment and prudence of Lord Derby, who "certainly has," said the Duke, "all the spirit of an English gentleman, and the wisdom becoming an English Minister."

The Duke of Somerset was followed by other leading Liberals. To an excellent speech delivered by Lord Hartington, who from the first wisely abstained from inflaming the minds of the people, we shall again refer. Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Brassey, Lord Monson, and others now came forward, and in language more or less forcible pointed out the unpatriotic and dangerous nature of the proceedings into which a large section of the people had been led. Earl Fitzwilliam thus wrote:—"I have spoken to many of the leading members of the Liberal party, and I have found no one approving of the language used by Mr. Gladstone—language calculated to inflame the minds of the ill-informed in this country, and to mislead the Governments of other nations, at a moment when the true interests of humanity most needed calmness and judgment."

It appears probable that Mr. Gladstone's proceedings have not merely ill served the true interests of the Liberal party, but have powerfully contributed to its further disintegration—a result most unwelcome to rational reformers, and to those who, like ourselves, view with regret the increasing indisposition of several sections of the party loyally to support any programme in which a prominent place is not given to their own extreme proposals. It is, we believe, this intolerant disregard of the elementary principles of successful and useful political combination which has, more than anything else, wrecked the Liberal party; and which must be corrected to render its return to power probable, or, in the interests of the country, desirable. One of the latest Parliamentary utterances of the late Mr. Mill, whose thorough independence was beyond suspicion, was a strong protest against the suicidal disregard of party discipline in the Liberal ranks. The Marquis of Hartington lately dwelt on the same subject in moderate but impressive language, which Liberals will do well to heed, remembering above all things that which Lord Hartington pointed out, though not exactly in the form in which we are stating it—that a political party should, paradoxical as it may at first sight appear, at the same time represent and form the opinions of the nation; and that when this is forgotten or neglected, in the pursuit of individual or sectional objects or crotchets, the nation ought to, and generally will, resent it. The consequences of such forgetfulness or neglect

* To the "Sheffield Observer," 21st October 1876.

have been very apparent during the last few months. Mr. Gladstone, who recognises the great importance of preserving the territorial integrity of Turkey, and Messrs. Lowe and Bright, who insist that Turkey should be altogether abandoned, have been able to unite in action which, by thwarting and weakening ministers charged with negotiations of rare difficulty, has perhaps compromised not only national interests, but also the peace of Europe; but how would they, as members of the same Cabinet, treat the important questions with which the present Ministers have had, and still have, to deal?

While the Russian "Golos" was emphasising Mr. Gladstone's assertion that the British Government had paralysed the beneficial action of the other Powers, Mr. Gladstone was launching against the Ministry fresh accusations, contained in a letter sent to be read at a London meeting* held by working men, for the purpose of denouncing "Ministerial complicity with the Turkish atrocities." We have not space to go through the objections to this letter. One instance must suffice. The Ministers were charged with "favouring the Turkish Government against its Christian subjects" as long as they could, and then, when forced by "the strong resentment of the country" to follow another course, directing their endeavours "to securing that the amount of good done to the oppressed shall be as small as possible." The natural supposition would be that such a charge could only be preferred on evidence of the strongest nature. Not so, however, in this case, for the accusation was followed by the avowal—"I expect that our information as to the acts of the Government is imperfect."

Much stress has been laid on the difficulty (alleged to have existed) experienced by the Government of Russia in restraining popular excitement in that country. However this may really have been, there can be no reasonable doubt that such excitement, if it did not already exist, was most likely to be created, or if it did exist, was certain to be intensified, by the dissemination throughout the country of a translation of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet—a measure which was effected by English hands.†

It has been contended that failure on the part of Turkey to carry out promised reforms has released England from her treaty engagements with, and from all other obligations in respect to, Turkey. But for this undoubted failure is not England herself very largely responsible? Turkey was in 1856 notoriously incapable of reforming herself. She was virtually in a state of tutelage. How has that tutelage been exercised? So long as Lord

* On the 9th October 1876, in St. James's Hall.

† Mr. Alexander.

Stratford de Redcliffe remained progress was made. To what followed his departure we have elsewhere alluded. England's neglect or inaction became Russia's opportunity. Turkey was thenceforward simply lured—on the part of England doubtless unintentionally, but not the less irresistibly—to her destruction, which appears to have been imminent when the Turks themselves made one bold step towards emancipation from the cunningly forged fetters which held them down. It is difficult to understand how England allowed things to come to such a pass; but it is much more so to admit either the justice or the expediency of a policy which would add to mistakes already committed the infinitely greater one of abandoning Turkey to Russia. Do those who advocate this bear in mind that it means either a fearful struggle in which the Christian populations would probably suffer at least as much as the Turks; or an arrangement, more or less peaceable, between Russia and Turkey—with the strongest probability in either case of the acquisition by Russia of important British and European interests? It seems probable that, with moderate aid from England, Turkey could offer to invasion a resistance which Russia, certain that such aid would be, in case of necessity, forthcoming, and that other serious contingencies might have to be faced, would not care to invite.

Those who have accepted Mr. Gladstone's assertion that "the honour of the British name" has been "gravely compromised" by the action of the present Government of Great Britain, may learn from the whole Continental press, that of Russia being excepted, that the general feeling has been one of extreme surprise that any considerable body of Englishmen should have deluded themselves, or allowed themselves to be deluded, into such a belief, and should on no better grounds have proposed to leave Russia to deal as she may please with the Turks, with the Turkish populations, with Turkey, and with interests heretofore deemed worth defending to the utmost. Other nations are well aware that a "reconstruction of Turkey means," as Lord Palmerston pointed out, "neither more nor less than its subjection to Russia, direct or indirect, immediate or for a time delayed." The moral drawn abroad from the agitation in England has been, not that the example should be followed, but that it should be carefully eschewed. Very recently, the well-known Liberal member of the German Parliament, Dr. Braun, represented the feeling prevailing throughout Germany, when during a debate on the Eastern Question he said, "We are asked to follow the example of England, where there have been numerous public meetings on the Eastern Question, the Bulgarian atrocities, and so on. . . . But what good have these English meetings done? They have

to a certain extent made the course of English policy insecure ; and I would most strongly dissuade you from imitating England in this matter."

Strong protest may be, we think, reasonably made against the part taken by a portion of the English clergy in the recent agitation. At a very early period two well-known Liberal Bishops did not hesitate to encourage it. Indeed, from one of them, the Bishop of Manchester, came almost the first notes sounded ; while the other, the Bishop of Exeter, objecting* to the explanation of the Government policy given by Lord Derby, on the ground of its not meeting public feeling, triumphantly inquired, "Are we to give up humanity in order to preserve the balance of power?"—apparently forgetting, certainly ignoring, the close connection between the two interests, and the fact of the Government policy necessarily comprising the protection of both of them. Just as fallacious were the arguments of several of the Church papers, which took up the cry, alleging that the Government had lost sight of Christianity, England, and Europe. Clerical fomentation of the popular excitement has been defended on the ground that its authors, while deprecating the necessity of maintaining the Turk in Europe, have not presumed to determine whether such a necessity exists. But to impress on congregations and audiences that to contribute in any way, or in any degree, to such maintenance is a national sin, is surely to endeavour to leave to statesmen no question to determine. There have existed, we fear, grounds undesirably strong for the published remonstrance † of a "Staffordshire Incumbent," who exhorted clergymen not "to shout on noisy platforms about subjects of secular policy"—not "to incite the ignorant populace with a dissatisfaction with the government of the country"—not to imagine those differing in religious opinions "necessarily capable of every sin and every wrong"—and not to forget that "perpetrators of atrocities are not always Turks;" but to attend to their "proper functions; avoid political partisanship; beware of fanatical and hasty judgments; study modern history; trust in the wisdom and patriotism of those in office; note the additions made to the Russian Empire during the last fifty years; study the peculiarities of the Turk and the Slav;" and then, in their own sphere of duty, "being indeed the leaders of the people, as in religion and morality it is fitting," make their judgments of value, and their opinions command respect. The introduction of politics into the pulpit was naturally followed by the imputation of

* Letter to the "Times," 16th September 1876.

† In the "Standard," 20th October 1876.

motives—a proceeding complained of, but with little apparent reason; for, as was justly observed *—"It is only by judging the motive that you can gauge the value, or the reality, of an agitation; and if the clergy use their pulpits for displaying party animosity, they must not feel aggrieved if laymen investigate their motives for doing so." The great body of the clergy, however, took no part in the agitation. That their silence was in thorough harmony with the real feeling of the country is, we think, sufficiently shown by the comparatively insignificant amount of money collected—evidence that however much "the great heart of Britain" may be moved by the knowledge of terrible crime and suffering, it did not beat in unison with an agitation of which the unwholesome character was even at first almost transparent. The Roman Catholics appear to have altogether abstained from joining the movement. Without attempting to discuss motives which may, or may not, have existed, we apprehend that Cardinal Manning stated nothing but a truth which ought to have been elsewhere obvious, when, explaining the passive attitude enjoined on, and taken by, Catholics, he said † that they "saw at this crisis perils to European civilisation, and considered that every loyal, wise, and patriotic Englishman should lend the whole of his support, in heart, and will, and speech, to the Government of his country, from whatever political party taken; and should forget himself at a time when the country might be compromised into one of the most terrible European conflicts ever known."

The bad example set in England appears to have been followed in India, where the Bishop of Bombay is reported ‡ to have denounced from the pulpit the Head of the Government of the Empire as a heartless "cynical buffoon;" and the Mahometan religion as one "whose very existence is incompatible with civilisation." India is surely not the place for a British clergyman who can be guilty of such imprudence and reckless intolerance. On the very day on which this outrage was committed in the Christian cathedral, a very large number of the forty millions of Mahometans inhabiting British India assembled in Bombay to express loyalty to the British Crown, and to pray for the prevention of the dismemberment of Turkey.

How Russian rule in Turkey is likely to affect British commercial interests was noticed at the meeting of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce on the 30th October last. It was shown that while British exports to Turkey amount to nearly thirteen

* Letter from Mr. Tucker to the "Standard," 26th October 1876.

† At Leeds, 26th September 1876.

‡ The Times of India, 2d October 1876.

millions sterling, Russia receives from us less than one-third of that amount. It was at the same meeting justly maintained that proper administration of the Turkish provinces is as much a commercial as a political necessity. England now appears to recognise this; but owing to her past neglect, and to the use to which Russia has astutely turned it, a very difficult and dangerous question has to be faced. The existence of Turkey is again threatened by Russia, and must be secured before the amelioration of the administration can be taken in hand.

In the "Contemporary Review" for November last Mr. Gladstone has endeavoured to show that the Russian proceedings in Turkestan, described by Mr. Schuyler, do not justly entail an amount of execration equal to that which the outrages in Bulgaria deserve. We differ entirely from Mr. Gladstone; but we can refer but very briefly to the subject. We believe that massacre such as that described by Mr. Schuyler, deliberately ordered, as it was ordered, by one of the highest Russian officials, and carried out by Russian regular troops, is morally worse than even the horrible outrages perpetrated by the Turks in Bulgaria, under circumstances known to have been those which always excite the worst passions of barbarous races. The horrors of Ismail, Poland, and the Caucasus, can scarcely be exceeded; and what Christianity has to expect the American missionaries have shown.* It must surely be as much the duty as the interest of England to prevent the exterminating struggle which must be waged before the Turks can be replaced by Russians.

We have already referred to Lord Hartington's speech in Parliament on the 31st July. At Keighley, on the 3d November, after having visited Constantinople, he again spoke on the Eastern Question; differing, as before, from the Government in respect to some of the measures taken; but approving, as before, the objects sought to be attained by those measures. At Keighley a declaration that the proceedings of Russia in respect to Servia and Montenegro had been, and that "intervention of the mildest kind by any single power is, fraught with the greatest possible danger to the peace of Europe," was followed by disapproval of the agitation in England, so far as it "may have done harm by the vehemence of its condemnation," and "may have led the Russian Government to think that so far as England was concerned the way was left clear for her to deal with the Eastern Question, and the future of the Christian races, by her single arm." In these opinions, and in the tone and language of his own speeches, is to be found, we think, a suffi-

* The Pall Mall Budget, 27th October 1876.

cient reply to the question implied in Lord Hartington's reference to "English statesmen who have committed no crime of which" he is "aware, except that of expressing their own warm and strong opinions, and representing the warm and strong opinions of a great portion of their fellow-countrymen." Lord Hartington will surely admit that "warm and strong" is, though correct as far as it goes, a *very imperfect description* of these opinions, and of the manner in which they were expressed. Lord Hartington's objections to action taken by Lord Derby at several stages of the negotiations, are very similar to others raised by Sir Henry James a few days previously.* The whole force of these objections depends upon whether by any course of action reasonably open to Lord Derby unanimity among the Powers could have been obtained. We have already placed before our readers the evidence, which to us is conclusive, that Lord Derby had no such choice. The avowed object of the Powers was to strengthen the Turkish administration by placing it on a sound and equitable footing. The real object of Russia was, as it remains, not to strengthen, but dangerously to weaken, and as far as possible to destroy, the Turkish Government. At each succeeding stage of the negotiations this became increasingly evident; and it was with this knowledge forced upon him that Lord Derby had to deal with Russian proceedings and Russian proposals. The assertion, repeatedly made, that the British Government prevented, or neutralised, action which could have benefited Turkey is, we think, disproved by the whole of the forthcoming evidence. The hollow speciousness of the assertion, as well as the position really taken up, and from first to last held, by the British Government, are well described in the following passage of a speech † made in the Hungarian Parliament after England had refused to entertain the proposals contained in the Berlin Memorandum:—

"For us this step of England can raise no anxiety; neither can it for those who do not cloak other secret plans under their pacification projects. If the union of the three Emperors remains true to the original idea, England will certainly never disturb their action. But if one or the other ally should be unfaithful to it, those who have acted straightforwardly will find a powerful ally in that insular kingdom, who will not allow Turkey to be worked out for objects inconsistent with the European balance of power, and the peace of the world."

We must now briefly describe occurrences in Servia and at Constantinople which followed the resumption of hostilities by

* At Taunton, on the 26th October 1876.

† Blue Book, No. 3, p. 237.

Servia. How the Turkish Government having declined to sign a Protocol with the Great Powers, guaranteeing the execution of reforms agreed on, Russia proposed the imposition of an armistice, or truce, of six weeks on both parties, to obtain time for considering the means of effecting a definitive arrangement—How this proposal was accepted by England, Sir H. Elliott being at once instructed (5th October) to press upon the Porte the grant of an armistice of not less than one month, and to state that a Conference would in all probability immediately follow—How, in the event of an armistice being refused, Sir H. Elliott was to leave Constantinople, “as it would then be evident that all further exertions on the part of Her Majesty’s Government to save the Porte from ruin would have become useless”—How the British representative at St. Petersburg was instructed (11th October) to press upon “the serious attention” of the Russian Government that “the presence of Russian officers and soldiers in the Servian army had assumed * proportions little short of national assistance” — How the Turkish Government (12th October) consented “to submit to the decision of the Powers on the conditions they had themselves proposed,” and to a regular armistice, not of six weeks, but of six months; the hope being at the same time expressed that the Powers would take measures to put a stop to the influx of Russian troops into Servia—How Lord Derby immediately pressed this proposal on Russia and Austria; and on Count Schouvaloff’s expressing doubts whether his Government would accept it, warned the Ambassador that “however strong might be the feeling of national indignation against Turkish cruelties, it would be superseded by a very different sentiment if it were once believed by the English nation that Constantinople was threatened;” and that, rightly or wrongly, the conclusion come to in England would be, “that the rejection by Russia of the Turkish proposal indicated a fixed purpose of going to war”—How Russia did, however, refuse the armistice (being supported in the refusal by the Italian Government), insisting on one for six weeks only †—And how the Porte consented even to that; only stipulating that should peace negotiations not be concluded within the six weeks, the armistice “should be renewed for a similar term, and again for two months if the second period passed without result,”—All these

* It was reported during October that a body of 4000 Cossacks with 800 horses had passed through Roumania; had crossed the Danube on rafts specially constructed for such purposes, and placed in charge of a Russian Colonel, Novischin; had landed at Kladwa; and had thence marched straight to the camp at Deligrad.

† The discussions in 1861 regarding the constitution of the Lebanon occupied nearly five months—from the 22d January to the 9th June.

things were described in Lord Derby's published dispatch of the 30th October last,* in which, after a recapitulation of the efforts made by the British Government for the preservation of peace, it was stated that they could not, as matters then stood (the six months' armistice having been refused by Russia), advance any fresh propositions; and that while anxious to co-operate in any measures of pacification concurred in by the other Powers, they must refrain from pledging themselves to anything impeding liberty of action at a later period, in the event of the rights and interests of England being affected.

Whatever may have been the object of Russia in refusing a six months' armistice, it is not surprising that the Turkish Government should have looked narrowly at the effect of the shorter one in the not improbable event of Russia taking the field at its close. They, however, did not refuse it; but while negotiations were going on, made a determined effort to crush the Servian forces, and succeeded in doing so. During the last days of October several desperate engagements placed the whole of the Servian positions, including Djunis, Alexinat, and Deligrad, in the hands of the Turkish army. The rout of the Servians was complete; the Russian troops were half destroyed, and further opposition was impossible; when General Ignatieff, who had returned to Constantinople a short time previously, received telegraphic orders from Livadia, where the Czar then was, to demand the conclusion within forty-eight hours of an unconditional armistice of six weeks; and, in the event of a refusal, to leave Constantinople, breaking off all diplomatic relations. It appears that when General Ignatieff received the order to present this *ultimatum*, a six weeks' armistice had been virtually concluded, if not actually signed. The unconditional armistice was, however, accepted by the Porte, and England immediately proposed a conference of the Powers to endeavour to effect a peaceful arrangement. The proposal was accepted, and it was arranged that each of the Powers should be represented by its Ambassador, and, if thought desirable, by an additional special delegate. For this duty Lord Salisbury has been chosen by the British Government, and it remains to be seen whether one of England's best statesmen will find the preservation of peace possible. Russia apparently desires to avoid war with England; but it does not seem at all certain that she will limit her demands to those which can be reasonably and honourably conceded. The mobilisation of a large portion of the Russian army, and the contraction of a large loan, are ominous facts which the Czar's conversation with Lord Loftus and Prince

* To Lord Loftus, for communication to the Russian Government.

Gortchakow's last despatch very insufficiently explain; while the anxiety of the Russian Government that the report of this conversation should be made public in England points, we think, to a probability that assistance is hoped for, or expected, from the promoters of the recent agitation. All this will probably have been placed beyond doubt when these sheets issue from the press. Should war happily be averted, we trust that the settlement made may be one enabling England to exercise to the full the influence which she has hitherto possessed in Turkey, and thus to contribute, as more powerfully probably than any other Power she can contribute, to the good government of some of the fairest portions of Europe.

We have endeavoured to place clearly before our readers, the grounds on which we believe, and the evidence which appears to us to prove, that it is neither England's duty nor England's interest to leave Turkey to her fate—least of all to the fate certain to overtake her if left to Russia's tender mercies; that the Government have fairly and strenuously laboured to carry out a just, humane, and prudent policy; and that the outcry raised against their proceedings has been unjust in its conception, and detrimental to the national interests in its effect. Mr. Gladstone, as we understand him, contends that Turkey has forfeited all claim to England's assistance; and that Russia has acquired, or at least has, a strong claim to England's confidence. We dispute both propositions. We believe that the whole history of Russia's aggrandisement shows that we cannot trust her; and we submit that to the sufficient evidence of this previously forthcoming, that afforded by the transactions of the last two years has now to be added. We believe that Turkey ought to receive England's aid, because England cannot reasonably rely upon Russia, and because England should, for her own sake, and for the sake of humanity and civilisation, strive to the utmost to bring about a settlement of European Turkey in the manner best calculated effectually to protect it from Russian aggression, and its populations from further misgovernment.

Since the foregoing pages were written, Mr. Gladstone's invitation to the Greeks to add another powerful element of disturbance to those which already constitute a serious menace to the peace of Europe, and the proceedings of the so-called National Conference, have doubtless been hailed with satisfaction by those able to turn to their own account everything calculated to weaken the influence of England at the present crisis; while the gentlemen to whom the Russian "Golos" appeals as "the sympathetic orators of the English Opposition," express a belief that they are serving the interests of their country and humanity, and assisting Lord Salisbury in his delicate and difficult task, by now

reiterating, in one shape or another, the utterly unfounded accusations against the Ministers of England which have already done such great, perhaps irremediable, mischief, and have so materially strengthened the hands of those who well know how to utilise them to their own aggressive purposes. The renewal of the war in Servia appears to have taught these orators nothing. They heed neither the useless additional slaughter already brought about by their proceedings, nor the encouragement which they have given to Russia to action not attempted, and probably not even contemplated, so long as England was believed to stand firmly in its way. Those who, with these facts staring them in the face, still see, as the Duke of Westminster sees, in the agitation to which the finger of Europe points with scornful derision, nothing but "splendid demonstrations," which do credit "not only to the heart, but also to the head" of Great Britain, are perhaps impervious to argument on the subject; but even to them we would recommend a careful consideration of the published and cognate facts on which the great majority of the English "educated classes," and of the corresponding classes abroad, have come to an opposite conclusion. That the foreign policy of Great Britain should at a momentous crisis be at all at the mercy of such a meeting as that which took place in St. James's Hall is indeed a revolutionary change, foreboding, we fear, little eventual benefit to England. Well has the Duke of Richmond* remarked that such proceedings must, whatever Party may be in power, be most dangerous to the country, and to the success of any difficult and important negotiations with foreign Governments. Such, indeed, would be the too probable result of any half or imperfectly informed discussion, even if fairly undertaken. But at this meeting there was no discussion. It was simply an exhibition of strong Party fanaticism. Lavish abuse of the Prime Minister; wholesale denunciations of the Turks; depreciation of the opinions of not merely the responsible Ministers of the Crown, but of the whole of the educated classes; and demands and assertions so wild as to carry with them their own condemnation—these were surely little calculated to assist Lord Salisbury. From first to last, the declamation proceeded on the false assumption that the present Ministers have been not merely indisposed to apply any effectual remedy to Turkish misrule, but desirous of preventing other Governments from doing so. The extraordinary and heterogeneous mixture found on the platform has been accounted for by the alleged existence of irresistible and all-pervading moral impulse. The proceedings do not in any degree bear out this

* At Chichester, 13th December 1876.

assertion, but they do show one common impulse to have been at work, inasmuch as the speakers, with scarcely an exception, united in holding up to popular condemnation, and in claiming high praise for exposing, Ministerial action or inaction existing only in their own imagination. For the rest all was confusion. The meeting has been described as "a Babel of utterances," and such it clearly was. Rational and sound Liberal opinion was not represented. It was simply a renewal of the old agitation under a different title. Religious passion was conspicuous, but of practical propositions, which any rational Ministry could adopt, we have been unable to discover a vestige. We regret that our notice of the unfounded or misleading statements which characterise most of the speeches must be of the briefest. We can endeavour to place before our readers only a few of the most remarkable specimens.

The Duke of Westminster, who presided at the morning meeting, disclaimed "with great emphasis" any intention of attacking the Government, but immediately went on to announce an attack on the Prime Minister subsequently vigorously carried out; alleged Turkish misgovernment to be "of course at the root of all the difficulty in this matter;" expressed astonishment that any Englishman should believe the Turks capable of regeneration; drew attention to Prince Gortchakow's charge against the Turkish Government of breach of the Treaty of Paris, but said nothing about the Russian breach of the same treaty in 1870; insisted on cordial co-operation with Russia, and expressed an opinion that the only honest action on the part of England would be to send her fleet and armies, "not to oppose Russia, but to coerce the Turk;" and concluded by quoting from Mr. Gladstone's "latest writings" that "it is in and by freedom only that every fuller preparation for freedom can be made," but without explaining whether such freedom is to be found in the Russian system of government. The Rev. Mr. Denton eulogised as heroic the action of Servia, and compared it with the action taken by "Elizabeth and by the Great Protector," but did not refer to Prince Milan's declaration, made long before the war, that national aggrandisement was his main object. The Bishop of Oxford corrected the opinion of the "upper" and the "educated classes" on the Turkish question; declared the people to be on this question right, and the educated classes wrong; and wound up by insisting that, "come what might of political complications, and 'English interests,' as they are called, the wrong should be helped"—neither the mode nor extent of help to be given at this price being, however, specified. Mr. Sergeant Simon, deviating from the course followed by most of the speakers, reminded the Con-

ference that suitable reform in Turkey must recognise the possibility and probability of oppression committed by others than Turks. Mr. Evelyn Ashley was introduced as the reviewer of recent negotiations, and of the present diplomatic situation, but his *résumé* of events described as those which have led to the present state of affairs, was, if his speech has been correctly reported, singularly incorrect and calculated to mislead. Lord Shaftesbury, who presided at the afternoon meeting, somewhat modified the views previously expressed by him at Glasgow, inasmuch as he now confessed to viewing "with terror the dominion of Russia over the provinces of Asia;" though he went on to state—"There is no question of it just now;" the fact being, as we believe, that this is the one question, the one difficulty, which has stood, and which stands, in the way of a peaceful arrangement of Turkish affairs; he concluded by declaring the attitude of the Conference to be "majestic," and to be the "attitude of the United Kingdom." The Rev. Canon Liddon wished that England could be "sufficiently clear in her convictions, and sufficiently disinterested in her purpose," to undertake such occupation of Turkey as may be necessary—a desire which we share to the extent of believing that while the interests of Europe, England, and humanity are not compatible with a Russian military and civil occupation of Bulgaria, they are not merely compatible with, but may be thoroughly served by, such an occupation by England. Mr. E. A. Freeman concluded a most unjust and violent speech by enunciating—"Perish our dominion in India rather than that we should strike a blow in such a cause as that of the Porte"—a repetition of the misleading description, adopted throughout the agitation, which suppresses the fact that Russian aggression alone can render it necessary to strike a blow, and that in such case the blow would be struck not in the cause of the Porte but to protect the interests of Europe, England, and humanity. Mr. Fawcett accused the Ministers of want of moral courage and statesman-like capacity, and then made the monstrous assertion that they had "done everything they could to associate the name of England with the most abominable cruelties that ever disgraced Europe;" he then contended that charges made by the Prime Minister against Mr. Gladstone ought never to be forgotten or forgiven, but he did not explain that whatever may be the blame justly attaching to those charges, the Prime Minister had, when he spoke, been just before subjected to charges of a very gross description made by Mr. Gladstone, not in hasty speech, but deliberately, in a document written and published for the express purpose of inflaming the public mind. Mr. Gladstone's speech (the last

made) was a bitter attack on "the distinguished gentleman," the Prime Minister, "acting through the unhappily too yielding mind of the Foreign Secretary;" a statement (which we believe to be conclusively disproved by declarations made in and out of Parliament) that the existence of any obligations to the subject populations of Turkey had been entirely ignored by the Ministry up to the date of a speech made by Sir S. Northcote in the North of England; a denunciation of the Porte for having "in a most signal and conspicuous manner broken and trampled under foot the Treaty of Paris," but no allusion to the glaring breach of the same treaty by Russia in 1870; a proposition that "one who has broken a treaty is no longer in a condition to appeal to it;" a protest (apparently in the teeth of the published evidence) against admitting that the insurrections in Bosnia and Herzegovina "were the works of foreign emissaries;" a condemnation of those who denounce the Turk individually, or otherwise than collectively, "as represented in the classes by whom his government is conducted;" an admission (which appears to be utterly irreconcilable with Mr. Gladstone's previous description of the Turkish race as "the one great anti-human specimen of humanity") that the ordinary Turk possesses "many valuable qualities and even virtues;" a dismissal as absurd of the idea that when the Turkish provinces pass from under the cruel and grinding yoke of Turkey they are to pass under somebody else's yoke, but no explanation whatever of how they are to be preserved from the yoke of Russia; an opinion that Russia "should be jealously and severely watched," and that this can best be done by our becoming competitors for the affections of the Christian populations of the East of Europe; and the following eulogy of the proceedings of 1826, which, as we have shown, ended in England being thoroughly outwitted by Russia, and in an enormous acquisition by Russia of Turkish territory:—"That chapter in our history is one of the most satisfactory on which we can look back."

Such was the style of the speeches said to represent the feelings and wishes of the British nation. Much of the ignorance and injustice displayed by speakers at this meeting has been thoroughly exposed by one of their number, Sir G. Campbell, in a small work* published a few days ago. His excellent description of Mahometans and of Mahometanism ought to go far towards convincing those open to conviction. He has clearly demonstrated that the Mahometan populations suffer as much, though not in all respects in the same manner, as their Christian brethren from the prevailing misgovernment. Concurring in his

* A Handy-Book on the Eastern Question.

distinct repudiation of any direct religious connection between the Sultan of Turkey and the Mahometans of India, we believe that he insufficiently appreciates the religious sympathy which, however latent, exists in India to an extent which cannot prudently be left out of consideration in dealing with the Eastern Question; to say nothing of the probable effect on India's millions of a conviction that England has wanted not merely the will, but equally the power, to stand between Russia and Turkey. To some of Sir George Campbell's political conclusions we altogether demur, though our space forbids any attempt to discuss them. We cannot but question the propriety of many of his comments on Sir H. Elliott's fitness for the post he fills, while to the style of these comments we object altogether. We fail to understand how Sir G. Campbell can possibly have acquired the full information on which alone such a judgment as he has expressed can be equitably formed, while it seems scarcely possible that he can have heard Sir H. Elliott's defence of his own proceedings. The Turkish proposal of a six months' armistice, on which Sir George Campbell lays so much stress, and which he terms "the six months' dodge," may have been, and may yet be proved to have been, made on strong grounds which the rejection or acceptance of the English proposition cannot materially affect, while it appears to be certain that such an armistice would have removed the danger of immediate armed collision which now embarrasses negotiation. We believe, however, that Sir G. Campbell has done excellent service in supplying the public, in a clear and readable form, with valuable information calculated to expose much of the injustice and fanaticism with which the Turkish question has been treated by a powerful section in England.

We have elsewhere endeavoured to show that the present dangerous crisis is due, not to Turkish misgovernment which united Europe could easily deal with, but to exclusive designs of Russia incompatible with any such settlement. On this point fresh and important evidence has been made public in the shape of correspondence which appeared in the "Times" of the 11th December last, and which proves Russian agents to have been actively engaged as far back as 1870 in discussing plans with which those recently carried out in Servia and elsewhere are clearly and directly connected. Lord Palmerston's description of Russian proceedings has here been verified to the letter. Work long carried on by secret intrigue and irresponsible agents only reached maturity when encouraging assurances received from a section of Englishmen—"the sympathetic orators of the English Opposition"—enabled the St. Petersburg Government fairly and openly to take it in hand.

On the success or failure of Lord Salisbury's difficult mission

we do not attempt to speculate. He is probably empowered to propose, or accept, any practicable method of reforming the Turkish administration which does not virtually hand over the country to Russia. Such would be the effect of a Russian occupation of Bulgaria. The independence of Turkey has long been but nominal, and it must be the duty and interest of England to insist on any further curtailment of this nominal independence which may be essential—and very considerable curtailment has probably now become essential—to the introduction of a tolerable system of government, provided always that such curtailment is effected only to the extent required for the sufficient protection of the subject populations. The integrity of the Turkish Empire we believe to be a thing which England is bound to insist on now just as it was insisted on in 1853, and which it is in her power to secure. The present Government of England appear to have no doubt on this point, and we trust that their opinion may prevail with the nation, believing, as we do, that the consequences of a contrary decision would press heavily on England in days to come, and perhaps not very distant.

ART. VI.—JOHN LOCKE.

1. *The Life of John Locke.* By H. R. FOX BOURNE. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1876.
2. *The Life of John Locke, with Extracts from his Correspondence, Journals, and Commonplace-Books.* By Lord KING. New edition. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1830.
3. *The Works of John Locke, Esq.* Sixth edition. 3 vols. fol. London, 1719.

AMONG the distinguished names which redeem the generally barren aspect of the latter half of the seventeenth century, none comes with more refreshing associations than that of John Locke. The broader features of that century are well known. Every one reads, or is supposed to read, the chapter in which Macaulay's pen has sketched, with bolder and freer strokes than some approve, the state of England in 1685. It was an age which might be paralleled with the state of ancient Greece in B.C. 427. The few emphatic sentences in which Thucydides has analysed the state of society which found one outburst in the sedition at Corcyra, recall in more than one respect the more extended picture which the modern historian gives us of

England at the period of the Restoration. Both periods are marked by an amount of insincerity and unscrupulous ambition such as is fortunately seldom found in history. In both the spirit of party prevailed over the love of country. "Reckless daring was esteemed stanch courage; cautious hesitation, specious cowardice; moderation, a cloak for unmanliness; candid consideration of all aspects of a question, inability to act on any. . . . Simplicity, the chief ingredient in high character, was laughed down, and disappeared; and a spirit of mutual opposition, marked by a total want of confidence, spread far and wide" (Thucydides, iii. 82). The spirit of the English nation was reflected in the mind of Charles. It was an age "with polite and engaging manners, addicted beyond measure to sensual indulgence, fond of sauntering and of frivolous amusements, incapable of self-denial and of exertion, without faith in human virtue or in human attachment, without desire of renown, and without sensibility to reproach. The love of God, the love of country, the love of family, the love of friends, were delicate and convenient synonyms for the love of self." The earnestness of Milton seemed to have vanished from the earth. The Puritan revival had succumbed, to be followed by the more violent a reaction towards libertinism. In the words which Mr. Pattison has applied to characterise a later period, we may describe it as "an age destitute of depth or earnestness; an age whose poetry was without romance, and whose public men were without character; an age of 'light without love,' whose 'very merits were of the earth, earthy.'"

This parallel must not be taken as complete. No historical parallel can be so. The differences will always from one standpoint or another appear more numerous than the resemblances. Nor, it is perhaps unnecessary to add, is the moral corruption in both instances without many brilliant specimens to the contrary. The "Antigone" appeared, perhaps, contemporaneously with the "Lysistrata," and Wychérley's "Country Wife" was not separated by many years from Milton's "Paradise Regained." If Alcibiades find his counterpart in some respects in Shaftesbury, the ancient period has its Pericles and Callicratidas, just as the modern has its Algernon Sydney and Argyle. Alongside of the petty aims of Athenian demagogues, and the narrow controversies of Sophists and Rhetoricians, stands forth the noble prophet and martyr Socrates.

Above this moral insincerity, this social degradation, this political one-sidedness, rises the figure of John Locke. Amid the bitter animosities of that period he remains unsullied by the breath of calumny. Even in the heat of controversy no serious charges of insincerity were brought against him. Surrounded

by hypocrisy and dissimulation, he displays an undeviating devotion to the cause of truth. His is "the voice of one crying in the wilderness." At the time, indeed, the voice seemed to fall unheeded. But in due time it made itself be heard. The value of that voice will be always differently estimated. But of it we may use the words Professor Jowett has applied to Bentham—without it, "a great word in the history of philosophy would have remained unspoken." It laid the foundations of psychology in England. The philosophy of Kant may be regarded as indirectly one of its chief results. We owe to it in great degree whatever religious freedom we possess. It lifted itself unhesitatingly in defence of popular rights and political freedom. Educational reform still requires to carry out some of those principles that Locke laid down. Above all, he has left us the example of a life "indifferent" (*i.e.*, impartial) towards truth, ready to welcome it from every side, and careless who provided it so long as truth herself was reached.

Such a life both requires and deserves a good biographer. Mr. Fox Bourne deserves to be so described. The English public owe him a deep debt of gratitude for the portrait he has delineated for them. His *Life of Locke* is not, indeed, a model biography. As a literary work it will never take its place beside Pattison's *Casaubon*, or Trevelyan's *Macaulay*. There is a painful lack of continuity, a provoking amount of repetition, in its pages. Its repeated subdivisions plead in themselves guilty to a want of systematic method. But it may be questioned whether Mr. Bourne's book would have been so valuable if it had shown more marks of system. The greater symmetry would perhaps have been purchased at the cost of omitting much that we could hardly be without. For Mr. Bourne's *Life* is not a mere biography; it contains, besides, a full analysis of everything of value that Locke wrote. Its merits cannot be estimated too highly when compared with the haphazard *Life* written by Lord King. King's so-called *Life* is really only a badly-arranged selection from Locke's commonplace-books and letters. By the side of this, Mr. Bourne's work is order and lucidity itself. It will, at least, always remain a valuable repertory for the use of all who wish to form for themselves an estimate of Locke's place in English thought. The Remonstrants' Library at Amsterdam, the papers collected by the Earls of Shaftesbury, the documents of the Record Office, have been ransacked to an extent which makes it doubtful whether more will ever be extracted from them. The materials which Mr. Bourne has so liberally supplied we propose to digest for our readers.

John Locke was born at Wrington, a small village in Somerset, in 1632. Those who love to trace hereditary tendencies

might find the seeds of his practical clear-headedness in the family from which he was descended. He was connected with Sir William Locke, the greatest English merchant under Henry VIII.; and his grandfather, Nicholas Locke, settled at Pensford, near Bristol, as a "clothier" or collector of the stuffs manufactured in the district. Locke's own father, instead of following the cloth trade of the family, began the practice of law at Pensford, and was appointed Clerk to the Justices of the Peace for the district. He served as captain in the Parliamentary army during the civil wars, and seems in consequence to have suffered considerable losses in his private fortunes. With the rest of this attorney's doings we are not concerned: the event we have to notice is his marriage with Agnes Keene, of the neighbouring village of Wrington, in 1630. At Wrington, according to the parish register, John Locke was born and baptized on August 29, 1632.

About Locke's early years little or nothing has been ascertained. But there is little doubt but the home influences brought to bear upon him were of a healthy kind. "What I remember him to have said of his mother," writes Lady Masham, "expressed her to be a very pious woman and affectionate mother;" and his father, the same authority assures us, "Mr. Locke never mentioned but with great respect and affection." About 1646, probably through the influence of that Colonel Popham for whom his father acted as law agent, he was entered at Westminster School; and after passing six years there, with South the preacher and Dryden the poet as his schoolfellows, he was elected to a junior studentship at Christ Church in Whitsuntide of 1652. Neither at Westminster nor at Oxford did Locke receive much true education. Dr. Busby, the head-master at Westminster, was too much of a disciplinarian and schoolmaster to be a real teacher; and Oxford was too much torn with ecclesiastical and political dissension to be a fitting refuge for the Muses. What learning survived at Oxford appears to have been in great part due to the single-minded zeal of Dr. John Owen, whom Cromwell had appointed Dean of Christ Church. Even Anthony Wood, who certainly was not favourably disposed towards a Presbyterian, allows Owen's learning and fairness of discussion. "What I myself know of him, which may, I hope, be mentioned without offence, envy, or flattery, is (let rash and giddy heads say what they please) that he was a person well versed in the tongues, Rabbinical learning, Jewish rites and customs; that he had a great command of his English pen, and was one of the most genteel and fairest writers who have appeared against the Church of England, as handling his adversaries with far more civil, decent, and temperate language than many of his fiery brethren, and by confining himself wholly

to the cause without the unbecoming mixture of personal slanders and reflection."* But Owen's influence did not extend beyond theological disputes. Philosophy could hardly be said to be studied at Oxford. The old scholastic subtleties, or rather the frivolities of scholasticism in its decline, still formed the basis of logical instruction; and the little modern culture which existed circled round the trivial controversies of the Ramists and the Anti-Ramists. A frigid dialectic, a narrow scholarship, a misinterpreted Aristotle, formed the mental food presented to the mind of Locke. His practical understanding rebelled, even at this early period, against the lessons of the schools. "Right reasoning," he held most probably now, as he expressed himself in a later day, "is founded upon something else than the predicaments and predicables, and does not consist in talking in mode and figure itself." It was no doubt his experience at Oxford which led to the vigorous but unhistorical examination of syllogistic reasoning which forms one of the most suggestive chapters in the fourth book of the *Essay* (*Essay*, iv. 17, § 4-9).

But if Locke learned little at Oxford from the formal lectures he attended, he derived, we may suppose, no inconsiderable benefit from the example and character of some of the teachers of the time. Dr. John Wallis, the Savilian Professor of Geometry from 1649 to 1703, cannot but have stimulated Locke, as he did all other young men of the period. More especially Locke fell under the influence of Dr. Edward Pococke, Laudian Professor of Arabic. A genuine scholar, whose works are still valued for the patient labour which they show, Pococke was still more distinguished for the unaffected humility and gentleness of his nature; and Locke afterwards bore public witness to the esteem in which he held at once Pococke's learning and character. Nor less important were those friendships which Locke formed with his fellow-students. There was more true education in those meetings with Nathaniel Hodges, David Thomas, and James Tyrrell than in all the "Monday and Thursday morning lectures on logic," and the "Tuesday and Friday on moral philosophy." Tyrrell and Thomas kept up their intimacy with Locke through life, and were members of that little debating society which in after-years gave rise to the "Essay concerning Human Understanding."

The conventionalities of the Oxford class-rooms could not satisfy a stirring intellect like that of Locke. In his distress he happened to alight upon a copy of the *Meditations of Descartes*. To a mind dissatisfied with the useless questions of the Peripatetic philosophy as then expounded at Oxford, the Medi-

* Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii. col. 740.

tations must have seemed a very revelation. Descartes might not be able to communicate a system, but he could at least supply that which was infinitely better, a touchstone which should try all truth—a “method” which repelled all dogmatism, whether it came with the poetical enthusiasm of a Plato or the encyclopædic grandeur of an Aristotle. Descartes’ first rule—never to accept anything as true but what is evidently so—must have come with the force of inspiration to a mind weary of the traditional tenets of Oxford. Descartes must be regarded as the true teacher of Locke. With many of the Cartesian principles he probably never at any time agreed. But the physiological theories, the scientific modes of explanation, which Descartes inaugurated, left, it would appear, a deep impression on his mind. Above all, the *method* of Descartes became also the method of Locke. The same use of introspection, of personal analysis, as marked the *Meditations*, was afterwards to mark Locke’s famous *Essay*.

Having taken his Bachelor’s degree on February 14, 165 $\frac{5}{8}$, Locke was elected to a senior studentship at Christ Church either in 1658 or early in 1659. He shortly afterwards began to take part in the tutorial work of the College. On the 24th of December 1660 he was appointed Greek Lecturer or Reader for the ensuing year; on the 24th of December 1662 he was appointed Reader on Rhetoric for 1663; and on the following Christmas he was appointed Censor of Moral Philosophy for 1664. This last-named office was usually held by a clergyman; and, in the natural course of events, Locke would have proceeded to take holy orders. Five only of the sixty studentships at Christ Church could be held by laymen. Whether Locke required at his election to declare himself prepared to join the ministry does not appear.* At any rate he finally determined to devote himself to medicine; and in 1663 we find him attending Peter Stahl’s lectures on chemistry, without much profit, if we may believe Wood’s version, either to himself or others. He managed somehow or other to retain his fellowship till 1666; and then, fortunately for him, came an order from Whitehall, marked “Dispensation for Mr. Locke,” which required the Dean and Chapter “to suffer him, the said John Locke, to hold and enjoy his said student’s place in Christ Church, together with all the rights, profits, and emoluments thereunto belonging, without taking holy orders upon him, according to the custom of the College.”

We may congratulate ourselves upon Locke’s resolution to devote himself to medicine. It is perhaps idle to forecast the consequences likely to have ensued had he acted otherwise. The

* Prideaux, in his *Letters to John Ellis* (published by Camden Society, 1875), says, “Lock hath wrigled into Ireland’s faculty place” (7th Feb. 1675); but Prideaux is not an impartial witness on the subject.

spirit of the time is greater than the greatest of great men ; and Locke's work would have been done by another had he himself been shut out from it. Yet it seems not unreasonable to imagine that a contrary decision on the part of Locke might have delayed for many years the forward impulse which the Essay gave to English thought. Medicine was the best preparation Locke could have obtained towards his future labours in philosophy. Neither he nor his contemporaries, it is true, knew of that physiological psychology which is so much pursued within our day. They would have been surprised to find the surgeon's scalpel made the organon of philosophy. But those habits of analysis, of patient observation, which Locke formed in the study of the human frame, cannot but have exercised an influence upon his future labours in philosophy. Like another Lotze, he was to advance from matter to mind, from the study of physical processes to the discovery of mental causes ; the facts which he had gathered in the fields of physiology were afterwards to be transferred to psychology and metaphysics. Medicine was then the progressive science of the age. The Royal Society had just been founded ; the discoveries of Harvey were still fresh in men's memory ; and Sydenham was soon to make a thorough revolution in the art of therapeutics. At Oxford the original intellect of Robert Boyle had already made itself felt ; and Boyle's influence, it may be, was not without a share in helping Locke to his decision.

Medicine, however, in itself was never to constitute Locke's sphere of work. He practised, indeed, in an informal non-professional manner, to a greater extent than is usually supposed ; and it was his medical connections that brought him into contact with the greater number of his friends. But it was never the main interest or chief occupation of his life. Political duties were the first that he was called upon to undertake. At Christ Church he had become acquainted with William Godolphin, the right-hand man of Sir Henry Bennet, Secretary of State in 1662 ; and, through Godolphin, Locke became in 1665 appointed secretary to Sir Walter Vane, ambassador to the Elector of Brandenburg. The letters which Locke wrote from Cleve, the capital of Brandenburg, are so interesting as to demand a passing notice. Cleve he found irregular at once in its buildings and its religion. " But yet this distance in their churches gets not into their houses. They quietly permit one another to choose their way to heaven ; for I cannot observe any quarrel among them upon the account of their religion." He dines at the Elector's, and rejoices that " they have good salads all the year, and use them frequently ;" joins in the refectory of the Franciscan friars, where, " after some silence, in marched a solemn

procession of peas-porridge, every one his dish ;” goes to service in the Lutheran Church, where the preacher’s sermon, he thinks, “was in blank verse ; for by the modulation of his voice, which was not very pleasant, his periods seemed to be all nearly the same length ;” and retreats from a combat with a probationer of theology, where “the end of all had been,” as at the wars of Troy, “nothing but some rubbish of divinity as useless and incoherent as the ruins the Greeks left behind them.” He visited the Catholic Church on Christmas Day, and was much amused with the Virgin and other “*dramatis personæ*” that he saw upon the altar. The musicians, it would appear, were not remarkable for their artistic skill. “However, I think they were the honestest singing men I have seen ; for they endeavoured to deserve their money, and earned it certainly with pains enough ; for what they wanted in skill they made up with loudness and variety.” He found that Oxford was not the only place at which men disputed about words instead of things. “The young monks,” he wrote, “are subtle people, and dispute as eagerly for *materia prima* as if they were to make their dinners on it.” He can joke, too, pleasantly at the dilatory habits of the people. It was a serious business to find a pair of gloves for Christmas ; and shoes, it seems, were provided with equal readiness. “A pair of shoes cannot be got under half a year : I lately saw the cow killed out of whose hide I hope to have my next pair.”

Locke returned to England in February 1666. He was no sooner home than he was offered the post of secretary to Edward Montagu, Earl of Sandwich, the new ambassador to Spain. After much hesitation, he finally determined to decline. He had found, perhaps, that it was difficult to oppose the action of an ambassador, and yet harder to assist in measures of which he might disapprove. No doubt, too, he had perceived that it was in the world of letters rather than of action that his calling lay.

At any rate, he proceeded to carry out those studies with which we last saw him occupied at Oxford. Even a visit to Somerset is taken up in attempting to make observations on the air for Boyle amid the “gruffs” or lead pits of the Mendip Hills. But the traditional medicine of Oxford was as little to Locke’s taste as were its traditional metaphysics and philosophy. Hippocrates and Galen repelled him as much as Aristotle and Peripateticism. It would be difficult to justify entirely this contempt. It is part of that want of historical reverence which will appear again in Locke’s character. Its effects were sufficiently disastrous. Locke somehow or other failed to procure the medical diploma which the University conferred. Even a letter from Clarendon to Dr. Fell, the Vice-Chancellor, requesting that Locke should be “dispensed with to accumulate” the

degree of "Bachelor in Physic," seems to have met with no attention. Yet if Locke, in a spirit of what, from want of other evidence, must be regarded as foolish obstinacy, refused to comply with the ordinary course of physical studies at Oxford, his friendship with Dr. David Thomas and with Boyle shows that he was making the practical work of medicine his chief study in 1666.

It was Locke's medical studies that brought him into contact with Anthony Ashley Cooper, Lord Ashley, afterwards created first Earl of Shaftesbury. The waters of Astrop Well, in Northamptonshire, were at this time enjoying a reputation for their medicinal properties; and Ashley determined to drink them when he went to visit his son at Oxford. For this purpose Ashley availed himself of the services of Dr. Thomas; and he, finding it necessary to leave Oxford at the time, employed Locke to act in his stead. A mistake about the waters brought Locke into direct contact with Lord Ashley, and the two were immediately attracted towards each other. "On the 15th of June 1667, Locke was at Exeter House, the London residence of Lord Ashley; and from that time, according to Lady Masham's statement, 'he was with my Lord Ashley as a man at home, and lived in that family much esteemed, not only by my Lord, but by all the friends of the family.'"

The intimacy which had thus arisen was cemented still more closely by the many services Locke rendered to the family. Upon Lord Ashley he performed a peculiar and successful operation, which did nothing less than save his patron's life. He acted as tutor to young Ashley, a youth of fifteen or sixteen years of age, weakly at once in body and in mind; and satisfied the wishes of the father to see the family line kept up, by finding for his inexperienced pupil a wife in Lady Dorothy Manners. To this new couple Locke acted also as physician, and he assisted at the birth, February 26, 1671, of that young Anthony who was afterwards to be distinguished as the author of the "Characteristics." From 1667, Locke, in fact, appears as not only the family physician, but also the familiar friend and confidential adviser of Lord Ashley and his family.

Students who have formed their estimate of Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of Shaftesbury, from Macaulay's History will find it hard to understand this intimacy between Locke and a politician who was "at one time the most unprincipled of ministers, and at another time the most unprincipled of demagogues;" and we are surprised that Mr. Fox Bourne has not discussed the question of Shaftesbury's character at greater length than he has done. He might have quoted from Mr. Christie's work those sentences which, to our mind, explain the

greater portion of that censure which has fallen upon Locke's patron. Shaftesbury, says Mr. Christie—

"Lived in times of violent party feeling; and calumny, which fiercely assailed him living, pursued him in his grave, and still darkens his name. He lived in times when the public had little or no authentic information about the proceedings of members of the Government, or of Parliament, when errors in judging public men were more easy than now, and when venal pamphleteers, poets, and play-writers drove a profitable trade in libels on public men. The power of Dryden's poetry eclipsed 'all the efforts of the inferior versifiers, who battled for Shaftesbury and the Whigs; and the undying verse of the brilliant but not conscientious author of 'Absalom and Achitophel' and the 'Medal' has been a powerful cause of Shaftesbury's condemnation by posterity.'"*

The latest historian of England has accepted, with more or less reservation, Mr. Christie's conclusions with respect to Shaftesbury's freedom from corruption. "As a statesman," says Mr. Green, "Ashley not only stood high among his contemporaries from his wonderful readiness and industry, but he stood far above them in his scorn of personal profit" (Short History, p. 629). He was "free from hypocrisy and cant; he was outspoken, courageous, and honest." The sagacity and penetration, for which Locke especially commends him, showed him that kings and statesmen were, like Bacon's nature, to be overcome by rendering obedience. The principle was a dangerous one, but it at least explains the double aspect which his character displays. He was, at any rate, as Locke knew him, the liberal politician of the day. "He was the steady and vehement advocate of toleration" (Green); and this fact alone may have sufficed to recommend him to the mind of Locke. That "labour for the public good," which Locke regarded as the special duty pressing on each man, may have seemed to him in no way more likely to be secured than through the aid of the liberal statesman of the time. Without the political introduction which his friendship with Shaftesbury gained him, Locke, it is not too much to say, would never have been able to influence the legislation of England to the extent he did.

It was a private company which first gave Locke an opportunity to realise his principles. Ashley was chief among the "Lords proprietors of Carolina;" and Locke became in some informal way chief secretary or manager to the company. The clauses in the Constitution of Carolina, which allowed, on the one hand, that "any seven or more persons agreeing in any religion shall constitute a Church or a profession;" and declared,

* Christie's Life of Shaftesbury, vol. i. p. xiii. cf. vol. ii. p. 467.

on the other, "no person whatsoever shall disturb, molest, or persecute another for his speculative opinions in religion or his way of worship," were, with the other laws of Carolina, drafted, if not indeed actually suggested, by Locke. With Ashley's elevation to the Peerage and Lord Chancellorship in 1672, Locke was still further enabled to influence the fortunes of his country. Appointed Secretary of Presentations, he may have used the post to spread abroad a liberal theology. More important than the secretaryship of presentations was the office to which Locke was appointed in the Council of Trade and Foreign Plantations. Shaftesbury had had much to do with the formation of this Board, and in 1673, when the secretaryship was vacant, Locke was appointed to the office. His duties on the Board were at once various and important. "He had to correspond and communicate with the chief officers of the Crown in England, and with the colonial governors and Government, on all matters of interest, as well as with everybody in England and elsewhere whose colonial affairs needed protection or advancement" (Fox Bourne's Life, vol. i. p. 280). With Shaftesbury's anti-Catholic attitude towards the Test Act Locke must have sympathised entirely; and he regretted, no doubt, the summary dismissal which his patron received in consequence, more than the resignation of the secretaryship of presentations, which it entailed upon himself. He had connected himself with Shaftesbury before he rose to office, and he continued with him when he was displaced. "When my grandfather," writes the third Lord Shaftesbury, "quitted the Court, and began to be in danger from it, Mr. Locke now shared with him in danger, as before in honours and advantages. He intrusted him with his secretest negotiations, and made use of his assistant pen in matters that merely concerned the State and were fit to be made public."

These years which Locke spent in the service of Lord Ashley were not confined to diplomatic matters. He became a member of the Royal Society in 1668, and shortly afterwards we find him chosen one of a special committee of eleven "for considering and directing experiments." Through Mapletoft, his old schoolfellow at Westminster, he became acquainted with Sydenham; and excited that admiration which Sydenham has expressed in the dedication of more than one of his treatises. Locke himself has left us the fragment of a paper, "*De Arte Medica*," which shows how thoroughly he followed in the steps of Sydenham. The second edition of Sydenham's "*Methodus Curandi Febres*" contains some complimentary Latin verses written by Locke in praise of the new therapeutics which Sydenham had introduced. In 1674 Locke obtained the bachelorship of medicine at Oxford, and about the same time

he was appointed to one of the two medical studentships at Christ Church. Nor were Locke's interests confined to medicine. The chief religious leaders of the day were included among Locke's friends. With the large-minded Tillotson and the philanthropic Unitarian merchant, Thomas Firmin, he stood on terms of especial intercourse. He was the centre of a small debating society, of which his old friends James Tyrrell and David Thomas were at least members; and there in 1670 the circumstances which led to the writing of the "Essay concerning Human Understanding" occurred.

In 1668 Locke had made a short visit to France for the benefit of his health in the society of the Earl and Countess of Northumberland, with whom he had become acquainted through Dr. Mapletoft. Again, in 1675, some of those ailments of chest or lungs to which throughout his life he stood a victim necessitated a change of air and circumstances, and the dissolution of the Council of Trade enabled him to seek that milder climate and repose of which he stood in need. Leaving London about the 15th of November with George Wall, a young Christ Church student and clergyman, for at least one of his companions, he proceeded southward to Montpellier. Did our space allow, we should like to quote many of the letters in which Locke sketches some amusing incidents of travel, and reflects like another Arthur Young upon the condition of the country and the people. But Locke's holiday was not confined to mere diversion. In the leisure of those months abroad he sketched out some of those ideas which were afterwards to be developed in the Essay. His commonplace-book shows us some discussions on "imaginary space," and another fragment dealing with negative and positive judgments. It was at Montpellier he met that Thomas Herbert to whom, as Earl of Pembroke, he, in a later day, dedicated the "Essay concerning Understanding."

From Montpellier Locke came to Paris in May 1677. A friend of Shaftesbury's, Sir John Banks, was sending his son across to France; and Locke agreed to take the supervision of his studies. At Paris Locke's medical attainments brought him into contact with some men of letters. He became acquainted with Guenellon, a famous physician of Amsterdam; and by him was introduced to Thoynard, writer of the "Harmonie de l'Écriture Sainte." Medicine, in fact, about this time promised to be of more importance to Locke than it had yet been. Mapletoft, the Professor of Physic at Gresham College, seemed likely, in consequence of marriage, to resign his chair; and Locke, we gather from his letters, was more than ordinarily anxious to succeed him. Mapletoft, however, did not actually

give up his chair till 1679; and by that time Locke seems to have no longer troubled himself about the post.

The Earl of Shaftesbury returned to power in 1679.

"It was he more than any other man who procured the impeachment of Danby, and when in the spring of 1679 a new scheme of government by a reorganised Privy Council was formally adopted by the King, he was appointed its President. In anticipation of that appointment, probably as soon as he saw his way to a return to power, he invited Locke to come back to England, and to resume his former relation with him as adviser upon all affairs of public importance."—Fox Bourne, vol. i. p. 411.

Locke came home to find England no nearer national tranquillity than it had been five years before. "The constitutional struggle threatening every day to break out into civil war, was only restrained for a little while;" Shaftesbury himself was arrested on the 2d of July on a "trumped-up charge of treasonable designs against the Government;" and though released on bail on the 1st of December, the event was an inauspicious foretaste of the greater trouble that was before long to attack not only Shaftesbury, but his illustrious protégé. Meanwhile Locke found relaxation from the cares of politics in the less exciting interests of tutorial supervision. Little Anthony Ashley, the son of the Lord Ashley for whom Locke had found a wife in Lady Dorothy, was assigned as early as 1673 to the formal guardianship of the future philosopher; and as the boy grew up, Locke devoted, it would seem, a considerable part of his attention to the supervision of his education. He does not, indeed, seem ever to have taken any part in the actual teaching of young Ashley; but the right of directing the studies and choosing the preceptors of his pupil cannot but have influenced the future author.

Occupation such as this might for the moment free Locke from the depression and despair which weighed upon him. He was gradually losing heart under the social and political corruption of his age. It was, we may believe with Mr. Bourne, more than a passing ill-humour which led him to express his readiness to emigrate with Thoynard.

"But, if the wickedness of our Europeans will not leave even one so manly and so honest as you are at peace, I am quite ready to go with you to the Ile de Bourbon; or if, without crossing the line and settling down at the Antipodes, you will be content to separate yourself from the wicked world by crossing the great ocean which tempted the ambition and avarice of our forefathers, I shall be yet more ready to accompany you to Carolina, where there is a very fine island which they have done me the honour to name after me."—Fox Bourne, vol. i. p. 427.

It was perhaps this feeling of depression at the hopeless aspect of the "wicked world" which led Locke in 1679 to return to the quiet of his rooms at Christ Church. Bigoted as Oxford was, he may have hoped to find in its humanising, if somewhat antiquated culture, a society marked by a higher moral tone than that of which he wrote to Thoynard. The fact that on the 27th of December we find him paying £2, 12s. for a new college gown seems to indicate an intention on his part to reside more permanently than he had done for many years within the precincts of his College. But whatever expectations Locke may have formed about the scholars of the University were destined to be signally frustrated.

The enthusiasm with which the populace received Shaftesbury on his acquittal, November 24, 1681, increased the suspicion entertained towards him by the King and the leaders of the Catholic party; and the part he played in the intrigues laid to assert the title of the Duke of Monmouth rendered his relations to the Crown still more precarious. Shaftesbury was obliged to save his life by flight. Disguised as a Presbyterian minister, he made his way to Harwich, and thence escaped to Holland. Locke's position meanwhile was little less critical than that of his patron. The letters which Humphrey Prideaux wrote to John Ellis, a Christ Church student employed by the Government, show that already at Oxford a kind of irregular espionage was kept over all Locke's movements.* He accordingly left Oxford soon after the 30th of June 1683, and went down to Somerset, perhaps even then intending to go no farther. However, in August or September he quitted England; and after some months, of which we know nothing, have elapsed, he appears in Holland.

The suspicions which already attached themselves to Locke were of course increased by his retreat to Holland—the hiding-place of Monmouth, Argyle, Shaftesbury, and the other enemies of the established Government. He was credited with some treasonable pamphlets and other publications in defence of Shaftesbury. A suspected traitor was no fit recipient of the bounty provided by King Henry VIII., and, on November 6th 1684, a note from the Earl of Sunderland requested Dr. Fell, the Dean of Christ Church, to take the necessary steps towards removing from his studentship "one Mr. Locke, who

* Yet even Prideaux, in a letter not quoted by Mr. Bourne, is unable to find anything wrong in Locke's doings. "John Lock," he writes (Oct. 24, 1682), "lives very quietly with us. . . . He seems to be a man of very good converse, and that we have of him with content; as for what else he is he keeps it to himselfe and therefore troubles not us with it nor we him."

belonged to the late Earl of Shaftesbury, and has upon several occasions behaved himself very factiously and undutifully to the Government.*

Dr. Fell had three years before, in answer to a note of Locke's apologising for his absence from the College, assured Locke of his "respect and friendship" for him, and in 1675 subscribed himself his "assured friend and servant;" and now, it must be said in his favour, showed that the "style of fulsome compliment" characteristic of the age perhaps meant more in his hands than it did with others. Instead of directly obeying the order he had received, he summoned Locke "to appear at Christmas following, to answer anything that should be alleged against him." "But," Locke wrote himself five years afterwards, when petitioning William III. for reinstalment, "this regular proceeding did not suit the designs upon the University." A second note from Sunderland (November 11th) instructed Fell to "forthwith remove him from his student's place, and deprive him of all the rights and privileges thereto belonging." The spirit which actuated the Fellows of Magdalen, when they withstood the appointment of Anthony Farmer as President, was not possessed by the Chapter of Christ Church. "On the 16th Dr. Fell wrote to Sunderland informing him that 'his Majesty's command for the expulsion of Mr. Locke from the College was fully executed;'" and he received immediately an answer to the effect that "his Majesty was well pleased with the College's ready obedience to his command for the expulsion of Mr. Locke."

Locke's residence in Holland extended from 1683 to 1689. These six years represent, in some respects, the most important portion of Locke's life. In the course of them he formed a number of valuable friendships—valuable especially because they stimulated Locke's otherwise dormant literary powers. At Rotterdam, Utrecht, and Amsterdam he enjoyed a pleasant domestic society, which did much to lessen any of those feelings of exile which his absence from England may have excited. Through Peter Guenellon, the physician, whose acquaintance he had made six years before at Paris, he became acquainted with all the men worth knowing in the centres of Dutch life. In Philip van Limborch, Jean le Clerc, Benjamin Furly, and Dr. Veen he found the sympathy which was needed to elicit both his political and theological beliefs. Through Limborch, the Professor of Theo-

* It is perhaps worthy of notice that the original MS. of the *second* letter, as preserved at Christ Church, bears not "the factious and disloyal behaviour of Locke," as Mr. Bourne prints it, but "of Lock," with a blank space before the name. The blank is significant. The spelling is of course indifferent.

logy among the Arminian "Remonstrants," he was confirmed in those conceptions of an unsectarian and undogmatic Christianity which the religious narrowness of the age had already been forcing him to form. In Benjamin Furly, the literary Quaker merchant of Rotterdam, Locke found another friend whose simple earnest Christianity must have extended further the horizon Locke was inclined to allow to Christian doctrine. While Limborch and Furly thus strengthened Locke's latitudinarian attitude, Le Clerc, on the other hand, called forth his powers of critical examination. It was Le Clerc who led him to investigate those questions lying at the root of a belief in inspiration and revelation. Le Clerc's "*Sentimens sur l'Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*" placed Locke for the moment on the horns of a dilemma. "If everything in the sacred books," he reasoned, "is to be indiscriminately adopted by us as divinely inspired, great opportunity will be given to philosophers for doubting our faith and sincerity. If, on the other hand, any part is to be regarded as of merely human composition, what becomes of the divine authority of the Scriptures, without which the Christian religion falls to the ground? What is to be the criterion, what the rule?"

But Le Clerc's influence was not limited to the spirit of critical scepticism which he led Locke to frame. "It may almost be doubted," says Mr. Bourne, "whether but for his acquaintance with Le Clerc, he would ever have given anything to the world." The "*Bibliothèque Universelle*," of which Le Clerc was editor, received several contributions from the pen of Locke. Above all, Le Clerc's organ contained in January 1684 the first sketch—a French epitome—of that great work on which Locke's reputation was to rest—the "*Essay concerning Human Understanding*."

Pleasant, however, as Locke found his Dutch surroundings, it was only natural that he should avail himself of the first opportunity he had of returning to his native land in safety. Shortly, therefore, after the accession of William of Orange to the throne of England, Locke started for the shores of Albion, and arrived there on February 12, 1689.

Locke had no sooner landed than he had to withstand the temptation of being carried again into the vortex of political life. An ambassador was required to represent the interests of England at the Court of Frederick III., the new Elector of Brandenburg; and, through Lord Mordaunt, Locke was asked to fill the office. Locke was placed in a difficult position. But on the day following that on which he received the invitation, he wrote and in a characteristic note declined the honour which the King would have conferred upon him. It was mainly on the ground

of failing health that Locke placed his non-acceptance of the post. "What," he asks, "shall a man do in the necessity of application and variety of attendance on business to be followed there, who sometimes after a little motion, has not breath to speak, and cannot borrow an hour or two of watching from the night without repaying it with a great waste of time the next day?" This refusal, it might have been thought, was positive enough.

"But it did not satisfy the King. So honest a man, thought his Majesty, must not be dispensed with. Other messages were sent to Locke. If Cleve and Berlin were too cold for him, he was invited to go to Vienna, where he need be in no fear of the weather; nay, let him name his own place, and, if possible, it should be assigned to him. But Locke was resolute. He could not trust in his health being sound enough anywhere for him to do such work as such a king as William deserved from a loyal subject, and a patriotic citizen, and he persisted in declining to take any diplomatic employment."—Fox Bourne, vol. ii. p. 147.

While, however, Locke refused to undertake the labours and responsibilities of an embassy, he accepted an appointment as Commissioner of Appeals, "a place," writes Lady Masham, "honourable enough for any gentleman, though of no greater value than £200 per annum, and suitable to Mr. Locke on account that it required but little attendance." This office Locke seems to have held for the remainder of his life.

But if Locke was unable to serve the Government of England through the customary channels of official duty, he was none the less advancing, by his example and his writings, that freedom, religious and civil, which William had inaugurated. The "*Epistola de Tolerantia*," written in 1685, and published at Gouda in 1689, acted as forerunner to that Comprehension Bill which proposed to relieve all clergymen of the Church of England and all members of the Universities from the necessity of subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles; and prepared a public to sympathise with those modifications of the Five-mile and Conventicle Act which were effected in the Toleration Act. Nor was Locke ungrateful for the results that had been gained. "I doubt not you have heard before this," Locke wrote to Limbörch, "that toleration is now established among us by law: not with such breadth as you and true men like you, free from Christian arrogance and hatred, would desire; but 'tis something to get anything. With these small beginnings I hope the foundations will be laid on which the Church of Christ can be built up" (Fox Bourne, vol. ii. p. 155). And in 1690, with a dedication to the Earl of Pembroke, appeared that famous Essay, which may

be viewed as the metaphysical counterpart of the political Revolution.

The "Two Treatises on Government" had a corresponding object. The Treatises, Locke hoped in the preface, would be "sufficient to establish the throne of our great restorer, our present King William, to make good his title in the consent of the people, . . . and to justify to the world the people of England, whose love of their natural rights, with their resolution to preserve them, saved the nation when it was on the very brink of slavery and ruin." Nor did he less contribute to the industrial prosperity of the nation by the opposition which he offered in 1692 to the current fallacies of political economy in "Some Considerations of the Consequences of the Lowering of Interest and Raising the Value of Money." But he was well aware that it was not in work of this kind that his real interest lay. "Though," he writes a friend, "I can never bethink any pains or time of mine in the service of my country, as far as I may be of any use; yet I must own to you that this and the like subjects are not those which I now relish."—Locke's Works, vol. iii. p. 523.

Literary retirement was, in fact, to be the characteristic feature of Locke's remaining years. Just before his departure to Holland he had made the acquaintance of Damaris Cudworth, the daughter of that Dr. Ralph Cudworth whose learned but ponderous "True Intellectual System of the Universe" finds nowadays but few admirers. Gradually between her and Locke a strong intellectual sympathy had arisen. The intellectual philosophy of the father was softened in the daughter into a humanitarian creed more correspondent with the views of Locke. But we must leave Mr. Bourne to portray her character.

"Bright, earnest, truthful, brave, as she must have been, or she could not afterwards have been what she showed herself to be—with as much masculine strength in her temperament as there was feminine grace in his—she no sooner became acquainted with Locke than she set herself loyally at his feet, and began to trim her lamp and furnish it with the oil of which he had such good store for all who sought it; and while she thought herself too young to claim the honour of his friendship, he discovered in her 'a soul not of the ordinary alloy.'"—Fox Bourne, vol. i. p. 478:

The intimacy which had thus arisen between Locke and Damaris Cudworth in 1683, was kept up by several letters during the years of voluntary banishment that Locke spent in Holland. On his return to England in 1689, Locke found his friend married to Sir Francis Masham, a country gentleman in Essex. At the invitation of Lady Masham, he visited them several times at their residence of Oates; and at last agreed to establish himself permanently at their house. He consented, however, to do

so only on the condition—and the fact is worth recording—that he should be allowed to contribute his share towards the expenses of the household.

It is at Oates we like to picture Locke. The group of which Locke forms the central figure is indeed a charming scene. He is surrounded by friends who fully appreciate his worth and spare no efforts to secure his comfort. Sir Isaac Newton, whose acquaintance Locke had made in 1689, comes over to the cheery hearth at Oates, and he, Locke, and Lady Masham discuss the meaning of some obscure prophecies in Daniel. His days are saddened by the death of Boyle. But he discharges a duty of affection to his friend in editing his "History of Air;" and his loss is compensated by the friendship of another earnest seeker after truth. This is William Molyneux of Dublin. His "Dioptrica Nova" had contained a graceful recognition of Locke's services in philosophy, and Locke hastened to make the acquaintance of one who had thus appreciated his labours. Inquiry showed them that they already had a common bond of union. Locke had known a brother of Molyneux eight years before at Leyden; and this brother, a physician, now writes to express the admiration he has formed for the new method Sydenham has introduced into physics. William Molyneux remains Locke's chief correspondent for the next ten years. He suggested various alterations and additions on the Essay; and it was at his request that Locke undertook his treatise on Education. Locke was not slow to express the admiration which he felt for Molyneux. "A rational free-minded man tied to nothing but truth," he wrote, "is so rare a thing that I almost worship such a friend." Meanwhile his Dutch friends carry on a correspondence with him. Limborch's "Historia Inquisitionis" was now completed, and Locke got his large-hearted friend Archbishop Tillotson to allow it to be dedicated to him. Furlly loses his wife, and Locke writes to dissuade him from his intentions of retirement. "Want of health, want of spirit, want of useful thought, is the state of those who abandon themselves to griefs, whereof business is the best, the safest, and the quickest cure." (See the whole letter, Fox Bourne, vol. ii. p. 229.)

But Locke's circle is not confined to philosophers and men of business; children also occupy a great share of his attention. Locke never married. The only letter which we possess written to his father makes reference to "another (whom you may guess)" in a way which leaves it hardly doubtful that an early love is signified (Fox Bourne, vol. i. p. 81). Whether this "other" was the lady who afterwards became Mrs. Blomer, and maintained occasional correspondence with Locke, addressing him as "my dear brother," and being spoken of by her own husband as Locke's

"sister," it is perhaps idle to investigate; in any case, Locke's first was his only love, and he remained unmarried to his death. The "love that never found its earthly close" lavished itself instead on bright young children. Such was the daughter of his friend Edward Clarke. Her Locke describes playfully as "my wife;" and the author of the famous Essay gravely writes Clarke, once when little "Betty" came to stay with him, "My wife's shoes are too little." This was in 1692, when Locke was sixty years of age, and Betty, it would seem, about eleven; but even in 1702 he acknowledges through Clarke "a letter from my wife." Another favourite was Lady Masham's step-daughter, Esther Masham, "a bright and amiable girl who lived to be a bright and amiable old maid." Esther "was nineteen years old in 1694. Full of life and fun, as well as of good sense and sober thought, as fond of serious study as of French romances, she had won a place in Locke's heart, and learned to nestle there during the years they passed together at Oates. She had come to be one of those adopted sisters, wives, or daughters by whose honest affection Locke's bachelorhood seems to have been cheered at almost every stage of his life" (Fox Bourne, vol. ii. p. 297).

But Locke's retirement is not spent merely in the social and domestic amenities of life. Religious questions occupy a continually increasing share of his attention. In 1692 he publishes his third "Letter on Toleration." But the real question, he saw, lay not between the Churches themselves, but between the Churches and the world. The conviction found in 1695 its expression in the "Reasonableness of Christianity." Meanwhile, also, at the request of Molyneux, he had thrown together his far-reaching "Thoughts on Education."

Nor had political questions ceased to interest his mind. He pleaded, if not so sublimely, perhaps at least as effectively as Milton, for the liberty of the Press, when the question came before the Parliament; and he assisted in the reform of the Coinage in 1695. For four years he comes forward again in the public service of the State. In 1696 he was appointed Commissioner of Trade, at a salary of £1000 per annum, and though now sixty-four years old, he threw himself vigorously into the duties of the office. He made various proposals for the encouragement of Irish linen manufacture (marked, it must be added, with many economic fallacies), and he devoted great part of his attention to the already crying evil of pauperism. But in 1700 he retired on the too genuine ground of ill-health, and betook himself to the home always ready for him in the manor-house at Oates.

Locke's last days were rapidly approaching. They were not allowed to be so tranquil as might have been wished. The liberal temper which characterised the "Reasonableness of

Christianity" served only to intensify the opposition which the treatise roused. The van was led by Edwards' "Thoughts concerning Atheism." It was followed by the implications and misrepresentations of Toland's "Christianity not Mysterious." "Locke had argued," as Mr. Stephen tersely expresses it, "that Christianity was reasonable; Toland added that there was no nonsense in Christianity." The mode in which Toland used the *Essay* to illustrate his four methods of testing religious truth—his application of Locke's definition of knowledge to Christian doctrine—his recourse to the experience of the senses as the first criterion of revelation,—these and other conclusions opened the eyes of the religious world to the consequences that could be drawn from Locke's philosophy. Orthodoxy found its champion in Stillingfleet, the Bishop of Worcester. His attacks on Locke's theory of Truth and Substance form a not over-interesting section in the history of the philosophy of that age.

Locke himself was personally little moved by all this criticism. "I know better," he said, "to employ the little time my business and health afford me, than to trouble myself with the little cavillers who may either be set on or be forward in hope of recommending themselves to meddle in this controversy." He was inquiring, as he wrote in the "Conduct of the Understanding," "not the easy way to opinion, but the right way to truth;" and he "never saw any reason why truth should not be trusted to its own evidence." The Bible became more and more his companion. "I thank you," he writes Esther Masham, "for the Bible you have been at the trouble about for me, and desire it may be sent me. When I come down next, I will bring it into the country with me, and you and I will be the better for it." Edwards had asserted that he had drawn the "Reasonableness of Christianity" solely from the Gospels, and given no attention to the Epistles. Locke repelled the charge in his "Vindications;" but the accusation may have led him to a deeper study of Pauline Christianity. He set himself to write a commentary on the various letters of St. Paul, and in the last year of his life annotated and paraphrased the Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians.

But Locke never fell into the error of supposing that it was within the Bible only that God and goodness were to be discovered. In the household at Oates, the Bible held its proper place as one book among other books, to be interpreted by help of them, and to cast its light on them in turn. No hard line separated it from other forms of literature. With Esther, writes Mr. Bourne, Locke "read novels and the Bible;" with Lady Masham "travel-books and the Bible."

On April 30, 1703, Locke begs his cousin Peter King to come and settle his affairs with him, because "on sober and sedate consideration" he knows not whether this may not be his last time of seeing him. This Peter King was one of those who cheered the last days of the great philosopher. He was the son of Locke's cousin Anne; and Locke having taken a fancy for him, had directed his education, and helped him generally forward in the world. His labours were not altogether wasted, for Lord King, as he was afterwards called, reached the Woolsack before he died, and is known as the author of some works that are not altogether forgotten. Another young man, who, like King, told Locke that his life and work would not pass away entirely unremembered, was the young ingenuous Anthony Collins. Collins had drunk deeply of the method of the Essay. His "Discourse on Free-thinking" was to perpetuate one side at least of Locke's "reasonableness" in religion. The thought that he had left in Collins one son who would continue to propagate his views may have been no slight consolation to Locke when in November 1703 "the heads of Colleges met at Oxford, and after some had proposed that the book (*i.e.*, Locke's Essay) should be publicly prohibited in the University, agreed that tutors should be instructed not to read it with their pupils." "I take what has been done," Locke wrote to Collins, "as a recommendation of that book to the world, as you do, and I conclude when you and I next meet we shall be merry upon the subject. For this is certain, that because some wink or turn their heads away and will not see, others will not consent to have their eyes put out" (Fox Bourne, vol. ii. p. 523).

Human controversies could have now but little interest for Locke. He would shortly be, as he believed, in a presence where we know as we are known. The thought could bring no melancholy to the mind of Locke. "I think at the last day," he had written, "it will not be inquired whether I was of the Church of England or Geneva, but whether I sought and embraced truth in the use of it." Who will venture to suggest that he had not? "I am in perfect charity with all men," he said after the little supper in which for the last time he commemorated the life and work of Christ, "and in sincere communion with the whole Church of Christ, by whatever name Christ's followers call themselves." And at last, on the 28th October 1704, while Lady Masham read aloud, by his own request, those psalms in which she tried to find a consolation for her sorrow, Locke "raised his hands to his eyes and closed them, and all was over."

"His death," wrote Lady Masham afterwards, "was, like his life, truly pious, yet natural, easy, and unaffected; nor can time, I think, ever produce a more eminent example of reason and

religion than he was, living and dying." His will, which he had made upon 11th April 1704, showed sufficiently, if proof were needed, his large-heartedness and liberality. No one of his many friends was left unmentioned in it. Neither "Betty" Clarke nor Benjamin Furly were forgotten, and munificent provision was made for Francis Cudworth Masham. "He directed that he should be buried in the parish churchyard of High Laver in a plain coffin, without ornament or ostentation of any kind, and that the money that would have been required for a more costly funeral should be expended in buying clothes for four labourers at Oates, whom he named." His wish was strictly carried out; and on his tomb was carved the Latin epitaph which he himself had written, an epitaph of which one sentence sums up his career: "*Litteris innutritus cousque tantum profecit ut veritati unice litaret*"—Bred a scholar, he used his studies to devote himself to truth alone.

To estimate aright the moral and intellectual character of Locke requires more time and space than is at our disposal. Nor, indeed, would any words of ours dispense with that study of his works which alone will form a portrait of the man. All we can do here is to try and emphasise that one point which seems to be the basis of the other aspects of Locke's character. We might enlarge upon his humour. The letters which he wrote from Cleve have already shown us an example of his faculties in this direction. Most people know the anecdote the third Lord Shaftesbury tells about him and the friends of the first Earl.

"At an appointed meeting of two or three great men at my grandfather's house, more for entertainment and good company than for business, it happened that, after a few compliments, the cards were called for, and the Court fashion prevailing, they were engaged in play before any conversation was begun. Mr. Locke sat by as a spectator for some time. At last, taking out his table-book, he began to write something very busily, till, being observed by one of the Lords and asked what he was meditating, 'My Lords,' said he, 'I am improving myself the best I can in your company; for having impatiently awaited this honour of being present at such a meeting of the wisest men and greatest wits of the age, I thought I could not do better than write your conversation, and here I have it in substance all that has passed for this hour or two.'"—Fox Bourne, vol. i. p. 202.

There are other interesting traits of character which the attentive student of Locke's life and works will find out for himself. Lady Masham and Pierre Coste, tutor to young Frank Masham, have enumerated some of those manners which make men. They refer to Locke's invariable courtesy, his efforts to adapt himself to every intellect and nature, his careful discriminating charity, his simple habits in dress and food. If we

leave these aside, it is not because we undervalue them, but merely because our readers may peruse them for themselves in Mr. Fox Bourne's pages (vol. ii. pp. 530-540); and because we wish rather to grasp that common standpoint which enabled Locke to work upon his generation, and to influence the world in different spheres of thought and action. It is this standpoint which will constitute the value of his life and work for us; it is the discovery of it which will help to put us also in a position to read the world, and to interpret those "problems of life and mind" which affect us all in greater or in less degree.

It is always hazardous to attempt to sum up in one word the spirit of a great man's life. The ordinary categories refuse in such an instance to apply themselves. Great men are always many-sided; and any word by which we try to characterise their standpoint is apt to emphasise one aspect of their labours to the exclusion of some other. But this cannot be the case with an expression which refers not to a set of doctrines, but to a way of looking at all doctrines—a method of judgment rather than an article of belief.

Criticism is an expression of this character; and it is the critical attitude which forms the basis of Locke's character, intellectual and moral. He is the exponent of enlightenment in England. His centre of observation is that which Socrates introduced, and Kant afterwards elaborated. It was an attempt to carry out still further the method which Descartes had founded. "The greatest part of the questions and controversies that perplex mankind depends," he said, "on the doubtful and uncertain use of words or indetermined ideas which they are made to stand for." Philosophy, he perceived, ran a risk of falling into the old unanswerable questions and frivolous discussions of the schoolmen. Constructive work, therefore, was not what was immediately wanted. The world had had philosophical systems enough: it desired to know how far these systems possessed truth, and how far truth was attainable by man. "We must unweave the web of experience and thought which we have woven in our sleep, that we may begin again at the beginning and weave it over again with clear and distinct consciousness of what we are doing."* These words in which Professor Caird has stated the problem of Descartes represent also the standing-place of Locke. The origin of the *Essay* has been often noticed. The friends who meet in Locke's rooms to discuss a speculative question are puzzled by the difficulties rising round it. Locke perceived that there was something before the question itself calling for solution; "and that before we set ourselves upon

* *Encyc. Brit.*, v., art. "Cartesianism."

inquiries of that nature, it was necessary to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understandings were or were not fitted to deal with." Locke, therefore, was led to ask the question which the results of Hume forced in upon Kant's dogmatic slumber. He does not intend, he explains at the commencement of the *Essay*, to "meddle with the physical consideration of the mind," or inquire how we "come to have any sensation by our organs, or any ideas in the understanding." He thought, on the contrary, that the "first step towards satisfying several inquiries the mind of man was apt to run into was to take a survey of our own understandings, examine our own powers, and see to what things they were adapted."

With the execution of this original design we are not now concerned. The inconsistencies in Locke's doctrine of truth and reality have been often pointed out. His conception of truth as consisting in the agreement or disagreement of ideas, with his distinction of the real and nominal essence, led him into the paradoxical assertion that mathematical and moral truths were real, precisely because they were ideal; while, on the other hand, the truths of natural substances, in so far as we never knew anything but their nominal essence, were never real; so that a science of nature was in consequence impossible. His empirical derivation of space, time, and substance has been often proved inconclusive. His account of the origin of intelligence is not without its ambiguities and inconsistencies; and the latest editor of Hume made a not unwarrantable *reductio ad absurdum* of Locke's theory when he described it as "having an idea of an idea of an idea of sensation."*

But whatever be the opinion entertained about the theory which Locke introduced in explanation of the origin of our "ideas," there can be no two opinions about the importance of that examination of innate ideas with which Locke started. He did good service in destroying the crude theory of ready-made *a priori* principles of knowledge. His *Essay* is, in the highest sense of the term, an "epoch-making" work. The sound of Locke's critique has gone forth into all lands. He communicated to philosophical inquiry a progressive movement of which we have not ceased to reap the benefits. He withdrew men's minds from the empty abstractions and fantastic notions with which they were surrounded. He rightly described the innate theory as "a short and easy way" which "eased the lazy from the pains of search, and stopped the inquiry of the doubtful." And he drew from his critique that which Hegel has called "the great lesson of empiricism—that man must see for himself

* Green's Hume, i. 9.

and feel that he is present in those facts of knowledge, which he has to accept."* - "The greatest reverence," so does Locke conclude the first book of the *Essay*, "is due to truth; and I hope it will not be thought arrogance to say, that perhaps we should make greater progress in the discovery of rational and contemplative knowledge if we sought it in the fountain, in the consideration of things themselves; and made use rather of our own thoughts than other men's to find it. For I think we may as rationally hope to see with other men's eyes as to know by other men's understandings."†

It is this "search for truth in the consideration of things themselves" which forms the counterpart of that critical standpoint which we have called the basis of Locke's character. He was doing for mental science what Sydenham had done for medicine. He was basing truth upon a "physiology of the understanding," as Kant has called the *Essay*; just as Sydenham was building up medicine upon "as genuine and natural a description of diseases as can be procured." Experimental observation was the method applied in the one case to body, in the other case to mind. Both Locke and Sydenham "pointed out a way and themselves walked in it; they taught a method and used it, rather than announced a system or discovery; they collected and arranged their *visa* before settling their *cogitata*."‡ No writer either before or after has expressed a greater enthusiasm for truth than Locke. It is enough to quote two or three of these passages in which we hear expressed his passionate devotion to it. "Our first and great duty," he writes in his fragment "On Study," "is to bring to our studies and our inquiries after knowledge a mind covetous of truth; that seeks after nothing else, and after that impartially, and embraces it, how poor, how contemptible, how unfashionable soever it seem."§ To the same effect does he describe himself in a letter to Limborch as one "seeking everywhere for truth, and embracing it equally, as far as he is able, whether it be found among the orthodox or heretic."|| And in a letter to Molyneux asking that thinking Irishman to supply him with some suggestions for the second edition of the *Essay*, "I flatter myself," he says, "that I am so sincere a lover for truth that it is very indifferent to me so I am possessed of it, whether it be my own or any other's discovery."

Locke's short treatise "On the Conduct of the Understanding" will long remain a standard manual for mental cultivation. It would be difficult to find anywhere finer sayings on the tendency

* *Logik*, § 38.

† *Essay*, Book I. iv. § 23.

‡ *Brown's Horæ Subsecivæ*: Locke and Sydenham.

§ *King's Life*, i. 188.

|| *Locke's Works*, iii. 574.

to mistake a partial for complete knowledge, to introduce our own peculiar notions into facts, to read the truths of the world in the light of that small sphere of science with which we ourselves happen to be acquainted. No writer has insisted more strongly on the need of indifferency and impartiality to truth, of intermediate principles by which we may gradually rise to higher truths, of translating words and ideas into things, and not supposing that "names in books signify real entities in nature till they can frame clear and distinct ideas of these entities." A few sentences, with true Baconian ring, deserve extraction:—

'Let not men think there is no truth but in the sciences that they study, or the books that they read.'

"To be indifferent which of two opinions is true is the right temper of the mind that preserves it from being imposed on, and disposes it to examine with that indifferency till it has done its best to find the truth, and this is the only direct and safe way to it. But to be indifferent whether we embrace falsehood or truth, or no, is the great road to error."*

"Let a man be given up to the contemplation of one sort of knowledge, and that will become everything. An alchemist shall reduce divinity to the maxims of his laboratory, explain morality by sal, sulphur, and mercury, and allegorise the Scripture itself and the sacred mysteries thereof into the philosopher's stone."†

How often would controversies be sweetened were people to remember that "Distinction and Division are very different things;" and that "one of them is the most necessary and conducive to true knowledge that can be; the other, when made too much use of, serves only to puzzle and confound the understanding." Locke's words are the germ of that wise aphorism of Coleridge: "It is a dull and obtuse mind that must divide in order to distinguish; but it is a still worse that distinguishes in order to divide." And if we cast our eyes back over time, it is the same spirit as that which led Anaxagoras to say, "Things in this one connected world are not cut off from one another as if with a hatchet."

"In any person fit to be a teacher," Mr. Mill has said, "the view he takes of religion will be intimately connected with the view he will take of all the greatest things which he has to teach." It was so pre-eminently with Locke. The same light as guided him through the "Essay concerning Human Understanding" illuminated no less his studies on Religion and Christianity. The critical enlightened spirit acted there as in the analysis of knowledge. Faith and Reason were not to be disjoined from one another.

* Works, iii. 333.

† Ibid., 387.

"Reason," the Essay taught, "is natural revelation whereby the eternal Father of Light and Fountain of all knowledge communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties. Revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by God immediately, which Reason vouches the truth of by the testimony and proofs it gives that they come from God. So that he that takes away Reason to make way for revelation puts out the light of both, and does much the same as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope."—*Essay*, Book IV. xix. § 4.

"Our age," he might have said in the words which Kant afterwards employed, "is the age of criticism to which everything must be subjected. The sacredness of religion and the authority of legislation are by many regarded as grounds of exemption from the examination of this tribunal. But if they are exempted, they become the subjects of just suspicion, and cannot lay claim to sincere respect, which reason accords only to that which has stood the test of a free and public examination."*

It was this spirit of religious criticism which gained expression in the "Reasonableness of Christianity." It was built upon the same method as that which produced the *Essay*. "Casting wide the infinite masses of learned speculation under which the whole subject had been buried till it was crushed and distorted out of shape, he resolved simply to use his eyes to see what was before him."† As he read his Bible he found that the original essence of Christianity was no dogmatic system, as later theologians had represented it. The Christian revelation he found, as Coleridge did after him, the perfection of human reason. But revelation was none the less required in order to communicate it to men. "Every one may observe a great many truths, which he receives at first from others, and readily assents to as consonant to reason, which he would have found it hard and perhaps beyond his strength to have discovered himself." There had been, it is true, moral systems in the world before Christ came. "But these incoherent apothegms of philosophers and wise men, however excellent in themselves, never make a morality whereof the world could be convinced: could never rise to the force of a law that mankind could with certainty depend on." A revelation was therefore necessary. But "'tis no diminishing to revelation that reason gives its suffrage too to the truths revelation has discovered." Revelation, in fact, as

* Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, note to preface.

† Stephen's English Thought, i. 95.

contained within the Gospels, is in thorough harmony with reason. "As it suits the lowest capacities of reasonable creatures, so it reaches and satisfies, nay, enlightens the highest. No tang of prepossession or fancy, no footsteps of pride or vanity; no touch of ostentation or ambition appears to have a hand in it. It is all pure, all sincere; nothing too much, nothing wanting; but such a complete rule of life as the wisest man must acknowledge tends entirely to the good of mankind."

But all Christian doctrine, Locke proceeded to point out, is not of equal importance. "There be many truths in the Bible which a good Christian may be wholly ignorant of, and so not believe; which perhaps some lay great stress on and call fundamental articles because they are the distinguishing points of their communion." Especially is this the case with the doctrines contained in the Epistles. They were written upon particular occasions, and explain the Christian faith "by proper accommodation of those they were writ to." The essential condition of Christian communion lay, as Locke with many a tedious quotation showed, in believing in the works and mission of Jesus Christ as such.

It was this interpretation of Christianity that formed the basis of his "Letter on Toleration." "The toleration of those that differ from others in matters of religion is so agreeable to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and to the genuine reason of mankind, that it seems monstrous for man to be so blind as not to perceive the necessity and advantage of it in so clear a light." The civil magistrate could have nothing to do with the spiritual beliefs of man. "The common principles of religion," Locke wrote as early as 1660 in his "Reflections on the Roman Commonwealth," "all mankind agree in, and the belief of these doctrines a lawgiver may venture to enjoin; but he must go no further if he means to preserve a uniformity of religion" (Fox Bourne, vol. i. p. 149).

Here, no doubt, Locke was inconsistent with his own principles; and he declared this in its boldest terms when he asserted that atheists "are not at all to be tolerated." But, however inconsequential Locke may have been in his theory of toleration, this inconsistency need not blind us to the beauty of the simile in which Locke summed up his opposition to sectarian persecution.

"If I be marching on, with my utmost vigour, in that way, which, according to the sacred geography, leads straight to Jerusalem, why am I beaten and ill-used by others because perhaps I wear not whiskers; because my hair is not of the right cut; because perhaps I have not been dipt in the right fashion; because I eat flesh upon the road, or some other food which agrees with my stomach; because I avoid certain by-ways, which seem unto me to

lead into briars or precipices ; because, amongst the several paths that are in the same road, I choose that to walk in, which seems to be the straightest and the cleanest ; because I avoid to keep company with some travellers that are less grave and others that are more sour than they ought to be ; or, in fine, because I follow a guide that either is or is not clothed in white and crowned with a mitre ? Certainly, if we consider right, we shall find that, for the most part, they are such frivolous things as these, that (without any prejudice to religion, or the salvation of souls, if not accompanied with superstition or hypocrisy) might either be observed or omitted ; I say, they are such things as these, which breed implacable enmities amongst Christian brethren, who are all agreed in the substantial and truly fundamental part of religion " (Works, vol. ii. p. 251).

Admirable, however, as is in many ways the critical enlightenment of Locke, it tends to be one-sided and dogmatic. Its standard of examination is one external to the thing itself. It looks at intellectual formations and moral institutions from the outside rather than from the inside. It is defective in historical insight and appreciation. This want of historical reverence is a defect which Locke shares in common with the other writers of the time. Neither Locke nor those who immediately succeeded him attached enough importance to the continued existence of a custom or belief. They were unable to appreciate the services which an imperfect form, a distorted aspect of a truth, had rendered in the development of humanity. They had not come to understand the value which experience, as the collective knowledge of the race, possessed for truth. Locke indeed calls his procedure in the *Essay* a "plain historical method." But the absence of such a standpoint appear repeatedly in his assertions of the value of individual opinion over the traditional beliefs of others. The fragment on "Study" warns us to avoid an aim and desire to know what have been other men's opinions :—

"Truth needs no recommendation, and error is not mended by it ; and in our inquiry after knowledge it as little concerns us what other men have thought as it does one who is to go from Oxford to London to know what scholars walked quietly on foot, inquiring the way and surveying the country as they went, who rode post after their guide without minding the way he went, who were carried along muffled up in a coach with their company, or where one doctor lost or went out of his way, or where another stuck in the mire. . . . I do not say this to undervalue the light we receive from others, or to think there are not those who assist us mightily in our endeavours after knowledge ; but I think it is an idle and useless thing to make it one's business to study what have been other men's sentiments in

things where reason is only to be judge, on purpose to be furnished with them, and to be able to cite them on all occasions" (King's Life, vol. i. pp. 174, 175).

This is but one instance among several that might be produced of the lack of historical sense in Locke. The conceptions of development and continuity, of gradual progress and evolution, were all foreign to the atmosphere in which he lived. He had none of Aristotle's anxiety to show the harmony between his own beliefs and those of mankind as a whole. The study of primitive culture, of antiquity in general, had not yet arisen. Nowhere did this unhistorical standpoint show itself more clearly than in the "Treatises on Government." It led to that fiction of a social contract, by which a company of independent men met together and set up a government. It supported the view of the king as merely "the image, phantom, or representative of the commonwealth." The Treatises, indeed, did good service in the opposition which they offered to the ridiculous theory of Filmer. They contain many truths which, to our loss, have not yet become familiar principles in statesmanship. They were the first to expose the rotten boroughs. But they fail, from the unhistorical nature of their standpoint, to explain the real nature of the State as a moral unity, an organic whole. Nor is it merely in political speculation that this lack of historical insight detracts from the value of Locke's views. It diminishes in no small degree the positive merits of the Essay. Locke did not sufficiently recognise the fact that the theory of innate ideas, extravagant and inconsequential though it was, contained a germ of truth which his conception of the mind as a "dark chamber" and "sheet of white paper" failed to recognise.

The method, therefore, to be applied not only in philosophy, but also in politics and in religion, is not criticism merely, but criticism which is historical. The critical attitude of mind must be wedded to the faculty of historical appreciation; and a natural history of man must be made the basis of all progress in philosophy. This is a subject on which we have no novel doctrines to lay down. We are content to adopt those which Stuart Mill stated in this "Review" in 1840, in the course of his well-known article on Coleridge. In the instructive parallel which Mill drew between the influence of Bentham and that of Coleridge, he sufficiently indicated the two standpoints which, if thought is to progress at all, must always be connected. "By Bentham beyond all others," Mill pointed out, "men have been led to ask themselves, in regard to any ancient or received opinion, Is it true? and by Coleridge, What is the meaning of it? Bentham judged a proposition true or false as it accorded or not with the

result of his own inquiries, and did not search very curiously into what might be meant by the proposition where it obviously did not mean what he thought true. With Coleridge, on the contrary, the very fact that any doctrine had been believed by thoughtful men, and received by whole nations or generations of mankind, was part of the problem to be solved, was one of the phenomena to be accounted for." Both those modes of thought, Mill went on to show, called for recognition. And he concluded, in words which we may be allowed to quote, by insisting on the necessary co-existence of antagonistic modes of thought—conflicting tendencies which, for the perfect understanding of a question, required to be united in the mind. "The spirit of philosophy in England, like that of religion, is still rootedly sectarian. Conservative thinkers and Liberals, transcendentalists and admirers of Hobbes and Locke, regard each other as out of the pale of philosophical intercourse, look upon each other's speculations as vitiated by an original taint, which makes all study of them, except for purposes of attack, useless, if not mischievous. An error much the same as if Kepler had refused to profit by Ptolemy's or Tycho's observations, because those astronomers believed that the sun moved round the earth; or as if Priestley and Lavoisier, because they differed on the subject of phlogiston, had rejected each other's chemical experiments. It is even a still greater error than either of these. For among the truths long recognised by Continental philosophers, but which very few Englishmen have yet arrived at, one is the importance, in the present imperfect state of mental and social science, of antagonist modes of thought, which, it will one day be felt, are as necessary to one another in speculation as mutually checking powers are in a political constitution. A clear insight, indeed, into this necessity is the only rational or enduring basis of philosophical tolerance, the only condition under which liberality in matters of opinion can be anything better than a synonym for indifference between one opinion and another."

These striking words of Mr. Mill would not be strengthened by anything that we might add. They indicate, we think, the main lesson to be gathered from Locke's Life and Works. Locke's Treatises will always be an education for the human race. The "Essay concerning Human Understanding" will always remain a standard text-book on philosophy. But it must be read as Locke's own method requires it to be read. To follow slavishly its doctrines is not only to seek the living among the dead—it is to be false to that attitude of criticism which is the chief lesson that Locke teaches. But further, this criticism must be historical in basis. Locke belongs to the seventeenth century; and to criticise him through the categories of the nineteenth is to

ignore his true significance in speculation. Nor is it to Locke only that this method of historical criticism must be applied. That historical attitude which Herder laid the foundation of, and which later German philosophy carried out, must be more and more recognised as an element in true philosophy. A logic which traces the natural development of thought must become the organon conducting to a philosophy of nature and a philosophy of mind. It is only a historical logic of this nature which can remove sectarianism in philosophy by showing how antagonistic modes of thought must merge by Dialectic into one. A study of the progressive types of thought will show how "that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural;" and in the evolution of the idea which underlies the world, it will find a place for every phase of intellectual belief. It will show how theories which in the understanding are disjoined must in the reason, which thus reads the truth of history, be thought together. What holds good of philosophy is true in no less measure of religion. There also history and criticism must go together. It is precisely because Locke combined historical insight with critical temper in religion more than in philosophy that his "Reasonableness of Christianity" still comes with so much life and inspiration. The natural reverence with which he approached religious truths led to his asking, in regard to the Christian faith, not only, Is this true? but also, What is the meaning of it? And this method, we may say in the closing phrase of Plato's "Republic," "will save us also," and will create a religion like Locke's, as Le Clerc describes it, "tainted neither by melancholy nor superstition."

INDEPENDENT CONTRIBUTIONS.

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

THE FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES OF THE GOVERNMENT
OF INDIA.

ON the 11th August last, Professor Fawcett gave notice of his intention, during the next session of Parliament, to move for a Committee to inquire into several questions connected with the administration of India. For some years past it has been apparent that the finances of that country are not in a satisfactory condition, and matters became seriously complicated when a great depreciation in silver, and the consequent fall in the rate of exchange between India and England, added to the difficulties of the administration. The recovery which has subsequently taken place in the value of that metal, and the prospect that such recovery will be maintained, have removed a serious cause of anxiety; but it would be a great error to believe that the Government has thereby been relieved of its difficulties. Those difficulties existed when the value of silver was greater than it is at present, and the necessity for reform may be considered as urgent now as it was at the close of the last session of Parliament.

Ever since 1858, when the administration of India was transferred to the Crown, the expenditure has constantly been in excess of the income, although the latter has meanwhile been considerably increased by taxation; and the funded debt of the country, which amounted to only sixty millions at the time of the transfer, has grown to more than twice that sum, and is rapidly increasing. In a similar state of things, and with a revenue that has of late given little sign of buoyancy, it is evident that, unless averted by reform, a crisis must soon result from the practice of meeting annual deficits by loans. The matter has been discussed to some extent in the leading journals, since the introduction of the last Indian Budget in Parliament;

and whatever be the opinions which predominate on particular points connected with the subject, the public are fully alive to the fact that the finances of India are in a very critical condition, and that a thorough revision of the system which has produced this dangerous result is urgently needed. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the appointment of a Committee, as proposed by Professor Fawcett, will receive the support of Parliament at an early period of the session. Without anticipating the conclusions at which such a Committee might arrive, a consideration of the causes that have led to the present difficulties, and of the effect which those difficulties have had on the administration of the country, and the condition and feelings of the people, might materially assist in determining the nature of the reforms that are needed. It is proposed, therefore, in this paper to take a cursory view of those questions, and to offer a few remarks with regard to them.

First. As regards *the causes of the present financial difficulties*, they must be looked for in the events which occurred subsequently to the mutinies of 1857, since, until that period, no sign of unsoundness was perceptible in the financial administration of India. On the abolition of the East India Company in 1858, the powers that had been exercised by that body, and those vested in the India Board of Control, were all transferred to a Secretary of State, in whom has since rested the final control and direction of the affairs of India. When this transfer was in contemplation, the Government was warned by the late Mr. J. S. Mill, that incalculable injury would be inflicted upon India, unless some influence were created for the protection of her interests, such as they had previously received from the East India Company; but the warning was disregarded. The constitutional defects in the form of government which was then devised for India, have been clearly indicated by Professor Fawcett, in his admirable speeches in Parliament, from which it will suffice here to quote the following passages.—

“Directly a Secretary of State for India begins to know his work, he may have to retire into Opposition, or party exigencies may require that he should be shifted to some other department. During the first three years that I was in Parliament, there were three Secretaries of State for India, and, I think, four Under Secretaries. Party government does not give an effective administrative machine; but it gives us this advantage, that it brings the pressure of public opinion rapidly to bear upon the Government. But as India has no representation in this House, and little public opinion in her support out of doors, she has to bear the disadvantages of party government without enjoying any of its advantages.”

A year later, the Professor, speaking on the same subject, said :—

“The East India Company, having a direct personal interest in the finances of India, was bound by the most potent of all motives to exercise a constant and zealous watchfulness over her finances. Under the existing system we cannot feel the slightest security that any one will exercise the same watchfulness. This indicates the great difference between the past and the present ; and it will not be difficult to show that it affords an explanation of the fact that, whereas the administration of the finances of India was formerly distinguished by the most remarkable frugality, it is now characterised by the most reckless extravagance.”

Nothing that I might add could bring out more forcibly the origin of the causes that have been at work, under the system of government inaugurated in 1858, in producing the financial disorganisation which we now discover. To say that the degree of economy attainable in State expenditure depends, as a rule, on the degree of influence which a nation exercises over its administration, is merely to repeat a truism. We all acknowledge a truth so self-evident, and in no country is the action of the executive more jealously watched and more systematically controlled than it is in England. Can it then be any matter for surprise to us, that this fundamental principle of economic policy should find its application in India likewise, and that an executive, liberated from all those constitutional restraints which we consider so essential to good government at home, should, in the management of the affairs of India, relax in its watchfulness, and fail to practise due economy? We may safely accept the absence of those influences which protect the people of Great Britain from waste and extravagance on the part of their Government, *i.e.*, of Parliamentary supervision and control over the executive, as the primary cause of the financial derangement in the affairs of India, which is forcing itself upon the attention of the public.

A serious difficulty, however, meets us as soon as we endeavour to supply this deficiency. Parliament certainly possesses the power of control over the administration of India, and the power carries with it the moral obligation of exercising it for her protection. Nevertheless, Parliament has always evinced an unwillingness to discharge such duty. Can this unwillingness proceed from the absence of real interest in the matters at stake? It is true that none of its members has specially been elected to represent India : but Indian interests have, in a great measure, become English interests ; any serious calamity befalling India would bring desolation to thousands of English homes, and, if due to official incapacity, would be a disgrace to the English

nation. The people of this country have therefore a deep interest in the safety and welfare of our Indian Empire, and would doubtless willingly exercise for its protection their influence over their representatives in Parliament, if they knew by what means Indian interests would best be served. The diversity in the opinions generally expressed on Indian affairs betrays, however, a want of precise information on the subject; and this want will easily be understood if we look at the scantiness and the misleading character of the accounts and reports that are annually submitted for the information of Parliament. There can be little doubt that, with more ample and more accurate information, the public would evince greater interest in the condition of India, and that their influence would soon be felt in Parliament. It is much to be regretted that circumstances should have prevented a comprehensive report being drawn up, on the valuable evidence so laboriously collected by the Indian Finance Committee; but one thing has been clearly recorded by that Committee, viz., that the Government of India should be called upon to furnish Parliament with more ample and more accurate information than it has hitherto afforded. The report drawn up by the Committee on the 18th July 1871 declared that the Indian accounts that were submitted to Parliament did not contain sufficient detail, and were not made in such a manner as to show the results of the financial operations of the Indian Government; and the report indicated what is really wanted by pointing to "the Estimates for the Naval, Military, and Miscellaneous Civil Expenditure, both for the Effective and Non-effective services, which are laid on the table of the House by her Majesty's Government." If Parliament would insist on similar estimates for India being furnished in due season, members would, with the additional assistance which they would receive from that section of the public who take an intelligent and lively interest in India, and whose number is annually increasing, be in a position to discuss the Indian Budget in a more practical and useful manner than it has hitherto been discussed in Parliament, and with a better prospect than there appears at present, of enforcing the reform which is so urgently needed, for placing the affairs of our great dependency upon a safe and a sound footing.

The next question which I proposed to consider was *the effect which the financial difficulties of the Government of India have had on her administration, and on the condition and feelings of her people.*

Under the pressure of those difficulties the Government have been led (among other measures adopted for increasing their income) to enhance arbitrarily the land-tax, and to enforce the payment of their demands, often illegal, by summary modes of

procedure, which have been productive of great injustice. Their pressing difficulties seem to have betrayed them into acts partaking, in a still greater degree, of the character of spoliation. Several instances have come to light of private estates having been seized on behalf of the Government, upon grounds as unjustifiable as they were illegal, and their number bears probably but a small proportion to the number of instances which have actually occurred. Before citing cases in support of the above charges, it might be as well, in order to show how small are the chances which the mass of the populations in India have of obtaining redress for wrongs inflicted by the Government, to say a few words on the constitution of the courts of justice, to which the people have access.

In the Non-regulation provinces, which are very extensive, there exist no proper law courts, the executive officers in these provinces being authorised to discharge judicial functions, in addition to their legitimate duties. In land-revenue cases, therefore, the judge is generally an interested party to the suit which he has to decide, and the result of such a combination may, in the majority of cases, easily be surmised. The suitor has a right of appeal; but his suit, in the second instance, is heard by an executive officer also, and, as the action complained of has generally been taken by the direction or with the sanction of the chief executive officer in the province, its justice or legality is seldom questioned by his subordinates. In some cases a further appeal lies to the High Court of the Presidency, a properly-constituted tribunal, which is presided over by an English barrister-judge, independent of the Government; but the expense of such a reference is beyond the means of the greater number of suitors; nor can the High Court adjudicate on appeal, excepting on a point of law.

In the other provinces, where the judicial machinery is less objectionable, the chances in favour of suitors obtaining an impartial verdict in cases where the Government are their opponents are still slender. Each district has a civil court, presided over by an English judge, and subordinate courts of different grades. The English judge, who is a member of the Indian Civil Service, and whose previous career has been spent in the discharge of executive duties, has received no legal training; and, as his prospects of promotion greatly depend on the goodwill of the Government, he is by no means an independent judge in cases in which the Government have an interest.

The following instances will more precisely illustrate the actual condition of things.

The Deshs of Kahlipur, in Guzrát, have for centuries held land subject to a fixed amount of revenue payable to the State.

Suddenly a demand was made upon them for about four times the sum due; and the case, after passing through the local tribunals of the province, came up on appeal before the High Court of Bombay, where it was thoroughly investigated. No admissible plea for the extraordinary demand enforced by the revenue officials could be offered on behalf of the Government; and the following passage in Sir Michael Westropp's judgment, delivered on the 22d December 1875, when a decree was given in favour of the plaintiffs, the Deshs, will convey an idea of the opinion entertained by the court, not only on the conduct of the revenue authorities in the instance in question, but on their habitual disregard of the rights of the people. The Chief Justice said, "The defendants' case shows a deliberate disregard for ancient vested rights; and the imperfect, perfunctory, and one-sided manner in which it has been conducted is not the only instance of the over-zeal with which revenue cases are managed by Government officers."

When the aggrieved parties are able, as in the above instance, to defray the expense of an appeal to the High Court, there is still a chance of their ultimately obtaining some measure of relief; and the law courts act in some degree as a restraint upon over-zealous officials intent upon increasing the revenue, regardless of the unfairness or illegality of the means used. But this security, qualified as it is, will now be taken away from the people of the Bombay Presidency, a Bill having recently been passed, which has for its object to "*limit the jurisdiction of the civil courts throughout that Presidency in matters relating to the land-revenue.*" As the history of this Bill throws some light on the course followed by the Government for adding to its income, it may be as well to give a short sketch of it here. The Bill was first introduced in 1873, and, in its "Objects and Reasons," reference was made to a case in which a small landholder, objecting to the assessment imposed on his field, on the ground that it contravened the Government rule, that the tax should not be more than one-sixth of the gross produce, sought relief against the action of the assessor, and, on appeal to the High Court of Bombay, obtained a readjustment of the demand. Great was the outcry against the judgment in the revenue department. Assessments had been very extensively enhanced, and much of the additional revenue expected might have to be given up, if the grounds of the assessments were to be inquired into and adjudicated upon, according to law. The mover of the Bill said, "If every man is allowed to question in a court of law the incidence of the assessment on his field, the number of cases which might arise is likely to be overwhelming." This awkward declaration,

virtually amounting to an admission of widespread injustice, seems to have led to the withdrawal of the Bill in 1873, and nothing further was heard of the measure for about two years. Suddenly it reappeared in October 1875, was passed in the December following, in the face of strong protests from the public, and is now under the consideration of the Secretary of State.* The great necessity which the officials in India seem to feel for a measure of this kind, is a convincing proof that the means by which we derive our land-revenue are so illegal and unjust, that our proceedings cannot bear the daylight of judicial investigation.

In Northern India, as well as in the Bombay Presidency, measures have been taken for shielding revenue officers from the action of the law courts. Two remarkable Bills, professing to place the land-law of Upper India on a satisfactory footing, were passed in November 1873, which, among several other very questionable clauses, provided for the withdrawal of revenue matters from the cognisance of the civil courts. The debate which took place on the occasion betrayed the singular fact, that the Council, who were passing the measures in question, were not satisfied either with their justice or their policy. The President and the Finance Minister seemed to have nothing to urge in support of the principles embodied in the Bills, and the Military member voted for them upon trust. The Law member confessed that "*before drawing the Bills he had to divest himself of those principles with which he had been familiar, and that much of the matter was to him of great complexity, obscurity, and uncertainty*;" words which, to men who had studied the Bills, simply meant that the Bills violated principles of justice and equity, such as an English lawyer and all educated Englishmen have been taught to respect. The Official member for Madras, after expressing serious doubts on the necessity and soundness of the measures, voted for them, nevertheless, but added these ominous words, "I can only express a hope that when the Bills become law, they might prove an exception to our past experience in regard to enactments affecting land-tenures." The Lieutenant-Governor and the Official member for the North-West Provinces, with whom the Bills in a measure originated, brought some specious arguments in their defence; but Sir William Muir concluded with the following words, which betray a decided

* This Bill, it is said, has been slightly modified and sent back to India, with "an expression of the doubts entertained by Lord Salisbury as to the wisdom of the measure;" but no precise information on the subject had reached the public when the mail of 27th November left Bombay.

antagonism to some of the most important provisions in the Bills: "In reference to the peculiar powers taken for officers engaged on the revision of settlements, I hope to see the time when these revisions of the land-revenue will not occur with the same frequency as they now do, and that existing settlements will be prolonged; or, if a certain enhancement of revenue were deemed to be justified and necessary, that it might at any rate be assessed upon some other procedure involving less of inquisition and interference with the agricultural classes than is inherent in the present system." Lastly, the Official members for Bengal and Bombay, who were the only other members present, also voted for the Bills, but, while defending their action by the best arguments at their command, clearly, and in forcible language, expressed their antagonism to several provisions of the Bills; and it became manifest that the measures had the approval of none of the members of that Council, and that they were being passed in obedience to orders emanating from a superior authority.

An attempt is also being made to curtail further the jurisdiction of the civil courts all over India, in suits concerning land, even when the Government are not a party to such suits. Clauses have been inserted for this purpose in the new CIVIL PROCEDURE BILL, which was discussed last October at Simla, empowering the executive, by a mere notification in the "Official Gazette," to withdraw from the control of the courts all immovable property decreed for sale in satisfaction of debt, and, at its discretion, to sell such property, or to mortgage it, or to let it on farm for twenty years, or to manage it through its own officers, on account of the concerned, "exercising throughout all the powers of its owner." The executive is, moreover, empowered to "impose conditions in respect of sales of any class of interests in land, in execution of decrees for money, or to prohibit such sales where such interests are, in its opinion, so uncertain and undetermined as to make it impossible to fix their value."

The clauses in question, while they profess to protect the interests of judgment debtors, are in reality calculated to injure them very materially, and to depreciate landed property, by enhancing the risks, and otherwise aggravating the position of mortgagees, the payment of whose claim may, under the proposed law, be indefinitely delayed, and the stipulated interest on whose loan may be considerably reduced, at the discretion of an executive officer. Many a landholder who at present is able to tide over a bad season by borrowing upon mortgage whatever may be deficient in the year's income for satisfying the Collector's demand, would, under the same circumstances, if the clauses referred to became law, fail to obtain money upon

mortgage, and be compelled to sacrifice his property by an immediate sale.

The proposed enactment, by placing private interests in virtually irresponsible hands, violates all sound principles of legislation, and is certain, if it pass, to inflict very great injury on the landed interests of India, an injury which cannot fail to recoil upon the Government, since the greater portion of the income of the State is derived from land.

The various circumstances detailed above, if considered in connection with the reports of revenue officers on the difficulty of realising the land-revenue, on the extent of land thrown out of cultivation, and on the general distress prevailing among the agricultural classes, will bring out in a clear light the results of the pernicious system of periodical revisions of the land-tax, which has obtained throughout the greater part of India. The success of a settlement officer's work, on which his advancement must depend, is generally measured by the amount of revenue which he is instrumental in raising; and the temptation for him to impose heavy assessments is therefore very great. The danger attending such a system has repeatedly been brought to the notice of Government, as well by actual results as by the reports of their own officers. Sir George Wingate, a highly distinguished settlement officer in the Bombay Presidency, wrote in 1841: "No unnecessary reduction can injure the country, and the Government revenue can only suffer to the extent of such reduction. An error upon one side involves an inevitable ruin of the country; an error upon the other, some inconsiderable sacrifice of the finance of the State; and with such unequal stakes depending, can we hesitate as to which should be given the preponderance?" The sound advice conveyed in the above passage doubtless produced good effect at the time, but has long been disregarded.

In the Madras Presidency the practice is to revise the land-settlements annually, and to make them as high as the land will bear when the crop is a good one. Arrears therefore arise whenever the season is not very favourable, and the landholders are thus kept constantly in difficulties. In the other provinces the assessments are generally for longer periods, and for fixed proportions of the estimated gross produce or of the rental of the land; but as these data cannot be accurately ascertained, a very wide discretion is left to the settlement officers, and the assessments for some years past have often been made excessively heavy, and added much to the difficulty of collecting the revenue, leading ultimately to large tracts of land being thrown out of cultivation.

In the fertile and once rich province of Oudh, which we annexed in 1856, Sir George Couper, the Chief Commissioner, said in his report for 1873, "The lauded proprietors, *with scarcely a*

single exception, are in debt and difficulties, . . . and the ryots and cultivators are generally in "a very poor way." The assessments in that province had recently been increased by £421,820; and owing to the arrears into which the collection of the revenue had fallen, a conference was held at the Chief Commissioner's in December 1873; at which the Viceroy was present; and it was then found that the rapid enhancement of the land-revenue, and the litigation consequent thereon, were among the chief causes of the arrears.

The injury inflicted on the country by the land-settlements, as they are carried on in Northern India, is graphically described by Mr. Auckland Colvin, one of the ablest revenue officers in the North-West Provinces, in his *Memorandum* written in 1872, from which a few extracts will enable the reader to form a correct idea of the system in force.

"Twenty-six years have elapsed from the date on which the first of the districts now comprised in the North-West were placed in the hands of a settlement officer; in other districts the settlements were commenced twelve years ago, and are not yet sanctioned; in one of these they are not yet completed. These facts are significant to those who know what the settlement of a district means. The value of property depreciated until the exact amount of the new assessment is declared; credit affected; heartburning and irritation between landlord and tenant; suspicion of the intentions of the Government; a host of official underlings scattered broadcast over the vexed villages. . . . Nothing can equal the injury inflicted by a slow, uncertain settlement, obstructed by conflicting orders, and harassed by successive administrations."

Even in the Punjab, where political considerations should have made it imperative on us to be conciliatory towards a people whose loyalty had so powerfully aided us in reconquering Upper India in 1857 and 1858, moderation in land-assessments was cast aside, and in 1872, settlements for a term of twenty years, which had been concluded with the concurrence of Government by experienced and conscientious officers, during the previous seven years, were condemned by a newly-appointed Governor, as involving a wanton sacrifice of revenue, and were arbitrarily directed to terminate at the expiration of ten years. Lord Mayo had just died, and nearly two years elapsed before the circumstances of the case could be brought in a complete form to the notice of the new Viceroy. Meanwhile the feelings of the landholders may be imagined when they were told that a revision of their settlement would take place shortly, and when they understood that such revision meant greatly-increased assessments. Land became depreciated, and the people openly said that "the

Sercár had broken its word." Landholders and cultivators gave out that they must abstain from digging wells and reclaiming waste lands, as they put no faith in the promises of the Government, and did not know when the land-tax might again be raised. Ultimately Lord Northbrook directed the order reducing the term of the settlements to be repealed; but owing to the manner in which that direction was carried out, the evil effects of the provincial order were but very partially mitigated. Not only was the repeal delayed, but it was made to appear as if it had emanated, upon reconsideration, from the very authorities who had issued the objectionable order. This prevented the people from feeling confidence in the stability of the settlements, and they expressed their fears lest the same authorities should again change their mind, and at any moment alter the terms of the assessments.

The short-sighted policy pursued during the last twenty years in connection with the land-revenue, contrasts in a very striking manner with the views of the same subject which were entertained by past administrations. By the *Bombay Revenue Jurisdiction* and the *Northern India Revenue Acts*, landholders and cultivators, having differences with the Government, are shut out of the law courts, and have to submit to the decision of revenue officers, *i.e.*, of representatives of the very Government with whom their differences exist; while in 1793, Regulation II. provided that all such differences should be referred to courts of law presided over by judges wholly uninterested in the result of their decisions, and bound, from their official situation and the nature of their trust, to decide impartially between the Government and the people. The preamble to that Regulation places the question, in all its bearings, in so clear a light, that I cannot do better than reproduce it here *in extenso*. It runs thus:—

"All questions between Government and the landholders respecting the assessment and collection of the public revenue, and disputed claims between the latter and their ryots (tenants), have hitherto been cognisable in the Courts of Maal Adawlut, or Revenue Courts. The Collectors of revenue preside in these courts as judges, and an appeal lies from their decision to the Board of Revenue, and from the decrees of that Board to the Governor-General in Council in the department of revenue. The proprietors can never consider the privileges which have been conferred upon them as secure, whilst the revenue officers are vested with these judicial powers. Exclusive of the objections arising to these courts from their irregular, summary, and often *ex parte* proceedings, and from the Collectors being obliged to suspend the exercise of their judicial functions whenever they interfere with their financial duties, it is obvious that, if the Regulations for assessing and collecting the public revenue are

infringed, the revenue officers themselves must be the aggressors, and that individuals who have been wronged by them in one capacity, can never hope to obtain redress from them in another. Their financial occupations equally disqualify them for administering the laws between the proprietors of land and their tenants. Other security, therefore, must be given to landed property, and to the rights attached to it, before the desired improvements in agriculture can be expected to be effected. Government must divest itself of the power of infringing, in its executive capacity, the rights and privileges which, as exercising the legislative authority, it has conferred on the landholders. The revenue officers must be deprived of their judicial powers. All financial claims of the public, when disputed under the Regulations, must be subjected to the cognisance of courts of judicature, superintended by judges who, from their official situations and the nature of their trusts, shall not only be wholly uninterested in the result of their decisions, but bound to decide impartially between the public and the proprietors of land, and also between the latter and their tenants. The Collectors of the revenue must not only be divested of the power of deciding upon their own acts, but rendered amenable for them to the courts of judicature, and collect the public dues, subject to a personal prosecution for every exaction exceeding the amount which they are authorised to demand on behalf of the public, and for every deviation from the regulations prescribed for the collection of it. No power will then exist in the country by which the rights vested in the landholders by the Regulations can be infringed, or the value of landed property affected. Land must in consequence become the most desirable of all property, and the industry of the people will be directed to those improvements in agriculture which are as essential to their own welfare as to the prosperity of the State."

The sound legislation of 1793 has realised what was expected from it, as is shown by the prosperous condition of the provinces where it has been in operation. Before 1793, and for some years subsequently, those provinces were in a wretched state of destitution. The land-tax being excessive as compared with the productive value of the land, could never be collected in its entirety, and heavy arrears always hung over the heads of the owners and cultivators, ready to swallow up any surplus that an exceptionally fine season might produce. This and the right of the Government periodically to increase its demand, served effectually to check improvement in agriculture, and extension in the cultivation, seeing that the fruit of any capital and labour which might have been bestowed on such improvement and extension would have been absorbed in the Government demand, either in satisfaction of arrears or under a revision of the assessment. But as soon as a permanent settlement of the tax secured to the landowner any surplus which he might raise, advances and assistance were offered to settlers, habita-

tions were built, tanks were excavated, waste lands were gradually brought under cultivation; and the country, which had previously contained only isolated patches of cultivation, was, after years of labour, and by means of capital judiciously applied, converted into what it is now, an almost uninterrupted sheet of cultivation, where the land-revenue has for years past been collected with remarkable ease and regularity, and at small expense, in comparison with the cost of collecting the tax in the other provinces.

It must be observed that the legislation of 1793 acted in a harsh and severe manner towards those landlords of the period, who had not the means of rapidly extending the cultivation of their estates, and thereby satisfying in full the annual demand of the Government. Their estates were sold for arrears, and bought by men of greater resources, by whom the land has gradually been brought into its present condition in the manner already mentioned. The same legislation, however, has produced another remarkable effect, that of breaking up large estates in the following manner. A great number of ryots so improved their farms that, after paying their rents and all expenses, they saved enough to purchase in time the *putnee* or perpetual lease of their fields, thereby virtually becoming peasant proprietors subject to a quit-rent; and the number of such ryots is steadily increasing. It will thus be seen that Mr. J. S. Mill indicated exactly what India needed, when he said, "What is wanted is permanent possession on fixed terms. The rent should be a fixed charge not liable to be raised against the possessor by his own improvements or by the will of a landlord:" a condition that the *putneedar* has realised for his own benefit.

The principle of maintaining the property in land to the State, whereby the Government would be entitled to claim a certain proportion of the produce for the benefit of the public, would involve no injustice in practice, provided the due proportion claimable could be defined. Hitherto, all attempts effectually to restrain the revenue department in India from over-assessing the share of the Government have failed: nor can a more favourable result be expected, as long as the power of determining the respective shares of the two parties entitled to the produce of the land, is left entirely to one of those parties. Under the form of government which obtains in India, the ryot has no voice in the settlement of a question upon which his whole substance and his very life are staked; nor has he the means of obtaining redress when he is unjustly dealt with. The consequence has been that, in innumerable instances, the settlement officers have claimed for the Government more than its equi-

table share in the produce ; while the ryot has been driven, for his protection, to exercise his ingenuity in deceiving the revenue officers, and keeping the Government as much as possible in the dark as to the productive value of the land. This unseemly contest has had the most demoralising effects upon the people, and has greatly tended to widen the gulf which separates them from their foreign rulers.

A few instances will now be cited in support of the assertion already made, that private estates have been seized on behalf of the Government upon grounds as unjustifiable as they were illegal. The Koth succession case, finally decided in 1874, furnishes a remarkable instance of the kind. The Thákur of Koth, a landed proprietor in the Bombay Presidency, having died, leaving a widow pregnant at the time of his death, the Bombay Government seized his estate, and took forcible possession of £8400 of Indian Government Stock from the hands of the widow, besides seizing a balance of £174, 6s. which was in the Savings' Bank, and a sum of £23, 6s. which the widow had placed in the hands of her lawyer. The unfortunate woman gave birth to a male child, and, as his guardian, claimed her deceased husband's property ; but every obstacle was placed in the way of her getting it, and it was attempted, through officers of the Government, to destroy her credit and her character, in order to prevent her obtaining loans for prosecuting her suit in the law courts. With the assistance of friends, however, she succeeded in appealing to the civil court of Ahmedabád, and in obtaining from it a certificate establishing her rights ; but the Government ordered the judge to revoke that certificate, and the judge obeyed that illegal order. The widow then appealed to the High Court of Bombay, when every effort was made by the Government to set aside the jurisdiction of that court ; and the intended spoliation would have been definitively accomplished had such endeavour been successful. But the High Court maintained its right, and a perusal of the judgment delivered by it can alone give an adequate idea of the persecution which the widow suffered, and of the means by which the Government had sought to encompass its purpose. The Chief Justice said—

“ I have met with no other case in the course of my experience which bore plainer marks of falsehood and fabrication. . . . One most extraordinary circumstance is that, after a long contest in the courts, the Government, through their officers, requested the judge at Ahmedabád to revoke that certificate (a certificate based upon a judicial decision), and the judge was weak enough and ill-advised enough to suspend it. . . . Furthermore, there was a hue and

cry throughout the country, raised through the officers of the Government, to destroy the woman's credit, in order to prevent her fighting her own and her son's battles. That was a very extraordinary course for the Government officers to pursue. . . . The conduct of the Government necessarily protracted the proceedings. . . . Under all the circumstances, . . . judgment must go for the plaintiff, with costs."

The costs are said to have amounted to some £30,000 ; but the financial question dwindles into insignificance when compared with the discredit which the conduct of the executive in that instance brought on the British Government in India.

In the next case, it was again a woman who was selected for spoliation. The seclusion of Oriental life, in the upper classes of society, places females in India at a great disadvantage in protecting their property.

Shortly after the mutinies of 1857, Thákuráin Sukráj Kuar, a Hindoo lady of Oudh, was forcibly dispossessed of her lands on the plea of her disaffection to the British Government. The authorities had been misinformed regarding this lady's conduct, and had adopted the above course without affording her an opportunity of justifying herself. There being no proper court of law in the province, the Thákuráin had to lay her petition complaining of the action of the British Government, before an officer of that very Government, the Assistant Commissioner of Oudh, who discharged both executive and judicial functions. A full investigation into her case proved the confiscation of her lands to have been unjustifiable, and a decree was given for their restoration. The Government, however, discovered some technical irregularity in the proceedings, and availing itself of the same, had the case referred to a superior officer, the Deputy-Commissioner of the province. This second trial resulted also in favour of the lady ; but the Government, loath to give up the estate, suspended the execution of the decree, and directed the matter to be referred to the Chief Commissioner or head executive officer of the province. This officer, without assigning any ground for his decision, reversed the judgment of his subordinates, and left the widow bereft of her property. There was no tribunal in India to which she could appeal from this last decree ; but her friends prevailed on her to lay her case before her Majesty's Privy Council in England ; and, after long years of anxiety and privation, she obtained in 1871 the reversal of the Chief Commissioner's decree, and an order for the restitution of her lands, of which she had, for some fourteen years, unjustly been kept out through the powerful action of the Government of India. The following passages in the judgment delivered by

the Privy Council will show the sense which the judges entertained of the conduct of the Indian authorities :—

“The case in its original hearing was investigated with a care that cannot be too highly praised, and the Assistant Commissioner, acting as judge, pronounced in the lady’s favour. . . . When, on appeal to the Deputy-Commissioner, the original decree was confirmed, the matter should have rested there. It appears, however, that the plaintiff’s villages had been included in a grant to an Oudh loyalist, . . . and it was thought that it would be very embarrassing if the grantee was obliged to give up the subject of his grant to the rightful owner, and accordingly a further appeal was made to the Chief Commissioner, who reversed the decree of the subordinate officers, and the poor widow was thereby left stripped of her whole property. . . . It would be a scandal to any legislation if it arbitrarily, and without any assignable reason, swept away such rights (as those of the plaintiff); and in this very painful case, it is at all events agreeable to their Lordships to find that no such scandal attaches to the Laws or Regulations or Government Acts in force in Oudh; and that the cruel wrong of which this lady has been the victim is due to the misapprehension of the law by the Chief Commissioner. . . . Their Lordships cannot but express a hope that, by an act of prompt justice and a liberal estimate of what is due to this lady, the Government will relieve her from further litigation. She had two decisions in her favour, carefully and correctly adjudged, which, as they were consistent with the plainest principles of justice, it should have been the effort of an appellate tribunal, unless the law controlled it, to maintain.”

In both the above cases a very painful impression is created by the evidence they present of a Government giving its countenance and support to misguided officers willing to perpetrate, for the benefit of their employers, the most flagrant acts of injustice. The following case, which occurred during the administration of Lord Northbrook, is a pleasing contrast to the former, by the attitude assumed in it by the head of the Government.

Thákur Kopilnath instituted, through his mother and guardian, a suit for the recovery of his estate situate in the Non-regulation province of Chutia Nágpur, and valued at £14,226, 17s. The Deputy-Commissioner, who acted as judge, took advantage of the non-attendance of the plaintiff’s representative, when the case was called, to pass judgment against him in default, and refused to reconsider the order issued at the time for the immediate recovery of the costs. The intended injustice would have been crowned with success but for the intervention of the High Court of Calcutta, to whom the plaintiff appealed, and who caused the suit to be transferred for trial to that court. A report of the trial, which took place in January 1873, attracted the attention of the Viceroy; and an inquiry having been insti-

tuted into the conduct of the provincial authorities in connection with the case, his Excellency published a Resolution, in which the action of the Deputy-Commissioner was censured, and the following admonition given for the guidance of officers similarly situated :—

— “His Excellency in Council desires that there may be no misunderstanding as to the views and wishes of the Government of India with respect to litigation in which the Government is concerned. In many parts of India the union of judicial and executive functions in one chief officer of a district, is still and may long be inevitable; and his Excellency in Council trusts that all officers, who exercise this double power, realise the responsibility which it throws upon them for scrupulous observance of equity in all suits to which the Government which they serve is a party. To lean towards technical pleas in favour of Government, or towards technical obstacles against a suit which the Government defends, whenever such pleas or obstacles merely hinder a decision on the merits—to strain laws for the advantage of Government; all these things would be exactly contrary to the rule of judicial conduct which in such cases the Government desires to impose. And his Excellency in Council expects all officers to understand that the interests of Government are most effectually promoted by sedulously upholding this high standard of entire impartiality.”

That it should have been deemed necessary thus authoritatively to proclaim these simple rules of common fairness, indicates how tainted must be the atmosphere of the courts in the Non-regulation provinces of India. The admonition administered in this instance cannot, however, be expected to produce any great or lasting effect, while those who lent themselves on other occasions to the perpetration of injustice for the benefit of Government have escaped unreprieved, or are rewarded with promotion. The displeasure of Government at conduct such as the Oudh and Koth succession cases brought to light, must be marked in an unmistakable manner before the great evil, which has cast a stain on the British name in India, can effectually be combated.

From what has been said in the foregoing pages, the effects of the financial embarrassments of the Government of India on the administration of that country, and on the condition and feelings of the people, may be summed up in the following sentences :—

1. Excessive severity in the assessment, and increased difficulty in the collection, of the land-revenue in many parts of India.
2. Great distress among landowners and cultivators, owing to the pressure of the land-tax.
3. Frequent instances of disregard of the rights of the people and of violation of the law by revenue officers in their dealings with the landed interests of the country.

4. Legislation calculated to augment the last-mentioned evil, by releasing revenue officers, when charged with an infringement of the law, from the jurisdiction of the law courts.

5. General mistrust in the minds of the people in the intentions and the good faith of the Government.

These appalling results are all clearly traceable to the financial embarrassments of the Government, brought on during a period of peace and industrial activity, when the resources yielded by a rapidly-increasing trade should have been made to satisfy amply all the administrative wants of the country, and to produce prosperity and contentedness.

It will be observed that much of the evil has derived its existence from the power retained by the Government of periodically increasing the land-tax, and from the desire of exercising that power beyond its legitimate scope—a desire which has rendered the executive impatient of the restraints imposed by law, and resulted in the indefensible legislation by which the administration of India has been marked during the last ten years. A remarkable circumstance, however, is, that while the power just mentioned is so persistently held, and so energetically exercised, it has actually proved useless in its main object, which is the increase of revenue. Since 1869 the land-revenue, although it has fluctuated, cannot be said to have increased; since, notwithstanding enhanced assessments, the average of the amounts recovered in subsequent years has been about the same as the amount that was collected in 1869.

It seems more likely that the power in question will defeat its own object, and lead to a diminution of the land-revenue, seeing the extent of land that has been thrown out of cultivation, and the distress that has been produced among the agricultural classes, by the effect of the excessive assessments imposed.

An obvious conclusion to be drawn from these facts is, that while the relinquishment of the power just alluded to is not likely to be detrimental to the land-revenue, such relinquishment would conduce—(1) To terminate the unprofitable and demoralising operations involved in the periodical land-settlements as they are carried on in India; (2) To lessen the expense of collecting the land-revenue; (3) By enhancing the value of land as a security, and by giving the landholder a powerful motive for increasing the productiveness of his fields, to encourage the application of capital to agriculture, and thereby greatly develop the principal industry of the Empire; (4) and lastly, to render unnecessary the anomalous legislation of late years, having for its object to place revenue officers above the law courts, a state of things that has encouraged lawlessness and injustice on the part of Government officials, and engendered mistrust and disaffection among the people.

J. DACOSTA.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

WE have read Dr. Mozley's sermons¹ more than once with the greatest pleasure. Few men, by their own gifts and by the chosen friends and associates of their lives, are so qualified to set forth the learned, philosophical, and cultivated side of the High Church theology. The dedication to the Dean of St. Paul's is, as were the dedications of Dr. Newman's sermons in olden days, no mere compliment, but an assertion of substantial agreement and of affectionate sympathy. The Regius Professor of Divinity is one of that band of friends who were associated with Dr. Newman when still within the pale of the English Church, and there is much in the tone of thought and style of this most interesting book which recalls to Oxford men the great teacher who left them.

We need not say that Dr. Mozley's standpoint is by no means ours ; but he is so calm, so temperate, so philosophical, so entirely free from the *odium theologicum*, that, whether we agree or disagree, our mental attitude towards the book is that of one who discusses deep matters with a friend from whom the widest difference of opinion can never divert his sympathy.

Perhaps the most striking sermon in the volume is that on "War and its Relations to Christianity and Civilisation." The author gives a most careful analysis of the manner in which—

"Christianity is weighted with human nature ; is burthened by having to act upon an alien hypothesis ; and has to admit within its pale a state of relationships full of dreadful disorder. Yet it stoops to conquer ; it grapples with the coarse elements of human nature, descends to the dust with man, to raise him out of it ; and accommodates its celestial birth to a worldly sojourn."

The following passage, which is the peroration of the sermon, strikes us as singularly beautiful :—

"The general only regards his men as masses, so much aggregate of force ; he cannot afford to look at them in any other respect ; he has only two things to look at ; the end and the means, he cannot pause between them to think of the life individual ; it would carry him into interminable thought ; it would be meditating as a sage, not acting ; the idea is overwhelming, and it would paralyse him ; he may admit it just for a moment, like Xerxes, but he must dismiss it instantly. No ! force is all he has to do with : if he thinks of the persons he totters ; if he pities he is gone. But the Church takes up the mass exactly where he left off ; at the units in it—the persons. Every one of these had his hopes, his interests, his

¹ "Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford." By J. B. Mozley, D.D. Second Edition. London : Rivingtons. 1876.

schemes, his prospects; but to some a wound, a loss of limb, in a moment altered all. Christianity comes to him as comforter, and shows how even that loss may be a gain. Every one of them has his home, where he is thought of, where he is somebody. If he has fallen, Christian hope alleviates the sorrow of that home. Thus the aspect of man as a mass was true for a purpose only, and false in itself. To some, to think of humanity as personal seems a dream and romance; that it is an aggregate, a whole, is the matter of fact; but to the Church this last is the dream, the first is the fact. Mankind is all mass to the human eye, and all individual to the divine" (p. 120).

In certain sermons, however, it seems to us that the cloistered shades of Oxford have fenced off from the Canon of Christ Church some of the noises which are blown across the world, so that they reach him but faintly, and the sounds are but little understood. His whole sermon on Positivism, with the title of "Eternal Life," seems to us characterised by a radical misconception of the standpoint of that philosophy and of that religion. We can criticise that sermon the more freely because the Positivist position is not our own. Canon Mozley describes the Comtist philosophy as an Atheism, and then says:—"We have been accustomed to connect Atheism with immorality and licentiousness; but here the coalition is in theory dissolved." Now, he ought to know that Positivism is not Atheism, neither is there in it as a philosophical system the denial of a future life. It is perfectly true that the conception of a future life is very different to that of the Christian Church, but, at the same time, other philosophies have speculated as to the mode of future life without being branded with the hard word Atheist. Surely the words "in theory" are a hard thing to say against those whose lives, if Dr. Mozley took the trouble to inquire, stand out above those of their fellows in our modern English society, distinguished by a severe standard of domestic life, of protest against the luxury of the time, of republicanism as stern and virtuous as that of the early Romans. The following lines are a specimen of how completely Dr. Mozley misapprehends that which he assails:—

"And for morality, again, you must have affections, and for affection you must have beings, and Atheism does not provide beings. Can you love phenomena? Nature is moved indeed, and a spirit half volatile and half melancholy breathes in light classic poetry toward all vanishing being, even upon the sympathetic ground of a common transiency; but love by its very laws tends towards a substance; it wants the solemnity of eternal being; it wants a beyond, and no being that is without this beyond can duly answer to it as an object. Atheistic morals, therefore, must always be stunted morals."

Now, he surely knows, or ought to have known before preaching of this in the University pulpit, that no "love for phenomena" is that which is at the basis of this religion, but that its love for humanity is as real a faith as the Christian faith itself, and that the belief in humanity, and in the growing progress of the race, might be described as completely as could the faith of St. Paul by his own words, "Now

faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

We do not expect Dr. Mozley to be able to see things from the Comtist point of view, and doubtless Positivism seems to him as absurd, as unphilosophical, as absolutely unbelievable, as the Christian faith seemed to Tacitus or Marcus Aurelius; but he might have seen with how passionate a fervour can be held a hope of an immortality which is to the philosopher exceedingly real, had he read the beautiful poem which closes George Eliot's last volume—

"Oh, may I join the choir invisible
Of those immortal souls that live again
In minds made better by their presence."

And

"So shall I join the choir invisible,
Whose music is the gladness of the world."

Again, in a burst of indignation, Dr. Mozley says—

"This horrible materialist indifference to the extinction of our being, this taking up with it as the natural end of man, what are we to call it? It is the lapse of human nature. It is a fall. This low apathetic insensibility to the continuance of his being is the recurrence to an animal nature. The race continues indeed: and what is that to me if I perish? And if to-morrow I am not, what am I to-day?"

But surely if, when preparing his sermon, he had thought of the love of a father for his children, of the way in which, religious feeling held for the time entirely in suspension, as well as the hopes of the future life, the father will look forward to a time when he shall be no more, but yet will relive in his children and his children's children, Dr. Mozley might, for the moment, have realised that which ennobles the lives of the Comtist believers, and he would have seen that the worship of humanity is no mere worship of abstractions. He would have seen that by it as a faith the believer of to-day is connected with all the past and with all the future; how his eager hope of a time when the human race will be greater and diviner than now might be expressed in words as great and as rhythmical as those of St. Paul, who looked forward to an end when Christ Himself should have delivered up the kingdom to God the Father, that God might be all in all.

It is not only in these sermons that the preacher has not entirely appreciated the currents of the thought of the age; but, as we said before, Dr. Mozley is always interesting, and his volume is a very real contribution to a reasonable Christian theology.

Mr. Oxenham² has done well to reprint his essays from the "*Contemporary Review*." For, first, the editor of that periodical had, without the author's knowledge or consent, given to the articles the erroneous title of "*Eternal Perdition and Universalism, from a Roman Catholic Point of View*," so that the author is here putting himself right with

² "*Catholic Eschatology and Universalism*." By Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A. London: Pickering. 1876.

his co-religionists and the public. Secondly, the work is in itself of permanent value. It is a learned and exhaustive statement of the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory. Mr. Oxenham states in the strongest possible way his belief in everlasting punishment, but he does so in order to put forward the doctrine of purgatory, which goes very far to mitigate the horrors of what may truly be called an infernal creed. We are entirely at one with Mr. Oxenham in his assertion that many texts in the New Testament state in the most emphatic language that doctrine of eternal death which he upholds; and while we are by no means sure that Scripture is plain on the doctrine of purgatory, we acknowledge that it is a healthy endeavour to escape from the teaching, without denying the texts. But we totally differ from him that the witness of reason is in favour of what he terms Catholic Eschatology. The real truth is, that reason absolutely fails to tell us anything whatever about the future life. The authors of the books of the Bible, *a fortiori* those in whose minds grew up the tradition of the Church, were as entirely unable as we are to pierce the veil. Our thoughts of God and of His dealings with men are necessarily conditioned by our views of our own nature. It perhaps is not possible to conceive of a personal God except as a greatly magnified man; and Theodore Parker spoke truth in his somewhat startling manner, when he said that if a stag in an American forest could have any thoughts of God, it could only think of Him as a very large stag. The whole controversy about eternal punishment seems, therefore, to come to this, that those who can conceive that man, under any circumstances, has a right to deal with man by *autos-da-fé*, by Smithfield fires, or the pile of Servetus, can without difficulty conceive of their God as burning sinners in an eternal hell; and we fully admit that it is not unnatural to a Roman theologian thus to think of God. While we utterly differ from Mr. Oxenham, we find his book well written, learned, and interesting. He makes many a point against those opponents who argue from Scripture and tradition against the doctrine of his Church, and, it may fairly be admitted, that of the great majority of Christian churches.

A clergyman,³ who wisely does not give his name, is altogether of another kind to Mr. Oxenham—not learned, not thoughtful, not logical. His book is remarkable for nothing but the extreme vehemence of his railing against everybody who takes a different view to his own.

We are glad to meet with a new work by the author of "Fundamentals" and "Studies of the Divine Master." No other writer among us on the orthodox side writes with such scrupulous fairness, such grasp of his opponent's thought, such varied learning, and clear classical style as Mr. Griffith.⁴ An old man, as we suppose, he is still full

³ "The Satan of Scripture." By a Clergyman. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

⁴ "Behind the Veil. An Outline of Bible Metaphysics." By Thomas Griffith, A. M., Prebendary of St. Paul's. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1876.

of that eager intellectual curiosity which induces him to read all that bears on the thought of the age, even when he has to search much chaff for a few grains. Without a tinge of pedantry or cumbrousness of style, his every page indicates that he is saturated with the literature of many languages ; and since Jeremy Taylor's day it would be hard to find notes of so wide a range.

In Mr. Griffith's own words, the object of his book is "to remind its readers of the old but never antiquated truth that the world of sense, by the very nature of its presentments, as merely phenomenal, requires the admission of supersensuous realities as the indispensable complement and base of those phenomena. And further, that since the action of such realities is shown by these phenomena to be limited and conditioned, they must be regarded as subordinate to a supreme reality from whom they spring, in whom they subsist, and by whom they are organised towards a preconceived end."

The matters here discussed are, as all would allow, not settled, and very few turn away their faces from metaphysics as resolutely as do the leading Positivists. Metaphysics, when treated as here, have a charm to many minds. The few real theologians left among us, the men of science and the philosophers, would understand each other far better if all controversy were conducted in the same temper as Mr. Griffith brings to that which he here raises ; and a sympathetic understanding is far on the way to some measure of agreement.

Mr. Horne's⁵ essay is best described by its sub-title, "An Examination into the Nature and Contents of Scripture Revelation as compared with other Forms of Truth." The original form of the work was that of a prize essay awarded to the author, the candidates being members of Scotch Universities. The tone of the book throughout is that of a liberal orthodoxy, expressive of a spirit which, while yielding to science and to morality all that must be rejected of the Bible, yet claims that, rightly understood, the spirit which lives in the Bible is that by which men can best rule their lives, because it is the highest revelation as yet of God's truth. The following passage is a fair clue to the character of the book :—

"If in the future, not visible as yet by any sign of the times, men may happily leave such a record far behind, superseding it by a better and a purer exhibition of God's ways to man, and of man's walking in these ways, still we can never imagine the time when in their progress they shall leave behind the supreme life embodied in a portion of that record. That life is indestructible in its spirit, and repeats itself from age to age in the life of all who are united by faith to what is divine. Above the book itself is always the immortal life within it, but the life goes a long way in conferring a like immortality on the book" (p. 355).

The chapters on the Bible and science, on religious ideas and metaphysical conceptions, all Mr. Horne's criticism of other writers,

⁵ "Reason and Revelation." By William Horne, M.A. London: Henry S. King & Co.

particularly the late Dean Mansel, are well worth reading, and there is much in the book throughout which will repay study. We have read it with much interest, though the point of view is very far from being our own, and though the style in which it is written is by no means easy or attractive.

Professor Hachett's⁶ own standpoint is orthodox. His introduction takes the ordinary view of the authorship of the Acts, and his biographical sketch of Luke follows the received traditions without particular discrimination. It can best be described negatively by saying it is very unlike Zeller's book on the Acts, recently rendered into English under the auspices of the Theological Translation Fund. But after the introductory pages, theology or private opinion has little to do with the book, which is a painstaking, critical examination of the text, together with discussions on the meaning of the words employed. The method is very like that employed in Dean Alford's Notes, but these are altogether of more value, and the incidental excursions, as on St. Paul's shipwreck, are full of life and interest. While the author is by no means to be accepted as an infallible guide, his book will be found very useful by all theological students.

The Bishop of Manchester's introduction to Mr. Parker's sermons⁷ consists of twenty-eight lines and three words exactly, and says, in the most general terms, only this:—"Mr. Parker was an excellent man, a sound but not brilliant preacher. His congregation will be glad to have his sermons, and the Bishop is very glad to testify his respect for him." Now this, we submit, is not the thing to announce prominently as "Introduction by," &c. It is simply meant to sell the book, and we are taken in. We should be glad to read a real introduction, but not this. It is like a testimonial of compliment, which wise electors toss aside; and if it be a mere "imprimatur," the days of such sanction are over. For the rest, the Bishop of Manchester is a vigorous, hard-working, sensible prelate, and no doubt a clergyman who gained his approbation had some real stuff in him. We rate the "style" of the sermons rather higher than does the Bishop. For their matter they are the usual orthodox teaching, presented in a way that is often attractive, never offensive, with perfect simplicity, and unconsciousness of any difficulties in the way over which a good life and hopeful prayer cannot gain an easy victory. The sermons are very short, but complete and compact.

Mr. Barrow,⁸ who interprets for us the doctrine contained in the three first chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians, hopes that "the usual indulgence" will be extended to his first work. We have never

⁶ "A Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles." By Horatio Hachett, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1877.

⁷ "Sermons on the Church's Seasons." By John Webster Parker, with an Introduction by James Fraser, D.D., Lord Bishop of Manchester. London: Rivingtons. 1876.

⁸ "The Mystery of Christ." By George Staunton Barrow, M.A., Vicar of Stowmarket. London: Rivingtons. 1876.

heard of this usual indulgence, or that any critic is or ought to be withheld from saying of a first as of a last work that it is dull and commonplace. That we say of these sermons, which are drearily correct, as most people count correctness in theology.

Mr. Heygate's⁹ name is well known as a devotional writer of a decidedly high, but not extreme, Ritual school. The present book consists of meditations for the clergy. Meditation has always seemed to us an extremely thin form of private prayer. It seems to consist in beating out a thought to its utmost tenuity, and must lead to a very diffuse habit of mind. Surely these are words, mere words, when a man addresses his God thus:—"Terrible is the disease, terrible also the risk, awful the neglect, and awful the consequence, fearful in its cause, and fearful too in its effect." Granting the orthodox position, we do not deny that there are golden thoughts in the book. A little gold, however, goes a great way when it is beaten out into exceedingly thin leaf.

We meet this excellent little book¹⁰ for the first time. No problem is more difficult to solve than this: How shall those who accept all the conclusions of modern science, yet value the religious teachings of the Bible, tell the young the truth about many of its statements without shattering with the false much that is of real and permanent value? "Aunt Amy" tries to give a solution, and does it on the whole successfully. The book is reverent, sensible, and clearly written; it is especially intended and adapted for girls, "who have arrived at an age when they can think and take interest in religious topics."

Was it really worth while to answer a book¹¹ by the author of "Dame Europa's School"—the chaplain of the Arctic Expedition? and if it was worth while, is this the way to answer it? These are the questions which must occur to all who turn over these pages. The book is a vehement assault upon orthodoxy, and is written from the point of view of the majority of Mr. Scott's pamphleteers. In fact, this book reads very much like an enlarged pamphlet from Mr. Scott of Norwood, of which we have received a considerable number.

PHILOSOPHY.

THE new year opens with bright prospects for philosophy. Seldom has it been our lot to bring before our readers so many works of real value as at the present moment. Both at home and abroad a spirit of critical enlightenment presents itself—an enlightenment, moreover, which does not disdain constructive work. Metaphysic is neither tabooed nor physical research neglected; and the study of past beliefs

⁹ "The Good Shepherd." By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1876.

¹⁰ "In Search of Truth." By Amy. London: Trübner & Co. 1875.

¹¹ "Civilised Christianity." A Reply to "Modern Christianity a Civilised Heathenism." Second Edition. London: Trübner & Co.

is skilfully applied to throw light on contemporary questions. Prominent among English works stand Mr. Leslie Stephen's "History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century" and the late Professor Grote's "Treatise on the Moral Ideals."

Mr. Stephen's volumes supply a real desideratum.¹ Ever since Mr. Pattison's succinct but luminous sketch of "Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750," appeared in "Essays and Reviews," an interest has been diffused to know more thoroughly the inner workings of the eighteenth century. The want was partly met in Mr. Hunt's "History of Religious Thought" and Principal Tulloch's "Rational Theology." But both these writers confined themselves to the religious aspects of the question, and studied the century merely in reference to individuals. What was wanted was an interpretation of the epoch as a whole by a thinker competent at once to analyse the complex phenomena of the time, and to trace the bearing of the different series of facts upon each other. Mr. Pattison, it might have been hoped, would himself have completed the history of which he had supplied so brilliant a foretaste. Now that the work has been so ably done, we may perhaps the less regret that the time which would have been otherwise given to Toland and Butler was devoted to Isaac Casaubon; for Mr. Stephen's "History," if not altogether free from flaws, is marked in the main by a clearness and comprehensiveness that could not be easily surpassed.

Mr. Stephen, we have already implied, does not supply us merely with a summary of the opinions entertained by successive writers within the period. He traces what he himself well describes as "the logical relations of different intellectual creeds." "I have considered," he says, "the successive controversies as of a continuous debate, in which each writer starts from positions determined by the previous course of discussion" (vol. ii. p. 331). A little reflection will show how much this means. The "thought" of which Mr. Stephen writes the history is not merely the speculative thought of the philosopher—it is, in addition, the thought which shows itself in religious controversies, in political theories, in social creeds, in imaginative literature. Burke and Adam Smith, Wesley and Richardson, come within its range no less than Hume and Hartley. An introductory chapter provides the "philosophical basis" necessary for any intelligent appreciation of the problem. This "basis" is contained within the tenets of Descartes, and the "English criticism" of Cartesianism in Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. "Repeating a thrice-told tale," the author has "endeavoured to be as brief as was compatible" with his purpose. It may be feared whether, with all the insight which the sketch displays, it may not appear superficial to those who have drunk deep of the illustrious triumvirate. Deism, of course, attracts a considerable part of Mr. Stephen's attention. The starting-point of Deism, as opposed to English Rationalism, is ably and clearly stated (p. 85). The different stages in the controversy are

¹ "History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century." By Leslie Stephen. In Two Vols. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

noticed, and Locke and Toland, Clarke and Wollaston, Tindal and Dodwell, Middleton and Waterland, are all fully analysed. A separate chapter shows the weaknesses of Butler's "Analogy." Hume's "Essay on Miracles" and "Dialogues on Natural Religion" are carefully sifted. Hume, Mr. Stephen holds, "as a true sceptic, probably did not expect that the bulk of mankind would ever follow him in his conclusions."

The most original part of Mr. Stephen's work is the sketch of the Moralists in Chapter IX. Hitherto, except in Sir James Macintosh's "Ethical Dissertation," there has been no readable account of this phase of ethical theory. But excellent as was in many ways Macintosh's exposition, it failed in true historic insight. Mr. Stephen sees that Clarke and Price are but approaching ethics from the standpoint of the Deists. The schools represented by Shaftesbury and Mandeville, on the one hand, Butler and Hutcheson, on the other, "correspond to the speculative tendencies embodied in Reid's 'common-sense' and Hume's 'scepticism.' Both of them recognised tacitly or explicitly the impossibility of constructing a moral code from the ontological bases." Hartley and Adam Smith tried to explain the "mechanism of the mysterious power postulated by the Common-sense school." The one result which remained fixed among these theories lay in man's wish for happiness. The fact gave rise to Utilitarianism. Of the utilitarian movement Mr. Stephen gives a clear account. It is perhaps to be regretted that he says so little about Bentham. But he rightly enough maintains that to Bentham a science of morality, resting as it does on "certain principles which belong to the sciences of psychology and sociology," was logically impossible. From *Morals* Mr. Stephen passes to Politics and Political Economy, and discusses the Bangorian controversy, the principles of the Revolution, and the consequences of the "Wealth of Nations." The work ends with an extremely suggestive chapter on the general literary characteristics of the epoch. With a few bold touches, Mr. Stephen paints the reflection of the prevailing theories in the sermons, poetry, and novels of the period. A new light is thrown upon the Mysticism of Law, and the Evangelicalism of Wesley and Newton, when viewed as the outburst of a reaction against the intellectualism of Clarke and Price. "Both Wesleyanism and Evangelicalism illustrate the twofold truth that powerful religious movements often originate in social strata lying far below the reach of philosophy; but are doomed to sterility if they cannot assimilate some philosophical element." Side by side with this religious revival there was a corresponding reaction in literature. Beginning with the sentimentalism of Hervey's "Meditations," and the novels of Richardson and Sterne, it developed into the "naturalism" of Wordsworth and of Burns. It will be evident that Mr. Stephen has sketched the intellectual aspects of the century with a master's hand. We should have liked to have quoted some of the many brilliant epigrams with which the work sparkles; but we have already exceeded our limits, and must simply close by saying that the work, if occasionally unequal, will remain a standard authority for the period of which it treats.

The same breadth of view as marks Mr. Stephen's work of learning

characterises also the "Treatise" of the late Professor Grote, which Professor Mayor has just edited;² but the last-named work is free from that appearance of dogmatism which is perhaps inseparable from the epigrammatic sentences of Mr. Stephen. Readers of the "Exploratio Philosophica" and the "Examination of Utilitarianism" will not need to be reminded of that "large-mindedness" and "fairness" which Mr. Mayor rightly regards as the chief mark of all Grote's writings. "Reason and sentiment, honour and conscience, fact and ideal, all find their place within the limits of moral philosophy as he viewed it. . . . Like his brother the historian, he had an almost fanatical love of freedom of thought, even when it took a form with which he himself could not sympathise." John Grote is as little as Mr. Stephen infected with the "measly spiritualism of a pseudo-Hegelianism" ("Academy" for December 2, 1876).

"Good philosophy," he remarks, "is something not far off from our minds; it relates constantly to portions of our consciousness, which from their apparent simplicity and triviality we think not worthy of notice; and then when the philosopher laboriously attempts to put this into words, it looks to us something very complicated and a long way off, and we puzzle ourselves to understand it, as if it were some foreign language or an abstract mathematical theorem."

The "Treatise on the Moral Ideals" is "constructed," says the author, "on this principle, that in what is commonly known by the name of moral philosophy there are two sciences: one the science of virtue, *Aretaics*; the other, the science of happiness, *Eudæmonics*." We trace in this the same family tendency as led the historian of Greece to speak of "psephisms" and "metics;" but, this apart, the distinction is one deserving of emphasis. It calls attention to the same point as Stuart Mill noticed many years ago in the pages of this "Review" in his well-known article on "Bentham." "Man," Mill wrote, "is never recognised by him (*i.e.*, Bentham) as a being capable of pursuing spiritual perfection as an end; of desiring, for its own sake, the conformity of his own character to his standard of excellence without hope of good or fear of evil from other source than his own inward consciousness." Much of Grote's "Treatise on the Ideals" may be compared with Mill's article on "Bentham." Man, Grote points out, is not merely a *sentient*, but also an *active* being; and he adds, that he is also a "wanting" being. Moral philosophy must take account of all these sides of our nature, and recognise different ideals as fitted for each of them. "It is man's sentient nature which leads to the ideal called happiness; it is man's active nature which leads to the ideal of virtue; it is man's nature as wanting which leads to the formation of a third ideal, more important than the first of them, and equally important with the second—the notion of 'good.'" Utili-

² "A Treatise on the Moral Ideals." By the late John Grote, B.D., Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. Edited by J. B. Mayor, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & Co. 1876.

barianism, therefore, cannot be the last word in morals. "Were there no use possibly to be made of it, no happiness which could possibly be promoted, generous and self-forgetting action would be worth having in the universe, and the universe would be the richer and better for it." This is, perhaps, the chief lesson of Mr. Grote's treatise. Of a more metaphysical nature is the comparison in Chapter V. of the intellectual with the moral ideals. Just, the writer shows, as the intellectual ideal of truth exists in the two forms of "rightness of thought" and "reality of being;" so there are two great moral ideals—that of rightness and that of good, analogous to these two aspects of the highest ideal of truth. There are other important chapters to which we can only now refer. Such is the chapter on "Duty in its Relation to Law," the discussion on "Conscience and Honour," the chapter on "Pleasure and Pain," and that also on "Happiness." The twentieth chapter, on "Discussion, Controversy, War," is full of sagacious insight. Altogether, "The Moral Ideals" is a stimulating and suggestive contribution to the problems of life. The writer is always fresh, because he invariably *thinks out* a subject for himself. "Whatever he says," as the editor remarks, "has at least the merit of being genuine thought at first hand, not a mere repetition of what others have said, or the imagination of what might be the right thing to say." Professor Mayor has ably discharged the duties of editor; much of the value of the book lies, it is evident, in the arrangement to which he has subjected the papers intrusted to him. The syndics of the University Press have made an exemplary use of their funds in the "liberal grant which," the preface informs us, "they have made towards defraying the expenses of the volume."

Bentham, says Mr. Mill, in the essay to which we have just referred, "found the philosophy of law a chaos, he left it a science." No better study, then, could be selected for the Law Examinations at Oxford than the "Principles of Morals and Legislation."³ But of this work there are two editions, as we may call them. There is the original work written by Bentham, and the French translation and adaptation by Dumont. The latter is well known to be superior in simplicity and clearness to the former, and, as such, was originally made the text-book at Oxford. But "change is sweetest of all things;" and the University suddenly determined to substitute the original treatise. A veteran jurist at Oxford, Mr. Pottinger of Worcester College, pointed out in a series of interesting letters the impropriety of the change. He showed that an "easy, useful, and intelligible work" was being abandoned for one that was confessedly difficult and obscure. He hinted at the indelicacies of the original, and grew merry over the *epistemothreptic*, *phthanoparanomic*, and other trusts with which the undergraduates would have to "cram" themselves. But the University was obdurate; and as the "Principles" could not well be got otherwise than in

³ "An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation." By Jeremy Bentham, Esq., M.A., Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, and late of Queen's College, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1876.

Bowring's edition of the works, it determined to print the book in a separate form to suit the requirements of the examinations. The result is the present volume. The text followed is that of the "new edition" of 1823, "corrected by the author." No excisions seem to have been made; even the "twenty-one sorts of offences to which, as the law stands at present in Christian countries, the condition of a husband stands opposed," being printed at full length. The work will not be without its uses, but it would have been much more useful had the delegates of the Clarendon Press taken the pains to provide it with an index.

Automatism and evolution are the keynotes of present controversy. It is the question with which Dr. Elam, Dr. Gizycki, and Dr. Carpenter are immediately concerned. Under the title of "Winds of Doctrine" (a phrase, of course, suggested by Ephesians iv. 14), Dr. Elam republishes those papers with which the readers of the "Contemporary Review" have been for some months favoured.⁴ The literary morality of such immediate republication is, of course, an open question; but this apart, Dr. Elam's reasonings are well worthy of a hearing. Professor Tyndall and Professor Huxley, he shows, fall into inconsistencies in their attempts to escape from the logical consequences of their doctrines. Huxley's idea of an "automaton endowed with free will" is, he with some justice remarks, a "pleasing and interesting novelty in physical science;" and he is unable to see how both Huxley and Tyndall can unite materialistic terminology with the repudiation of materialistic philosophy. The best part of the book is the examination of the Darwinian "Origin of Species" in the sixth and seventh chapters. The strength of Dr. Elam's criticism lies in the fact that most of his arguments are drawn from Huxley's own concessions; and he does at least make it evident that Huxley's latest assertions about the truth of evolution are, without any due cause, very different from his views in 1860. There is a good deal of truth in what he says (p. 133), that the candour with which Mr. Darwin has acknowledged difficulties in his theory has perhaps done more to advance the spread of his doctrines than any other cause would have effected. But Dr. Elam must be aware that it is no argument to write, "Mr. Darwin's abortive attempt to trace back the moral sense to some development of gregarious or social instincts is so completely beside the mark that it really presents no point for criticism."

Darwinism is the chief subject to which Herr Schellwien applies those principles which he enunciates in his stimulating treatise on Causality.⁵ It is apparently as a follower of Schelling and Hegel that the writer approaches the question. "The essence of natural causality," he teaches (p. 15), "lies in the fact that in any relation

⁴ "Winds of Doctrine: Being an Examination of the Modern Theories of Automatism and Evolution." By Charles Elam, M.D. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

⁵ "Das Gesetz der Causalität in der Natur." Von Robert Schellwien. Berlin: G. W. F. Müller. 1876.

whatever between different things the difference is suspended and the objects stand as similar towards each other ;" so that, as he adds, "nothing can produce any effect, so far as it is solely active and the other solely passive: an effect can take place only through equalising action on the part of two or more different things ;" and "variation is possible only so far as the object of variation stands in a position of equilibrium towards another object." Identity in fact is Schellwien's catchword. From this standpoint, Darwinism, the author seeks to show, is a simple *husteron proteron*. It has, indeed, he grants, the merit of having introduced the *historical* method into the study of organic life. Through Darwinism, natural *history* has come to be something more than a mere name. But in attempting to derive higher from lower forms of life, and to create differences through the mere course of time, it involves nothing short of a logical contradiction. Natural development consists in "abolishing differences and entering into relations of equality." There is much real ability and originality in Schellwien's examination of the Darwinian conception. The book contains many happy sayings, none, perhaps, happier than this: "Behind the Bible history of creation stands at least Almighty God; behind the natural history of it, only some professor." Herr Schellwien requires a strong swimmer, and we do not know that we have always followed him ; but we may say of him, as Socrates of Heraclitus, what we have understood is excellent, and we believe the rest must be as good.

Dr. Gizycki deals also with the same subject as Dr. Elam ; not, however, as a judge, but as an advocate.⁶ A pupil of Edward Zeller's, he regards philosophy, with Zeller, as a "comprehensive scientific conception of the world and life ;" and the object of his treatise is to show that the Lamarck-Darwinian theory of evolution provides a philosophic standpoint of this nature. He shows this in successive chapters with regard to psychology, cognition, morals, and religion. The evolution theory, we learn (p. 43), has finally decided the question of free will by demonstrating the continuity and necessary connection of every event.

Dr. Carpenter thinks otherwise.⁷ A long note prefixed to the fourth edition of his "Mental Physiology" discusses with much vigour the view which identifies moral with physical causation. Dr. Carpenter allows, as every one does more or less, the general prevalence of law and uniformity ; but he holds, with Emerson, that "thoughts rule the world," and that intellectual and emotional influences cannot be brought to any common measure either with muscular contractions or molecular changes. The self-volitional power of the ego is implied, he holds, in the very conception of "choice," the existence of a moral

⁶ "Philosophische Konsequenzen der Lamarck-Darwin'schen Entwicklungstheorie: Ein Versuch." Von Dr. Georg von Gizycki. Leipzig und Heidelberg: Wintersche Verlagsbandlung. 1876.

⁷ "Principles of Mental Physiology, with their Application to the Training and Discipline of the Mind, and the Study of its Morbid Conditions." By William B. Carpenter, C.B., M.D., LL.D. Fourth Edition. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

consciousness, and the ideas of "duty" and "responsibility." All this is interesting enough, but it does not seem to reach the bottom of the matter. The law of causation, as Professor Kym has well pointed out ("Metaphysische Untersuchungen," pp. 282-320), holds as fully in the moral as in the physical world: the real question turns on the constitution of the cause. The matter cannot be solved by referring merely to such words as "responsibility" and "duty;" for a Socrates may always ask—What is Responsibility?

The "Vocabulary of Philosophy" comes like a very *deus ex machina* to answer such a question.⁸ But in vain we turn to the letter R. No such word as "responsibility" appears; nor does the index note its explanation under any other heading. Surely this is "Hamlet" with Hamlet left out. Nor is this a solitary instance of the vagaries which characterise the work. Apart from actual omissions (among which we may notice all the terminology of modern evolution), the work bears many marks of slovenly revision. Better things might have been looked for from the united labour of two Scotch professors. But surely to define moral philosophy as the "philosophy of our knowledge of moral law," is as bad as the proverbial definition of the Archdeacon. Nor will even the authority of the Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh allow us to believe that "the name of Hedonism may be applied to the systems of Chrysippus and Epicurus." Of course anything *may* be applied to anything; but all the philosophical professors in Scotland will not prevent us from supposing that Aristippus was intended. What is meant by saying that *ἰντελέχεια* is compounded of *ἰντελέ*, perfect; *ἔχειν*, to have; and *τέλος*, an end? Surely the last word is superfluous. Why, again, is "Cynic" put in, and "Cyrenaic" left out? Among misprints, "Fallacia Ignorationis *Ellemi*" (p. 182) might be corrected in next edition. A vocabulary is useless if inaccurate; and we cannot understand how a well-known Scotch organ came to describe this as "an admirable work."

The spirit of criticism and enlightenment, to which we have referred as characteristic of the day, finds its mental sustenance in very different quarters. "Criticism," says Mr. Stephen of Lord Shaftesbury, "is of surpassing importance with him, because criticism gives the theory of judging in religion, in art, or in morality." Some such thought has led to Dr. Gizycki's monograph upon him.⁹ Shaftesbury Gizycki regards as the philosopher of the future. He has provided the elements both of a philosophy of religion and of an ethic adapted to a genuine scientific conception of the world. All who have amused themselves with the grace and humour of the "Characteristics" will know that Dr. Gizycki has taken up a difficult position. Shaftesbury's maxim,

⁸ "The Vocabulary of Philosophy, Mental, Moral and Metaphysical, with Quotations and References, for the Use of Students." By William Fleming, D.D., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. Third Edition. Edited by Henry Calderwood, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. London: C. Griffin & Co. 1876.

⁹ "Die Philosophie Shaftesbury's." Dargestellt von Dr. Georg Von Gizycki. Leipzig und Heidelberg: Winter'sche Verlagshandlung. 1876.

"To philosophise in a just signification is but to carry good-breeding a step higher," makes it difficult to uphold him as the philosopher *par excellence*. But Dr. Gizycki is undaunted. He maintains that, in spite of its unsystematic character, and "method-concealing method," the philosophy of Shaftesbury is, as Schopenhauer held philosophy must always be, "immanent," connected, and suited for a theory of evolution. There is a sense in which this estimate of Shaftesbury may be accepted. Virtue with him meant action directed towards the good of the species. His philosophy was a valuable protest against the Rationalism of Clarke; with which, rather than with the "unnatural" system of Kant, Gizycki should have compared it. But it is mere playing with words to say that Shaftesbury's ethics is a "physic" and not a "metaphysic of ethics." "Harmony," as Mr. Stephen says, "is Shaftesbury's catchword," and all the phraseology of the "Characteristics" implies an artistic rather than a scientific system of ethics.

What Gizycki finds in Shaftesbury, Dr. Goering finds in Kant.¹⁰ "Criticism," he holds with Lange, is still the standpoint which philosophy requires to emphasise. It is the "uncritical consciousness," as he calls it, which lies at the root of all the false metaphysic with which mathematics and natural science are filled. The escape from this bad metaphysic is to be found in the experience philosophy of Kant; and more particularly in the keystone of his system—the theory of space. "Space," Kant explained, "is the formal condition of my mind to be affected by things." This is the text on which Dr. Goering's work is a somewhat diffuse but very suggestive commentary. "What," Dr. Goering teaches, "is usually called the outer world is really only a part of ourselves." "Without impression on our part there is no such thing as space; it does not as *a priori* lie ready in the mind before the impression, or innate according to the fashion in which the Kantian distinctions have been falsely misunderstood: it is in the impression that it first comes into being through the formal condition of our mind. This is the critical idea: the uncritical consciousness seeks for space *in* experience (empiricism) or *before* experience (innate ideas):" two views both of which are fundamentally false. It follows, the writer goes on to show, that both materialism and idealism are metaphysically without foundation. The attempt to resolve mind into the reciprocal action (*wechselwirkung*) of molecular parts is, in the light of a critique of sense, simply unmeaning. The very notion of "part" admits of application only to the phenomenal world given in our thinking nature. Even were physiology to succeed in resolving every mental act into some process of the brain, still "this brain and all its processes would be nothing but a phenomenon in our transcendent space." Idealism is no less uncritical. It supplies, indeed, Goering grants, a real theory in a sense Materialism cannot do; but it is equally groundless, because in its transcendent principle of unity it rejects the one phenomenal fac-

¹⁰ "Raum und Stoff: Ideen zu einer Kritik der Sinne." Von Wilhelm Goering, Dr.Ph. Berlin: C. Duncker. 1876.

tor, that of extended matter, and elevates the other, which is also merely a *phenomenal* factor to a transcendent principle. The work concludes with a too fragmentary chapter on the "interaction between the elements of an intellectual world." Dr. Goering believes that the rational organic unity of all the different spiritual and intellectual influences of the present day is only to be found in the critical spirit of the Kantian philosophy. The same keynote runs through an oration "On the Discovery of the *a priori*," delivered by Dr. Jacobson at Königsberg on February 12, in celebration of Kant's death.¹¹

Professor Harms' "Philosophy since Kant" is a vigorous and lucid exposition of later German philosophy,¹² and a valuable protest against the tendency to find philosophy in Kant alone. "Did," asks Dr. Harms, "Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel not know Kant also?" "Better perhaps," he replies, "than those who now misuse his name while they mutilate his doctrine and his works." Our present limits render it impossible to do anything but state the method in which Professor Harms goes to work. An introductory chapter sketches the character of philosophy before Kant, and adds some rather aimless but pregnant remarks upon the thought of Greece and medieval Europe. The immediate subject is considered under four divisions. The first deals with the *beginnings* of German philosophy in Lessing, Herder, and Jacobi. They introduced that historical interpretation of the world which forms the essence of German speculation. The second section discusses the *establishment* of German philosophy by Kant. The third division contains its *development* in Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel—the first teaching an ethical, the second a physical, and the last a logical idealism. The last division considers the *limitation* of philosophy at the hand of Schleiermacher, Herbart, and Schopenhauer; and the volume concludes with a short reference to the question of the day—whether the anthropologism of Schopenhauer (*i.e.*, Materialism) is or is not philosophy.

Of making philosophies there is no end; and now that sense and thought, feeling and reason, consciousness and unconsciousness, have become too old for service, thinkers are obliged to find some other principle. Professor Frohschammer finds it in imagination.¹³ The term, he explains, is to be taken in a liberal sense as embracing every mental process of creative energy and envisagement. The advantages claimed for the principle are numerous. It reveals the spiritual in terms of sense and reclaims the spiritual from the sensuous. It provides a link to connect the conscious with the unconscious. It raises us above both the cognitive dualism of sensualism and idealism, and the metaphysical opposites, materialism and spiritualism. In the course of

¹¹ "Ueber die Auffindung der Apriori: Rede gehalten zu Königsberg." Von Julius Jacobson, jun. Berlin: G. W. F. Müller. 1876.

¹² "Die Philosophie seit Kant." Von Friedrich Harms, ord. Prof. an der Universität zu Berlin. Berlin: Theobald Grieben. 1876.

¹³ "Die Phantasie als Grund-Princip des Weltprocesses." Von J. Frohschammer, Professor der Philosophie in München. München: Theodor Ackermann, 1877.

three books our Munich professor traces, with much literary power, the action of the principle—*first*, as a subjective mental faculty; *secondly*, as an objective regulative agent; and *thirdly*, in its development into self-conscious mind and human personality. The imagination is an essential factor in truth: it is by means of the imagination that we grasp things in their true worth and perfect notion. It plays a large part in cognition. Categories and ideas are products of its agency. Through morality, religion, and art, it forms an important element in historical progress. But imagination is not merely a subjective element. As a teleological plastic force it regulates the development of objective nature. It is imagination which leads on to life, which creates the senses and perception, which forms the basis of instinct and impulse. It is the source of waking and consciousness, it regulates generation and sexual selection, while it supplies the defects both of the evolution and of the transmutation theory. From the philosophy of nature, Frohschammer passes to anthropological psychology. He reviews in succession the monistic, dualistic, and “trichotomistic” theories of the relation between mind and body. There is an instructive chapter on will; and the present volume concludes with an interesting view of dreaming and insanity. A second volume, we gather from the preface, will deal with the influence of the imagination on the historical development of humanity. The sketch we have given will show that Professor Frohschammer’s book, besides being always interesting, throws valuable light upon many of the problems of philosophy. Original it is not; for the “plastick nature” of Dr. Cudworth reminds us in many ways of Frohschammer’s “*Phantasie*.” It is hardly necessary to add, that it falls under that mental tendency which Bacon long ago observed, of “supposing a greater order and symmetry in things than can actually be found.”

If Professor Frohschammer be a victim to the *idola tribus*, the late Richard Payne Knight may be taken as an example of the influence exercised by the *idola specus*.¹⁴ His “Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology” is a work of extensive and curious learning; but it runs a theory to death in the attempt it makes to interpret all ancient religion in the light of Dionysiac worship. Ancient mythology is indeed a heterogeneous compound. “Side by side,” as Mr. Symonds has remarked, “with some of the sublimest and most beautiful conceptions which the world has ever produced, we find in it much that is absurd and trivial and revolting.” But any explanation of mythology must embrace both elements. The productive powers of nature constitute as little as the phenomena of dawn and sunset the *one* basis of Greek mythology.

Philosophy has been at last enclosed within a nutshell, and the “Ultimate Generalisation” treated within the compass of fifty

¹⁴ “The Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology: An Inquiry.” By Richard Payne Smith, Esq., Author of “The Worship of Priapus,” &c. A New Edition. By Alexander Wilder, M.D. New York. 1876. (From Bernard Quaritch, 15 Piccadilly.)

pages.¹⁵ "That which is presented," says the preface, "as the ultimate generalisation, has the merit of being grandly simple—so exceedingly simple, that to minds not entirely divested of their original superstition, it may appear inconsequential." The ultimate generalisation turns out to be "correlation" with its cognate ideas of polarity, oppositeness, and reciprocal dependence. Something and nothing are the first pair of correlative opposites; "by something is meant matter and motion;" by nothing space and time. The recognition of correlation as the ultimate generalisation will bring with it many advantages; amongst others, "a presumption of truth in opposed doctrines, and from this a new outgrowth of candour and liberality." "The cry of 'Eureka,'" says the preface, "has been too often made by self-deluded thinkers;" and we are inclined to think that the "Ultimate Generalisation" contains nothing which has not been said before by Jacob Boehme, Emerson, and Hegel.

E. Von Hartmann's "Collected Essays," of which we noticed the first instalment some time ago, are now all published, and offer an instructive and interesting mass of reading.¹⁶ They deal with subjects as various as those discussed in Herbert Spencer's or Stuart Mill's essays. Thus we find one entitled "The Contest between Church and State;" another gives us an account of Lao-tse; "The Prison of the Future" is the subject of a third. Eight of them are devoted to aesthetics. There is a critique of "Romeo and Juliet," and studies on Goethe's "Faust" and Schiller's poems. Seven essays, described as "Contributions to Natural Philosophy," include the valuable article on Ernst Häckel which appeared two years ago in the pages of the "Deutsche Rundschau." The remaining essays deal with the three philosophical stars (*dreigestirn*) of the nineteenth century—Schelling, Hegel, and Schopenhauer—and finish with a *Schlusswort*, in which the philosophy of the unconscious is shown to contain the virtues of all three, without their vices. Readers of Von Hartmann's other works will find little new in these discussions; but all of them are marked by that lucidity and straightforwardness which characterises everything that Hartmann writes.

The promoters of the well-known "Philosophical Library" would seem at first sight to have turned their industry to good account in the monograph on Scotus Erigena which they have issued.¹⁷ But unfortunately the title of the book turns out to be a rather deceptive statement of its contents. It is merely a series of notes upon the translation of the "De Divisione Naturæ"—the great work with which the Scoto-Irish Churchman laid the foundations of scholasticism. It is almost needless to say that the work with its fragmentary dis-

¹⁵ "The Ultimate Generalisation: An Effort in the Philosophy of Science." New York: C. P. Somerby. 1876.

¹⁶ "Gesammelte Studien und Aufsätze gemeinverständlichen Inhalts." Von Eduard Von Hartmann. Berlin: Carl Duncker. 1876.

¹⁷ "Johannes Scotus Erigena: Sein Leben und seine Schriften; die Wissenschaft und Bildung seiner Zeit," &c. Von Ludwig Noack. Leipzig: E. Koschny. 1876.

connected annotations by no means comes up to its high-flown title—"Johannes Scotus Erigena and the Science of his Times."

We have received two other volumes of the "Philosophical Library;"—a new edition of Kant's "Prolegomena to all Future Metaphysic;"¹⁸ and the first two parts (containing the "Categories" and "De Interpretatione") of what appears to be a projected translation of the "Organon."¹⁹ The latter will be noticed when the translation is completed.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

IT is impossible to predict exactly what may be the attractions of some future volume that shall describe the doings and sufferings of the late English Arctic Expedition, but the probabilities are strongly against its giving anything like so vivid a picture of the experiences of such travel as do the two volumes translated from the German of Herr Julius Payer.¹ A man of unusual strength and power of endurance, an accomplished mountaineer, a tried man of science, a first-rate sketcher, a hearty comrade both to the men and to the dogs of the expedition, he has been able to narrate from no hearsay report all that was done by the two great German North Polar Expeditions of 1871 and 1872-74. The Austro-Hungarian Government were incited, or at least encouraged, by private munificence to undertake an exploration of portions of the Arctic regions until then utterly unknown to science—the seas between Spitzbergen and Novaya Zemlya; and a small voyage of reconnaissance was undertaken first by Lieutenant Weyprecht and Lieutenant Payer, not with the object so much of reaching high latitudes as for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Gulf Stream would prove helpful to an expedition, and whether the climate and the state of the ice generally, and the probabilities of the following season, pointed to the following year (1872) as a suitable one for more extended efforts. In a small sailing vessel, with a crew not under their control, they had such success that at one moment they hoped they might come nearer the Pole than any ship ever had done in this sea, and actually did reach latitude 78°38', with prospects that almost inclined them to think that there might be open water beyond. The approach of winter compelled their return, after navigating a hundred miles of unknown seas, and they returned believing themselves entitled to report that the Novaya Zemlya Sea is open far towards the north every year, and that Gillis's Land is either an island or a group of

¹⁸ "Immanuel Kant's Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik." Herausgegeben und erläutert von J. H. Von Kirchmann. Zweite Auflage. Leipzig: E. Koschny. 1876.

¹⁹ "Aristoteles' Kategorien; Aristoteles' Hermeneutica." Uebersetzt und erläutert von J. H. Von Kirchmann. Leipzig: E. Koschny. 1876.

¹ "The Lands within the Arctic Circle." By Julius Payer. Two Vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

islands with masses of land to the north-east. From their report, from which these two conclusions are taken, no doubt was entertained as to the desirableness of sending the expedition, and Messrs. Weyprecht and Payer were appointed joint commanders of it. Its duty was not so much to make any special effort to reach the Pole as to make general Arctic exploration in an E.N.E. direction. Starting on the 13th of June 1872, the "Tegetthoff," with its complement of twenty-four picked men, left Bremerhafen, and a month later took leave of Europe on its first and last voyage. Its equipment was the result of a minute study, which can be appreciated only after reading Herr Payer's admirable introduction on the whole of the problems of Polar exploration—an introduction in which he distinctly declares against the theory of an open Polar sea, and expresses his opinion that the highest latitudes accessible by ships have already been reached, and that the probability of reaching the Pole itself with our present resources is so small, and the attempt to do it is so utterly disproportionate to the sacrifices exacted and the results achieved, that it would be advisable to exclude it from Arctic exploration until, instead of the impotent vessels of the sea, we can send thither those of the air. Much light on the difficulties of sledging, and on the reasons why blasting is of so extremely little service in the ice, will also be found in the same chapter, while they receive frequent illustration in the course of the succeeding narrative. They found great difficulties a few days after their leaving the Norwegian coast, but thought them accidental and temporary; and after an unexpected meeting near the Pankratjew Islands with three special friends and promoters of the expedition who had determined to make a depôt of provisions for them far north, they again set off with a fresh wind from the north-east, with a promise of good navigation in a northerly direction. Within a few hours the "Tegetthoff" was closed in upon by the ice, and they never again saw her floating in water. A winter of great hardship and depression followed, the ship drifting with the floe, and subjected for a hundred and thirty days to daily alarms, which partook of that characteristic of earthquakes, that no amount of repetition rendered them less but rather more terrifying. They were surrounded and squeezed by the ice, the tossing tremulous motion of which literally filled the air with noises as of shrieks and howls. Night after night they lay down clothed, with rifle and bag of necessaries at hand, ready for instant flight; and night after night the deck-watch warned them of imminent peril. They were drifting to the north-east in utter darkness after a short while. But they hoped for deliverance in the spring. The ship was, however, too deeply imbedded in piled-up ice, and the summer passed in ineffectual efforts to get free. In August the ice of the second winter began to form, and despair of accomplishing any of their objects settled down upon them. But on the 20th of August they found that their floe had carried them to the glorious discovery of Kaiser Franz-Joseph Land. This put new life into the whole party. After fresh dangers, they at last succeeded in landing; and in sledge journeys, involving the extremest effort and suffering, Herr Payer and a selected number of men

made, between March 10th and April 24th, explorations covering a distance of 160 miles (nautical) from the ship. It then became necessary to abandon the ship, and it was only as hunger was threatening to end their struggles that, after a journey with sledges and boats, helped by the two remaining dogs who had been such cherished and valuable companions of their toils, lasting ninety-six days, they happily fell in with two Russian ships out for salmon-fishing on the coasts of Novaya Zemlya and were brought back to Norway. It is impossible to praise these two volumes too highly. There is no exaggeration of self-laudation or of detail, but all seems to be the plain unvarnished tale of heroic effort crowned with success as well as threatened by almost paralysing terrors. They are models for tone, vigour, and simplicity, and their translator has been as happy in his work as their author. They are abundantly illustrated with capital sketches taken by Herr Payer himself on the spot, after he had, as he says, "accustomed" himself to draw with only one pair of woollen gloves at risk of frost-bitten fingers. For those who, not wishing for the details of Arctic travel, yet wish to ascertain the opinions of so daring a traveller, the introduction, the tables of contents, the copious index, will be very valuable.

Mr. W. G. Palgrave's name on the title-page of a book must at once procure for it many careful readers, and is in itself a security that it is written with an amount of information not too common. Dutch Guiana was interesting to Mr. Palgrave as affording him an opportunity of studying in a somewhat successful colony the problem how to secure colonial success. The word "somewhat" has to be introduced, because, until more capital and enterprise come to Surinam, and its population is increased, that success is necessarily circumscribed. The temperature varies from 70° Fahr. to 96° Fahr.; "there is no tropical field growth but finds, or might find, its home in Dutch Guiana; no valuable timber but forms part of her boundless forests; no costly spice is a stranger to her soil; no useful extract alien from the list of her resources. Surinam is the triumph of vegetable life: the triumph of human industry alone is wanting to subjugate and complete." The Dutch Government is thoroughly popular throughout the district, and the wars which resulted in the freedom of the Creoles and of the Bush Negroes appear to have been so far from leaving bitterness behind, that Europeans and blacks are able to rely upon each other for help against any threatening danger. Mr. Palgrave relies, for the details of those wars, and for the general history of the colony, upon the information kindly provided for him by the friends whose guest he was during his fortnight's visit to Surinam. Apart from the suggested openings for commercial enterprise, the chief interest of this book for the English public lies in Mr. Palgrave's account of the Coolies and Chinese immigrants, and in his propositions of modes of increasing the labouring population. The Dutch, though rulers of the land, are few, and other Europeans fewer still. The population, appearance, and habits of the capital are

* "Dutch Guiana." By W. G. Palgrave. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

impressed by the Dutch stamp, however, and throughout the colony there is a noticeable steadiness and method which shows how the governing class have contrived to assimilate the governed to themselves. This has been happy for Surinam, for there the Negro, in consequence of the lessons he had learned, has, since his emancipation in 1863, risen with unparalleled rapidity to a relationship with his former master which promises the best future for the colony. These Creoles are a cheerful, bustling portion of the community, and though they retain some of the vices that come in the train of slavery (of which it would have been well for Mr. Palgrave to speak in a more refined and more condemnatory tone), there is every reason to hope that as they prosper, and as the children grow up in freedom and virtue, they will be quite a model West Indian population. The importation of Coolies dates only two years back, so nothing can be predicated yet of their future; but the conditions of their immigration have been carefully supervised, and they are put on exactly the same footing as in Demerara and Trinidad. Mr. Palgrave has a very low opinion of them, reporting their gardens to be neglected, their houses untidy, and themselves "offensive." He adds, however, that these signs are perhaps only due to their being dispirited by their new circumstances in life. Considering the facts of their engagement as Coolies, this may well be the secret. It is also a matter for doubt whether a comparison between the dwellings of Creoles who have their wives and families around them, and those of the presumably lonely Coolies is quite a fair one; for gardens stocked with vegetables and bright with flowers, as well as houses full of glass and gaudy prints, are more apt to be found where women are making home pleasant to men and children. The Chinese have also not been long enough in the colony to be free from their indentures to field-work, and so have not yet spread through its society, as Chinese invariably do, taking the shopkeeping and trading industries often almost entirely into their own hands, till, as in California, the community begins to fear them. But their gardens are utilised to the utmost, though Mr. Palgrave declines to indicate what the insides of their houses are, otherwise than by reminding his readers of their fondness for pigs. To supply the want of population Mr. Palgrave recommends, first, the appointment of qualified women in each of the eleven districts of the colony to superintend the Creole babies, who die in great numbers through the ignorance and carelessness of the mothers; secondly, he bases on the fact of the suitability of the climate of Guiana to the Negro a scheme for an organisation of immigration from Zanzibar. He thinks that the suppression of the slave-trade in Eastern Africa must have created a surplus in the African labour market, and more or less done injury to the prestige of the Sultan of Zanzibar, whom we had engaged to protect. He wishes "well-meaning ignorance" to stand aside and allow a system for supplying the deficit of West Indian labour by Negro importation from the East African coast, under regulations such as apply to Coolie immigration, giving the Sultans of Zanzibar and Muscat a percentage on the emigration agency by way of keeping up their dignity. This would be, according to Mr.

Palgrave "to transfer, not by compulsion, but by their own free consent, those who, if they remain at home, cannot, by the nature of things, be other than slaves or slave-makers," to favourable conditions of life. Mr. Palgrave was the guest of gentlemen needing labourers, and of the Dutch governor of the colony.

Mr. Fisher³ takes for one of the mottoes on his title-page Voltaire's exhortation to an historian, "*De ne point calomnier et de ne point ennuyer.*" An English reader can decide that he fulfils the second condition; a candid Californian must decide whether or no he fulfils the first. If he does not calumniate, it must be confessed that California, with all its lovely climate and luxuriance of production, is "a very good place for an honest man to keep away from." The prominent political problem of California is the incursion of the Chinese. The "six companies" bring them over in immense numbers, and Mr. Fisher says, "Where the yellow workman appears the white workman disappears with an alarming celerity and certainty." He can live on less, and so can starve out his competitor. "The Chinese have already in most parts of California secured a practical monopoly of such trades as woollen manufacturing, bootmaking, public-laundry work, domestic service, cigar-making, navy-work, fruit-preserving, market-gardening (hard run here by Italians), costermongering, and placer-mining. They are pressing into watchmaking. In fishing, especially in shell-fishing, and in farm labour, their competition begins to be felt." Mr. Fisher gives a pleasant and curious picture of California's great littérateur, Mr. Bancroft, among whose band of literary assistants he at one time was, and speaks with the authority of past personal experience of the condition of journalism there. His volume is of great interest and value, though some might think it marred by a certain degree of flippancy, as well as by the last chapter, on what he calls "muck-erism."

Colonel C. Chaillé Long,⁴ chief of the staff of the expedition which, in 1874, accompanied Colonel Gordon, the Governor-General of the Equatorial Provinces of Egypt, to Gondokoro, prefaces his account of his travels to Lake Victoria Nyanza, and to the Makraka Niam-Niam country, by a few laudatory paragraphs about the Khedive, whom he calls an "enlightened sovereign, under whose auspices the work of Central African regeneration is being carried forward," and to whom he ascribes the "triumphant solution of the problem of the sources of the Nile." These views will give the measure of the man. Trained in the Southern States of America, he deprecates, perhaps of course, a "sentimental" view of Africans, whom he finally describes as "miserable wretches, often devoid of all tradition or belief in a Deity, which enthusiastic travellers have heretofore endeavoured to endow him with" (*sic*). He believes that missions and commercial enter-

³ "The Californians." By Walter M. Fisher. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

⁴ "Central Africa: Naked Truths of Naked People." By Colonel C. Chaillé Long. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

prises are alike impracticable in Central Africa, and holds that while the Sultan of Zanzibar is powerless to stop the slave-trade on the eastern coast of Africa, the establishment of the Egyptian Government along the Bahr-el-Abiad has struck a fatal blow to the slave-trade in those regions. He places implicit faith in the will and the power of the Khedive to produce this result. He visited M'Tsé, "king" of Uganda, to seek his help, and was present, and did not remonstrate, when thirty victims were strangled in his honour. To have remonstrated or shown any sign of feeling would "have subjected him to ridicule and loss of prestige." He felt sickened and oppressed, but accompanied the king to his harem, where he laughed "with a freedom that soon convinced me we should be great friends." He did not visit frequently "at the palace, for I was seriously ill; and, besides, almost every visit was attended by a human sacrifice; and my soul sickened at this kind of honour." A fortnight after his first reception seven men were in the place for victims when he was summoned to receive publicly M'Tsé's consent to help him on his journey. He was ill, and sat down and reflected on the world beyond. He was roused from his day-dream by the murder of the seven men. He says, "My anxious look of inquiry" called forth a sort of apology from the king; but he records no remonstrance, although he says, "Though I felt elated at the permission of visiting the lake, there came a shadow of regret as I thought of the now mangled bodies without, and my indirect complicity with their death." A little later on, when a strange tribe attacked his boats, he used his elephant-hunting rifle with explosive bullets, and speaks of their exploding in their naked bodies. This is at least a very naked truth. At the conclusion of his journey, for which he claims great scientific results, and for which he has been "decorated" by the Khedive, he took some native men and women from the interior and "gave" them to the Khedive for purposes of ethnographical science. At that interview the Khedive assured him that he wished for the extinction of the slave-trade, "which is no longer a want or even a luxury to Egypt." We have, as far as possible, put these facts in Colonel Long's own language. It is to be hoped that the English reader will not pass them by with an indolent sense of merely reading a stimulating and somewhat original record of explorations. The traveller is an American; and the character of his country is distinctly at stake if it does not take the most public means available for denouncing a canon of moral action towards aboriginal tribes which is not only directly counter to the most hopeful impulses of modern civilisation but has been explicitly repudiated by the American Government in its own treatment of the Indian tribes. It is known that the attention of the United States Government has been called to this scandalous enunciation of doctrines and confession of practice; and it rests with the English public to give no uncertain note of condemnation of a narrative in which Western civilisation is disgraced. The conduct of travellers will be largely affected by the sentiments of that public for whom they publish the record of their travels; and even if the travel-reading public is lazy and careless when

the tale concerns only the reckless and cruel waste of animal life, it is more than time for the public conscience to rouse itself when barbarism and brutality to human beings are coated over with the varnish of scientific and ethnographic phraseology.

Lieutenant-Colonel Dodge⁵ displays a great knowledge of the lands inhabited by the remaining Indian tribes, of the game and hunting yet left in these regions in spite of the recklessness of modern sportsmen and of skin-traders, and, what is more interesting to intelligent persons, of the manner of life and customs of the Indians themselves; although, as an official, he certainly is disposed to do them scant justice. He has asked Mr. Blackmore to write a preface to the book; and it is curious to see how far the colleagues differ as to facts and principles, and yet agree as to conclusions. It is to be feared that almost all Americans look upon the extinction of the Indians as an immutable decree of nature. Mr. Blackmore says that three great mistakes have been made in the relations between the United States Government and the Indians: that the Government has not fulfilled its treaty engagements; that the "Indian agents" perpetrate frauds which constantly enable them to retire quickly with good fortunes; and that the whites make encroachments on the Indians. Mr. Dodge says that three mistakes are: that the Government has failed to enforce its treaty obligations; that it has dealt with the Indians through two departments; and that it has yielded too much to the sentimental humanitarian element of the country. Mr. Blackmore appeals to the happy experience of the Canadian Government, which reconciles and civilises the Indians of the Dominion by fair treaties fairly adhered to. Mr. Dodge says that the treaty system is entirely a wrong one, and is not adopted in Canada. Mr. Dodge also admits the frauds committed on the Indians, and wishes the tribes to be as rapidly as possible subjected to the ordinary laws of the United States; to punish "cohabitation, miscalled marriage (of white men) with Indian women;" to discourage most distinctly the introduction of "liquors, arms, ammunition, and property of any kind taken without authority into the Indian country for traffic with Indians;" to reform the Indian agencies, and severely to restrict Indians to "reservations." Then he thinks the Indians may be civilised. Mr. Blackmore looks upon their disappearance as certain, but that may only be because he despairs of their receiving justice, much more kindness. The volume is a valuable book of reference for all whose hearts are stirred by the pressing question whether these aboriginal tribes are or are not to be driven off the face of the earth by the only too frequently unscrupulous white man. It may not be fit for a guide, but it is certainly the exponent of a large mass of opinion.

A small volume detailing the experiences of a month's visit, in the autumn of 1874, to many of the Kindergartens, several of the Primary Schools, and some of the Training Colleges of West Germany, will

⁵ "The Hunting-Grounds of the Great West." By Richard Irving Dodge. London: Chatto & Windus. 1877.

serve to heighten the deep regret felt by all friends of scientific education at the loss of the late Professor Payne.⁶ Left at his death unfinished, or rather not fully prepared for the press, these chapters are a most characteristic relic of their author, for they well represent his impartiality and thoroughness of investigation, his prompt decision and incisive criticism, his tender and large-hearted human interest in each individual to be educated, and his absolute openness to new impressions. His great concern was to introduce into England a just estimate of elementary education as apart from elementary instruction; that is, the training of the intellectual powers which are to be employed in acquisition. He says, "The object of elementary education is to develop the natural faculties; that of elementary instruction to apply them." "If we make instruction our chief aim, we necessarily introduce dogmatic, didactic teaching, which, as a rule, depresses the native powers; whereas if we make education—that is, cultivation—our chief aim, we elicit the native powers, and make the best of them." He found that these principles serve as the theoretical basis of German education, and that results follow in proportion as this theoretical basis is practically worked upon. His report is definitely in favour of the Kindergartens. One of the lessons most frequently recurred to throughout the volume is that the teacher is not to impose himself on the pupil, but to develop his powers. His observations on the special machinery through which Froebel's educational ideas are worked in Kindergartens will be of most practical importance to those who have children in groups under their charge; while the clearness with which he deduces the underlying principles, and points out the intellectual results expected from the use of the "gifts," will be invaluable to many whose little ones are being taught in their natural homes, and who will thus be enabled to utilise the constant variety of ordinary domestic life to the highest and best educational ends. If the book were to receive the public notice which its intrinsic merits and the weight of Professor Payne's well-earned eminence ought properly to ensure for it, it might well bring about the beginning of a new era in the intellectual history of England. Professor Payne afforded a remarkable instance of a man in advanced years possessing to the last all the alacrity of intellectual youth, and devoting himself with ever-renewed zeal to educational enterprises, which only failed of entire success through being too premature for general acceptance.

Mr. Hugh Owen⁷ has published what he calls an "Education Acts Manual." It is mainly a transcript of the recent Education Acts, arranged in a form which, to many persons, is easier to read than an ordinary Act of Parliament. The introduction is a sort of summary or popular digest of the whole of the recent legislation, and it will be

⁶ "A Visit to German Schools." By Joseph Payne. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

⁷ "The Elementary Education Acts, 1870, 1873, 1874, and 1886, with Introduction, Notes, and Index." By Hugh Owen, jun. London: Knight & Co. 1876.

extremely valuable to members of School Boards who are suddenly called upon to undertake unwonted duties.

Side by side with the English Education Acts may be read the Report of the Minister of Public Instruction for the colony of Victoria for the year 1875-76.⁸ It appears that during the year eighteen "Boards of Advice" reported that they had instituted proceedings to enforce compulsory clauses. Convictions were obtained in one hundred cases, and forty-nine cases were dismissed on various grounds. It seems that at the time of publishing the Report, the Education Act was in the course of being amended so as to make the compulsory clauses thoroughly effective throughout the colony.

Mr. David Syme⁹ has written a treatise on what he calls "Industrial Science," in which, in a sufficiently friendly spirit, he calls in question some of the most popular dogmas accepted by English political economists. On the whole, he accords in spirit with Mr. Mill, but mostly on those sides of him on which he was least of a pure economist and most of a social philosopher. Mr. Syme's view is, that among writers on political economy too much emphasis is laid on the narrower, coarser, and by no means universal facts of man's nature and of the physical world, and not enough on the more complex conditions which are of the utmost moment, and yet often evade notice. Thus Mr. Syme holds that political economy is not so much conversant with facts of the outward world as with the desires and other feelings to which these facts give rise. Nevertheless Mr. Syme is by no means a sentimental writer, and, in fact, his work is closely and aptly reasoned throughout, and in a mode which Mr. Mill, of all others, would have admired. Perhaps, however, Mr. Syme will generally be admitted to have laid down too broad a rule where he says, that "what is good for all, and not merely for an individual or a class, should be undertaken by the State; what benefits only the few should be left to private enterprise."

Mr. Crompton's¹⁰ treatise on "Industrial Conciliation," though small in compass, has merits of the highest order, combining at once practical suggestions for improving the relations of employers and workmen, and an enlarged and enlightened view of the issues involved in the several problems discussed. Mr. Crompton puts no faith in mere machinery, whether created on one side or the other; and while he regards trade unions as necessary for the provisional organisation of labour, looks far more hopefully to the personal character and sense of responsibility of employers for the rise of wages and the elevation of the labourer. The capitalists "have to solve the industrial problem of the world, to discover the truths on which it must depend, and, putting aside the preconceived notions and prejudices of the past, to urge

⁸ "Report of the Minister of Public Instruction for the Year 1875-76." Melbourne. 1876.

⁹ "Outlines of an Industrial Science." By David Syme. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

¹⁰ "Industrial Conciliation." By Henry Crompton. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

forward the final industrial and social reorganisation towards which we are now moving." The Appendix contains a useful collection of documents pertinent to the subject which is treated throughout in connection with all the leading trades.

Mr. Nicholl and Mr. Flaxman have published a serviceable edition of the "Law of Parliamentary and Municipal Registration" ¹¹ with "notes, useful tables, and the most important decisions given in appeals from revision courts," and proposed alterations in the law.

The conception of Mr. James Routledge's work on the "History of Popular Progress, chiefly in Relation to the Freedom of the Press and Trial by Jury," ¹² is a good one, and it is worked out with laborious attention to detail. The period covered is from the accession of Charles II. to the death of George III., and the method employed is to discover, not only striking constitutional events and crises, but to trace the progress of social changes in all classes of society which were working together towards the full establishment of popular liberties. Mr. Routledge is broad and tolerant in his tastes and in his treatment of his subject. He attempts, as he says, "to pay as true and just a regard to William Hone the parodist, to Samuel Bamford the Radical poet, to Robert Owen the undoubted philanthropist, to William Lovett the representative Chartist, as to Junius, to Horne Tooke, to the labours of Wilberforce, or to the statesmanship of Pitt and Fox." Mr. Routledge is of opinion that, since 1820, popular progress has been incessant, and that hereafter it is likely that the "one problem of education or ignorance will rise above all else, and claim solution at the hands of all honest men."

Mr. Haweis ¹³ is one of the best known, and, to many persons, the most favourably known, of the London clergy. In his collection of essays or lectures styled "Current Coin," the whole of Mr. Haweis's philosophy of human life is set out in full. The leading topics are not very numerous, but, ranging as they do from the "Devil" to "Recreation," they touch upon most of the thoughts with which all persons in their graver moments are more or less occupied. The topics of crime, pauperism, and drunkenness are those on which an active and sensible London clergyman is pretty sure to have strong and clear views, and Mr. Haweis's views are of the strongest and clearest. He is vehemently opposed to using the police court as a training place for children. He says, "Instead of sending juvenile criminals to the magistrate, send them to the schoolmaster: let the policeman take them to some one who will teach them better; not, as now, to a place for the manufacture of criminals." Mr. Haweis objects to giving charity in small doles. He says that—

"Popular charity may be defined as the art of making that useless to

¹¹ "The Law of Parliamentary and Municipal Registration." By Alexander Charles Nicholl and Arthur John Flaxman. London: Knight & Co. 1876.

¹² "Chapters in the History of Popular Progress." By James Routledge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

¹³ "Current Coin." By the Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

many which might have been useful to some one. You give a shilling to a man out of work, you might just as well give a man one boot. No ; spend a little more, and get him a place or give him an outfit. If it is a real case of temporary calamity, then pour out your money. Let us have a £5 note."

The most original essay in the volume is, perhaps, that on "Recreation," in which Mr. Haweis defends the literature, and even the art, of the "Police News," and dwells eagerly on the moral lessons and moral influence of the play of "Rip Van Winkle." He says—

"We weep over the man as he is dragged back again by this demon of drink. It comes home to many hearts every night. There are people who have friends, fathers, sons, who are going the same way. . . . The man in the midst of his weakness is so lovable at times, that we long to reclaim him ; and many a man sees there a portrait of himself, and I do believe he goes home a sadder, a wiser, and a better man than he was before."

Mr. D. P. Stuart-Menteth, stock and share broker of Calcutta, has published a "Review of the Causes which have led to the Depreciation in the Value of the Rupee as a Standard of Currency in connection with the Exchange between India and Great Britain."¹⁴ He reviews in a series of precisely-stated propositions all the familiar causes which ever have, or ever could, be alleged as explanatory of the depreciation in question. His remedy is, 1st, that Government "should raise a loan in London ;" and with the proceeds, 2d, buy up the whole or as much of the available stock of silver in the London market as may be deemed advisable ; and, 3d, reduce the paper currency by withdrawing from circulation all notes of the several issues over Rs.100 in value, as a means to absorb the silver purchased. The writer, in fact, purposes, and expects, to enable Government absolutely to regulate the price of silver at all times by making great or small purchases. But it is obvious such a remedy is only an artificial and momentary palliative. The Government can only contract loans for the extensive operation contemplated by pledging its credit ; but its credit must be supported by payments of one kind or another, and at one time or another ; and therefore all that is really done is that the country engages in a cumbersome operation for the sole purpose of buying a thing dear and selling it cheap.

One of the subordinate, but highly illustrative, problems respecting the province of Government is usefully treated in Arthur Von Studnitz's work on gold,¹⁵ translated by Mrs. Brewer, with notes and additions by Mr. Edwin W. Streeter. The value of this work largely consists in the copious and exact account it contains of the actual

¹⁴ "The Silver Question and how to raise Exchange." By D. P. Stuart-Menteth. Simla.

¹⁵ "Gold ; or, Legal Regulations for the Standard of Gold and Silver Wares in Different Countries of the World." Translated and Abridged from "Die gesetzliche Regelung des Feingehaltes von Gold- und Silberwaaren," von Arthur Von Studnitz. By Mrs. Brewer. With Notes and Additions by Edwin W. Streeter. London : Chatto & Windus. 1877.

efforts in the way of Government interference which have been made in different countries. The most recent English law upon the standard of gold and silver ware dates from 1854. In 1844 the penalties attached to counterfeit stamping of gold and silver were fixed. It is instructive to notice, that whereas Besançon, in France, pays from 800,000 to 1,000,000 francs stamp-duty generally upon watches, many more hands could be employed if it were not that, in consequence of the restrictions of the French laws, it is necessary to send so large a number of unfinished watches to Geneva, where the gold may be of lower standard than is allowed in France. It is extraordinary what a mass of varied information is included in the small compass of this book, and it would be difficult to name a civilised country in which the existing laws regulating the standard of gold and silver wares are not included. Part II. of the work is wholly occupied with a brief enumeration of these laws. In Part III. the problem is discussed as to whether "the statesman has to deal with the gold trade and with the silver trade in the same or in a different manner"! The question is answered in the terms that "no reason exists why legislation should deal with the whole silver trade otherwise than it does with the gold trade." In Part IV. an inductive conclusion is arrived at that "experience has pronounced throughout in this matter against the interference of the State." In Part V. a similar conclusion is reached deductively from general reasoning. In Part VI. the particular methods applied or proposed in order to render possible the legal regulation of gold and silver ware are examined. In Part VII. the degree of interest in the question which the workers in precious metal may be supposed to have is examined; and the conclusion is finally reached that "legal regulations for the standard of gold and silver do not protect the public against deception; and they are therefore worthless."

Mr. James Maclaren's "Thoughts Suggested by the Fall in the Value of Silver"¹⁶ in India, though they are not much more than thoughts, are none the less useful comments on several expedients which have been suggested for the remedy of the inconvenience. Mr. Maclaren notices that it is far from certain that the fall in the value of silver—at least a fall anything like that now felt—will be permanent; and that it is possible, perhaps probable, that it will cease when the tendency to demonetise silver in Europe has reached its limit, and the Indian Government may be right in checking the flow of the demonetised silver into India, and waiting until this extra supply has been absorbed by the other silver-standard countries. The principal object of the writer is, however, to establish that a very long period must elapse before the currency of India can be sufficiently expanded to restore the former rate of exchange by a general rise of prices in India; and that the so-called demand for silver, caused by a fall in the value of that metal, cannot give rise to any increase in its price.

¹⁶ "The Indian Exchange: Thoughts Suggested by the Fall in the Value of Silver." By James Maclaren, M.A. London: Bumpus. 1876.

The "Report on the Administration of Travancore,"¹⁷ for the year 1874-75, brief and statistical as are the facts of which it is composed, affords an interesting picture of the internal economy of a Native Indian State. Thus, under the head "Elephant Department," it appears that at the beginning of the year there were 110 elephants, which were added to in the course of the year by twenty. There are miscellaneous receipts from hiring out elephants for pagodas and marriage processions. Under the political head is included a somewhat detailed diary of the Maharajah's tour to Madras, Calcutta, Agra, and Delhi in January and February 1875. Under the head of "Receipts" it appears that, in respect of arrack and opium, the increased receipts were due to higher rentals fetched at the sale of farms; and the increase in the salt revenue was due partly to the raising of the monopoly price, and partly from increased sales.

We may well envy the completeness of Colonial Government statistical tables such as those of New Zealand for the year 1875.¹⁸ The index itself presents a most comprehensive survey of national activity in all its departments. The educational and agricultural statistics are those which are most lacking in English Government statistics; in those of New Zealand, they are full and exact.

Mr. James Lord's pamphlets^{19 20 21} on various aspects of the controversy between the Churches of England and Rome, though somewhat desultory in their method and indefinite in their general purport, certainly contain a quantity of matter of undoubted value. The interest of the discussion which arose some years ago on the claims of the Pope to confer "ecclesiastical titles" in this country has long slumbered, and has only been temporarily reawakened by the occasional pamphlets of Mr. Gladstone. Mr. James Lord has none the less thought it worth while to conduct a laborious historical investigation into the pre-Reformation relations of the Pope and the Kings of England, and, more especially in his "Ramble with the Cardinal," to controvert, almost paragraph by paragraph, an article of Cardinal Manning's which appeared in the "Contemporary Review" in 1875, in which the Cardinal enters upon a most elaborate and erudite inquiry for the purpose of distinguishing between the Pope's assent to the *contents* of Magna Charta, and his disapproval of the *mode* of getting it.

We have to notice some fresh contributions to the excellent German pamphlet series, edited by Fr. von Holzendorff and W. Oucken, entitled, "Controversial Questions of the Day." One of these recent additions treats of the new law of the 6th of February 1875, concern-

¹⁷ "Report on the Administration of Travancore for the Year A.D. 1874-75." Travancore Government Press. 1876.

¹⁸ "Statistics of the Colony of New Zealand for the Year 1875." Wellington. 1876.

¹⁹ "The Vatican and St. James'; or, England Independent of Rome." By James Lord. London: W. Macintosh. 1875.

²⁰ "The Roman Pontiffs, Popes, or Bishops of Rome, and their Times." By James Lord. London: Bush. 1876.

²¹ "A Ramble with the Cardinal." By James Lord. London: Bush. 1876.

ing the establishment of civil marriage. Dr. M. Baumgarten's²² arguments in defence of the law, especially as against narrow Protestant objections, are able, and indeed brilliant. He shows the hypocrisy which all necessary conformity to ecclesiastical usages unavoidably occasions, and how uncongenial such forced conformity is to Luther's conception of Christianity, and to a spiritual conception of a Church.

Herr Etienne Laspeyres' ²³ pamphlet in the same series on the age of German Professors is entitled, "A Contribution to the Statistics and Politics of Universities." The average age of professors of Berlin University is 58; of Gottingen, 60; of Heidelberg, 53;—while the age at Dorpat is only 46; at Strasburg, 42; and at Czernswitz, 40. At Vienna the age is 51. The number of students at Berlin is 2421; at Vienna, 3655; at Innsbruck, 1481; and at Leipzig, 1513.

The collection of popular scientific pamphlets edited by Herren Virchow and Holzendorf affords scope for the discussion of a number of topics which are often either buried away in cumbrous volumes or escape precise treatment altogether. In a pamphlet on the "Ground and its Purpose," ²⁴ a quantity of material is collected which, under any other less original title, could hardly have been introduced. Thus the ground under our feet is not only an object of geological and chemical research, but has its economical and social aspects. It supplies food; it is susceptible of various degrees of cultivation; its constitution throws light on the earlier phases of the world's history, and perhaps on the future vicissitudes of the world's course. It is the grave of all organic life; and, in more senses than one, it is the weightiest portion of the earth. The pamphlet is, on the whole, a very suggestive one.

Another pamphlet of the same series, by Dr. R. Buchholz, treats of the "Country and People of West Africa." ²⁵ It gives a brief, clear, and lively picture of natural objects and phenomena, and of the manners and customs of the natives. It is satisfactory to know there is a reading public in Germany which can appreciate such solid and yet unpretentious literature.

We have received an extremely full and interesting Report of the Italian Minister of Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce, for the first half of the year 1876,²⁶ and also the Report of a Commission²⁷ appointed to obtain agricultural statistics and to report on the condi-

²² "Deutsche Zeit- und Streit-Fragen." Heft 75. "Der Kampf um das Reichs-civilstandsgesetz in der deutschen protestantischen Kirche." Von Dr. M. Baumgarten. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1876.

²³ Heft 74. "Das Alter der deutschen Professoren." Von Dr. Etienne Laspeyres. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1876.

²⁴ "Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge." Heft 263. "Der Boden und seine Bestimmung." Von Heinrich Mohl. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1876.

²⁵ Heft 257. "Land und Leute in West-Afrika." Von Dr. R. Buchholz. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1876.

²⁶ "Annali del Ministro di Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio Anno 1876, Primo Semestre." † Roma. 1876.

²⁷ "Relazione della Commissione sul progetto di legge presentato dal Ministro di Agricoltura." Roma. 1875.

tion of the agricultural classes in Italy. The former Report includes another Report already presented by the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Local Government Board on the subject of poor-laws and general provisions for poor-relief in the different countries of Europe. The mathematical figures under which the statistics of births, deaths, immigrations, and the like are presented, give the latter part of the work more the appearance of a geometrical treatise than a Blue Book. The other Report affords a minute picture of the modes of subsistence and manner of life of the inhabitants of districts of Italy which are not accessible to the ordinary traveller.

SCIENCE.

DR. ENNEPER has published an extremely valuable work on the theory and history of "Elliptic Functions,"¹ a subject too little known and too little studied by the generality of the mathematicians of the present day. In our own language we know of no such systematic treatise on the subject, and even on the Continent the attention of mathematicians has been to a much greater extent devoted to higher algebra and geometry, if at least we may judge by the character of the mathematical works recently published. Dr. Enneper's book contains the substance of his lectures on the theory and application of elliptic functions, and its publication we have no doubt will do much to arouse interest in this subject, so important in its manifold applications to the different branches of mathematics. The historical sketches are well drawn; indeed, much of the interest with which the book will be studied is derived from the fact that every proposition or result of importance is connected with the name of its original discoverer. This is an admirable plan, which we should like to see more generally adopted in mathematical treatises. It has an animating influence on the reader, and without doubt helps towards the advance of science. The historical notices may be accepted as strictly trustworthy, for the author tells us he has himself carefully examined all the original authorities.

The works of Legendre, Abel, and Jacobi form the foundation of all later researches in this subject. Almost every theorem and every formula in the theory of elliptic integrals and elliptic functions is connected with the names of these three distinguished mathematicians. Legendre's researches on the rectification of elliptic and hyperbolic arcs led him to denote the corresponding integrals, as well as other integrals to which purely analytical considerations gave rise, by the name "elliptic functions." They were afterwards called "elliptic integrals." The term "elliptic" is applied to the integrals and functions which occur without any characteristic geometrical or analytical meaning whatever, except of a purely conventional nature.

¹ "Elliptische Functionen: Theorie und Geschichte." *Academische Vorträge.* Von Dr. Alfred Enneper. Halle a. S.: Nebert. 1876.

Among functions of one variable, trigonometrical functions have the peculiarity that the value of such a function remains unchanged when the argument increases by a multiple of a certain real quantity, which is called the *modulus* or the *period*. Exponential functions lead to imaginary periods. An elliptic function is a double periodic function, that is, it is such that two determinate quantities may be added to its argument without causing any change in its value. The property of double periodicity of elliptic functions forms the basis of the researches by which Abel of Christiania and Jacobi of Königsberg advanced in so marvellous a manner the mathematical sciences. Abel's papers were published in Crelle's Journal in 1826, but he was not long permitted to pursue his great and manifold discoveries. In his twenty-seventh year, only two years after the publication of his first paper on elliptic functions, death put an end to his brilliant career.

In 1829 Jacobi, the contemporary of Abel, published his celebrated work "Fundamenta Nova Theoriæ Functionum Ellipticarum." This work, which placed its author—not yet twenty-five years old—amongst the foremost mathematicians of his time, contains in small space the most important results of the theory of elliptic functions. From certain passages in the "Disquisitiones Arithmeticæ" there is reason to believe that Gauss had busied himself with investigations of a similar nature, which had led him, before the end of the last century, to results identical with those obtained by Abel and Jacobi. If this be so, it is to be lamented that so great a mathematician did not communicate his discoveries to his contemporaries and invite their co-operation.

For the general character and execution of the theoretical part of the work, great praise is due to Dr. Enneper. The notation employed is exclusively that of Legendre and Jacobi. In the notes at the end of the volume will be found some interesting geometrical applications of elliptic integrals by Maclaurin, Fagnani, Talbot, and others.

The first part of M. Schlegel's "System der Raumlehre"² was published in 1872, and was noticed in the "Westminster Review" at the time. The second part is now before us, containing the application of Grassmann's method of lineal extension to the elements of modern geometry and algebra. It is a remarkable method. The book introduces us to what is, in fact, a new kind of mathematics, an entirely new mode of treatment, both of algebraical and geometrical problems. Old symbols are used with new meanings. An equation, for instance, may denote a point or a line, or a particular piece of a line, according to the relations which hold amongst the constants employed in it. It is a peculiarity of Grassmann's method that the formulæ with geometrical signification contain no co-ordinates, but only points, straight lines, and curves, whose relations are directly expressed by the formulæ. Numerous applications to geometry and stereometry, to statics and mechanics, even to magnetism and crystallography, show in a striking

² "System der Raumlehre nach der Principien der Grassmann'schen Ausdehnungslehre." Von Victor Schlegel. Zweiter Theil. "Die Elemente der modernen Geometrie und Algebra." Leipzig: Teubner. 1875.

manner that the new analysis is the only one adapted to the nature of these sciences.

It may be well to give an idea of the contents of the present volume. The introduction treats of the line at infinity, systems of points in involution, and the multiplication of space-magnitudes; after which follow the chief properties of the conic sections considered as functions of a variable point. The second chapter describes the projective properties of points and lines, and their combinations, a good deal of which is original. Then comes the theory of determinants and sub-determinants, and the application of determinants to the theory of equations. The rest of the book is occupied with general considerations respecting space-functions, invariants, and covariants, &c., and the particular forms and properties of these in special cases.

Grassmann's method deserves to obtain, and we have no doubt will ultimately obtain, wide recognition. It cannot fail to excite interest in the mind of any one who takes the trouble to learn its methods, and appears to be susceptible of considerable and varied development.

We have received the first part of the first volume of Clebsch's "Vorlesungen über Geometrie,"³ edited by Dr. Lindemann. This work, when completed, will contain, with some modifications and additions, the lectures delivered in the University of Göttingen by A. Clebsch during the latter years of his active and successful professoriate, together with lectures delivered otherwise by him on the present condition of geometric-algebraical research. The name of Clebsch is well known in connection with the higher developments of analytical geometry, and the work before us is an admirable, though far too condensed, exposition of his researches, and those of his fellow-workers in the same field. Among those fellow-workers we may mention the names of Chasles, Cremona, Hesse, Cayley, Sylvester, and Salmon. Although no single treatise in our own language with which we are acquainted is so comprehensive in its scope as the first part of the "Vorlesungen," the English student has in the widely-known works of Dr. Salmon, "Conic Sections," "Higher Plane Curves," "Lessons in Higher Algebra," the greater part of the subject-matter here treated of. In the chapter on curves of the second order and second class, *i.e.*, the conic sections generally, we find (as also elsewhere in the book) the fertility of the dualistic method and the theory of polars prominently brought out. The notation employed is that suggested by Aronhold and Clebsch himself, and differs from that used by the English geometers. In the chapter on the theory of algebraical forms the problem to be investigated is thus stated: Let there be introduced into a given algebraical form (or quantic, as it would be called by English writers), in the place of the n variables which it contains, n new variables which are connected with the original by n homogeneous

³ "Vorlesungen über Geometrie." Von Alfred Clebsch. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Dr. Ferdinand Lindemann. Erster Band. Erster Theil. Leipzig: Teubner. 1875.

equations; the given form is thus changed into a new one having certain properties common with it, and the study of such properties, unalterable by linear transformation, is the business of the Form-theory. The author then proceeds to the investigation of invariants and covariants, the Hessian and Jacobian of a quantic, and gives the methods of Sylvester and of Cayley and Bézout for forming eliminants. The fourth chapter discusses Plücker's formulæ, and investigates the singularities of the curves known as Steiner's curve, Cayley's curve, and others.

To the advanced student these lectures will prove of unquestionable value, although, as we think, their value would have been enhanced had condensation not been carried so far by the editor. If the matters here discussed had been extended over a large number of pages, or if in the given bulk less had been attempted, and a fuller treatment allowed, the result would have been a decided improvement. The second part, we are told, will treat of curves of the third order and third class, Abel's integrals, &c.

Dr. Von Nagel's "Geometrische Analysis,"⁴ which has reached a second edition, is calculated to occupy a definite and important place in a systematic course of school mathematics. It is intended for students who, having mastered the elementary propositions of geometry, are prepared for something of a more constructive character; and although of small range—extending only to the straight line and circle, and involving no conceptions except of a purely geometrical nature—will be found of considerable use as a text-book. The author's object has been to show that the discovery of the solution of a problem is not, as many think, a matter of mere accident or of special cleverness, but that it depends upon the application of definite and universal rules. It will be admitted that the book well satisfies the purpose for which the author intended it.

The second edition of "Die Theorie der Kegelschnitte,"⁵ by Dr. Geiser, differs from the first edition, which was published in 1867, chiefly in the arrangement of the subject-matter, many special propositions due to Steiner, which were in the first edition scattered through the volume, being in this collected into one chapter. There are also many additions, especially in the later chapters. One cannot but be struck, in looking through the book, by the absence in the diagrams of the *figures* of the conic sections. Tangents are drawn, and their points of contact, when these are required by the nature of the problem, marked, but the curves themselves are rarely drawn. In the fifth chapter, on the geometrical properties of the parabola, not a single parabolic curve is to be found until we come to the last pages, on the quadrature of the parabola. This peculiarity, which might be

⁴ "Geometrische Analysis: Eine systematische Anleitung zur Auflösung von Aufgaben aus der ebenen Geometrie auf reingemetrischem Wege." Von Dr. Von Nagel. Ulm: Wohler. 1876.

⁵ "Die Theorie der Kegelschnitte in elementarer Darstellung." [Jacob Steiner's "Vorlesungen über synthetische Geometrie." Erster Theil.] Von Dr. C. F. Geiser. Zweite Auflage. Leipzig: Teubner. 1876.

a positive gain to advanced students, is likely to confuse and perplex beginners, for whose benefit especially these lectures have been published.

Dr. Neumann has written a satisfactory little book on the "Mechanical Theory of Heat."⁶ It is intended for beginners, is quite elementary in its character, and has many of the requisites of a good text-book, being short, compact, and well arranged. We can highly recommend it as an introduction to the more extended treatises of Clausius, Zeuner, Verdet, &c., and to the special papers of Thomson, Boltzmann, and others. In an elementary text-book the multiplication of symbols which are not absolutely required for the elucidation of the matter in hand is to be deprecated. Dr. Neumann employs a new symbol, \bar{d} , to denote an infinitesimally small quantity, the usual d being reserved for those particular infinitesimals which denote *increase*. It does not appear that any advantage is thus gained. The old symbol, d , is sufficiently definite in its meaning to satisfy all the demands of the analysis, and Dr. Neumann has confused rather than simplified his exposition by the use of both symbols. The plan of the book is simple. In the earlier chapters the general principles of energy, work, heat, &c., are given, and the second law of thermo-dynamics (called here the principle of Clausius) explained. The chapters which treat of the development of the theory for gases and the principles of Carnot's cyclical processes are followed by a discussion of the applications of the theory to special cases, *e.g.*, to fusion, vaporisation, and systems of substances. A short appendix gives Krönig's theory of the molecular constitution of gases as modified by Clausius.

A work by Professor von Waltenhofen on "Mechanical Physics"⁷ is excellent in many ways. The author is Professor of Physics at the Technical High School at Prague, and his book is intended for the use of advanced students in this and similar schools. When we say that this volume gives, within the limits of 350 pages, an outline of the mechanics of solid, liquid, and gaseous bodies, the mechanical theory of heat, and the theory of the potential as applied to gravitation, magnetism, and electricity, some idea will be formed of the comprehensive scope of the work, as well as of the elevated character of the instruction given at the German technical schools. The author has added a "Mathematical Introduction," which we cannot but think to be either inadequate or unnecessary. To understand many of the most important parts of the book, the student must be thoroughly familiar with the principles of the differential and integral calculus, and the solution of differential equations. If he has not acquired this familiarity before entering upon the study of mechanical physics, the mathematical introduction will hardly enable him to do so.

The name of Riemann is known to mathematicians and physicists in

⁶ "Vorlesungen über die mechanische Theorie der Wärme." Von Dr. C. Neumann. Leipzig: Teubner. 1875.

⁷ "Grundriss der allgemeinen mechanischen Physik." Von Dr. A. Von Waltenhofen. Leipzig: Teubner. 1875.

this country as that of a mathematician of the first rank. In the work before us⁸ are embodied the lectures on mathematical physics which Riemann delivered in Göttingen in the year 1861. He left behind him nothing more than scanty notes of his lectures, and the best thanks of mathematicians are due to M. Hattendorff for the care and labour he has expended in the production of this work, which is of the highest value, both on account of Riemann's admirable mode of treatment, and also from the large amount of original matter contained in it.

The complete works⁹ of the great Königsberg astronomer Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel are now, thirty years after his death, for the first time being collected, and will be published in three volumes. We have received the first volume, containing a beautiful engraved portrait of Bessel, but shall reserve our notice of the publication until the other volumes appear.

Professor Blaserna's contribution to the "International Scientific Series"¹⁰ will be found interesting by many who, knowing a little of acoustics or of instrumental music, would gladly know something of the bearing of one upon the other. The chief object of the author has been to dwell upon this connection, and to show that music has been developed according to certain rules which depend upon unknown laws of nature since discovered. He has written an agreeable but at the same time rather superficial book. For thoroughness and accuracy it is not to be compared with the elementary book on the same subject by Mr. Sedley Taylor which was recently published.

The simple phenomena of acoustics, those, for example, which illustrate the dependence of the sound produced by a body on the vibrations of its particles, the vibrations of strings and plates, &c., are briefly, but, on the whole, skilfully sketched, and some recent experiments are well described. Sometimes, however, brevity leads to vagueness, as in the following account of the production of a note by an organ-pipe:—"The air enters by a pipe (reference is here made to a woodcut), passes into a box, and breaks through a narrow fissure against the upper lip. It partly enters the pipe and induces vibrations, and produces a very clear and agreeable sound." When these purely acoustical matters have been disposed of, the author shows how our common harmonic intervals have been introduced into modern music, and a comparison is instituted between the Pythagorean scale, our modern true scales—major and minor—and the tempered scales. The Greeks employed octaves and admitted the harmonies of the fourth and fifth, but did not use harmony properly so called. The important ratio $\frac{5}{4}$, corresponding to the interval of a major third, was unknown to them, and

⁸ "Schwere, Electricität und Magnetismus." Nach den Vorlesungen von Bernhard Riemann, bearbeitet von Karl Hattendorff. Hannover: Rümpler. 1876.

⁹ "Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel." Herausgegeben von Dr. Rud. Engelmann. In drei Bänden. Erster Band. Leipzig: W. Engelmann. 1875.

¹⁰ "The Theory of Sound in its Relation to Music." By Professor Blaserna, of the Royal University of Rome. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

was not introduced into modern music until the fifteenth century. The Greeks had in its stead the not widely different ratio $\frac{9}{8}$, which, the author says, is distinctly dissonant. No doubt it is, but he gives no reason for its dissonance, except that it is a high ratio, which is not a sufficient reason. The varieties of the Greek scales employed in Italy have been transformed by degrees into our modern scales, *i.e.*, the major scale and the minor scale. The first was more easily arrived at, but the second, with its two variations for the ascending and descending movement, was not completely developed until the seventeenth century, when admirable schools of music were established in the chief cities of Italy. After pointing out the compromise involved in the tempered scale, the author says—

“It is now in such general use that, for the most part, our modern executants no longer know that it is an incorrect scale, devised in order to avoid the practical difficulties of musical execution. Music founded on the tempered scale must be considered as imperfect music, and far below our musical sensibility and aspirations. That it is endured, and even thought beautiful, only shows that our ears have been systematically falsified from infancy.”

The importance of resultant notes, or combination notes, as they are otherwise called, in determining or modifying the dissonance of a chord, is insisted on. It is shown that, while all the resultant notes in the perfect major chord tend to reinforce the existing harmony, certain of them in the minor chord tend to disturb it. If these resultant notes were stronger, they would suffice to render the chord dissonant; as it is, they impart to it a disturbed and undecided character. Such effects are largely increased if the chord be inverted, that is, if one of the notes of the chord be played an octave higher. Professor Blaserna says:—“It is wonderful to see how Palestrina, who made great use of the musical process of inversion, guided only by the delicacy of his ear, and without any knowledge of theory, has been able to feel and appreciate such slight differences.”

During the last summer, special science lectures, intended for science teachers and others, have been delivered in the South Kensington Museum by various distinguished scientific men. These lectures were intended to illustrate the instruments and models contained in the different departments of the Loan Collection of scientific apparatus. Three of them are before us, “Sound and Music,” by Dr. W. H. Stone; “Photography,” by Captain Abney; and “Kinematics of Machinery,” by Professor Kennedy.¹¹

Professor Kennedy gives a few of the salient points in Reuleaux's theory of machines; and, although such lectures as these should be heard, and not read, in order to be fully appreciated—for woodcuts, however good, must be inferior to the actual models as means of

¹¹ “Science Lectures at South Kensington.” London: Macmillan & Co. 1876. “Sound and Music,” by Dr. W. H. Stone. “Photography,” by Captain Abney, R.E., F.R.S. “The Kinematics of Machinery,” illustrated by the Berlin Collection of Kinematic Models, by Professor Kennedy, C.E.

illustration—still Professor Kennedy has succeeded in giving a very intelligible account of Reuleaux's theory.

Dr. Stone has attempted too much. He would have acted more wisely had he confined himself to fewer topics and expounded them at greater length. At times he is obscure. In speaking of musical instruments, he points out the strong objections which may be urged against the system of equal temperament, and, at the same time, the grave difficulties that are encountered in any attempt to improve it. The chief attempts which have been made are seen in the enharmonic organ of General Perronet Thompson, with seventy-two keys in each octave; in Mr. Bosanquet's harmonium, with eighty-four keys in the octave; and in a simpler form of harmonium devised by Mr. Colin Brown.

Captain Abney gives an interesting account of the discovery of photography, and the advances in the photographic art made during the last forty years. He describes, among other processes, Dr. Vogel's experiments with films containing silver bromide, combined with various dyes, which become sensitive to the action of those rays which the dyes absorb.

It is difficult to write a satisfactory text-book on physics for school-boys. Of many attempts which have been made, especially on the Continent, but few have entirely succeeded. The writer not only should be a thorough master of his subject, but should have learnt by experience to sympathise with the wants and peculiarities of boys; for it is not the accumulation of facts, but their intelligent correlation, which can excite in the young a lively interest for science. If we may judge from the second part of Dr. Fliedner's "*Lehrbuch*"¹²—and unfortunately we have not the first part before us—we must pronounce it to be an exceptional success. The subjects of the present part are Light, Heat, Magnetism, and Electricity, which are treated in language as simple as the nature of the subjects allows. The phenomena of heat are explained according to the mechanical theory. The illustrations are good as far as they go, but they are not nearly numerous enough. Frictional electricity has too short a space allotted to it, while in the chapter on galvanism descriptions are given (*e.g.*, of Du Bois Reymond's physiological coil) which might with advantage have been omitted. On the whole, however, Dr. Fliedner has performed his task with great skill. He has had a long experience of school-work to guide him, and the value of his book is due nearly as much to what he has left out of it as to what he has put in it.

We have received a number of pamphlets on various matters connected with photography and dissolving-view apparatus,¹³ most of which are new editions of old publications, and call for no special

¹² "*Lehrbuch der Physik.*" Von Dr. C. Fliedner. Zweiter Theil. Braunschweig. 1876.

¹³ "*Der Kohle-Druck.*" Von Dr. Paul Liesegang. 4te Auflage. "*Ferrotypie.*" 7te Auflage. "*Ueber das Erlangen brillanter Negative.*" "*Die Projections-Kunst.*" 5te Auflage. "*Das Sciopticon.*" Düsseldorf: Verlag des Photographischen Archivs.

remark. The most imposing of them is "Der Kohle-Druck," which describes the complete process of carbon-printing. M. Bahr's¹⁴ aim is to give to those who, though ignorant of science, may desire to understand without foreign help the management of magic-lantern and similar apparatus, the manufacture of oxygen and hydrogen, &c., sufficient information to enable them to do so.

Dr. Günther has published a pamphlet—the substance of a lecture delivered at Nijremberg and at Munich—on the "Influence of the Heavenly Bodies on the Meteorological Phenomena of our Globe."¹⁵ We may mention a few of the many interesting points herein discussed. Do the sun and moon exercise any tidal action on the liquid nucleus of the earth? The author holds that such action must be taking place. He regards the earth's crust as comparatively thin, and appears to be unacquainted with the reasons advanced by Hopkins, Thomson, and others, for assigning to the solid crust a much greater thickness than two or three hundred miles. An explanation is given of the connection between the cold weather of February and May, and the November meteor-showers; and the question of the influence of the moon's rays is gone into, whether they possess any molecular action, as is believed by Secchi and Lommel. The connection between sun spots, magnetic disturbances, appearance of aurora, rainfall, thunderstorms, &c., is pointed out at some length. Whatever value the pamphlet may have is increased by the fact that all the authorities mentioned are quoted chapter and verse, so that the reader can refer at once to the original memoirs for fuller information.

"Die Löthrohranalyse,"¹⁶ by M. Landauer, is founded on the American work of Elderhorst—"Manual of Qualitative Blowpipe Analysis"—the fifth edition of which was edited by Professors Nason and Chandler. It is compiled from a chemical rather than from a mineralogical point of view, and is to be welcomed as an additional attempt to draw attention to the value of the blowpipe in purely chemical qualitative analysis. The tables at the end of the book, on the behaviour of metallic oxides in the blowpipe flame, are extracted from Plattner's "Probirkunst mit dem Löthrohr."

The fact that Dr. Will's "Chemical Tables"¹⁷ have reached a tenth edition proves their popularity and usefulness. They are so arranged that the whole scheme of simple qualitative analysis can be grasped at a glance, and the signification of an observed experimental result at once understood.

Written professedly only to explain the information about the weather which is given in newspapers, Mr. Scott, in his "Weather

¹⁴ "Der Nebel-Bilder Apparat." Von W. Bahr. Leipzig: Koch. 1875.

¹⁵ "Der Einfluss der Himmelskörper auf Witterungsverhältnisse." Von Dr. S. Günther. Nürnberg: Ballhorn. 1876.

¹⁶ "Die Löthrohranalyse." Von J. Landauer. Braunschweig: Härig & Co. 1876.

¹⁷ "Tafeln zur qualitativen chemischen Analyse." Von Dr. Heinrich Will. Zehnte Auflage. Leipzig und Heidelberg: Winter. 1875.

Charts and Storm Warnings,"¹⁸ has given incidentally an excellent explanation of the laws of change of wind and weather. By telegraphing from a number of European stations to our Meteorological Office, it has been determined that the motions of the atmosphere or winds are chiefly governed by the way in which the pressure of the air varies. This pressure of the air, as indicated by the height of the barometer, may be laid down upon a map; and lines which indicate the same pressure wherever drawn are called "isobars." Hence, these isobars may, by being drawn for other pressures, indicate the direction in which pressure of the air decreases. This fall in the height of the barometer is called a gradient, which is expressed in hundredths of an inch of mercury in a degree of sixty nautical miles. The wind then usually blows from places where the barometer is high to places where it is low, with a force which depends upon the amount of the gradient between the places. And along the path of the wind, the height of the barometer is greater on the right hand than on the left, so that there is also a tendency for winds to follow the isobars. From this it follows, that if there be a central point in which the pressure of the air is least, round which the isobars are drawn, then the wind must be of the nature of a cyclone, blowing spirally in towards the centre. When a cyclone is formed, there is always a rapid rise in temperature, and the storm advances in the direction of the rise. The term "anti-cyclone" is used to express a region in the centre of which the temperature falls, so that the air becomes heavy, and hence descends downward and outward, giving rise to a higher barometer. Coming from a cold region, the air is dry; while in a cyclone, the air, which comes from a warm region, is moist and hence rainy. The cause of these winds seems, however, to be very much of the same nature as that of the monsoons, and to be due to our insular position and the fact that in winter the land cools more rapidly than the sea, while in summer it becomes more rapidly heated. And this seems to determine the formation of satellite systems of cyclones. Storms move in different directions. In the West Indies from E.S.E. to W.N.W., and in the Mauritius from E.N.E. to W.S.W. In our islands, the direction is usually from the west. Anti-cyclones move slowly. From the very principle of cyclones it follows that "the appearance of easterly winds on the northerly side of westerly winds is a nearly sure sign of the approach of southerly winds," because the cyclone moves onward.

For the practical application of these principles, reference must be made to the book itself. Storm warnings arrived at from them have now been issued for several years, with the result that about eighty per cent. of the warnings issued have been justified either by gales or strong winds, while the warnings which were not justified were from sixteen to seventeen per cent. The reason for this partial failure

¹⁸ "Weather Charts and Storm Warnings." By Robert H. Scott, M.A., F.R.S. Director of the Meteorological Office. With Numerous Illustrations. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

appears to be a deficiency of information as to the weather in other localities.

A handbook of ethnology at once full of well-digested facts and pleasant to read has long been wanted; and Oscar Peschel's book¹⁹ gives just that kind of knowledge which will secure for it a welcome among many classes of readers. In his preface the author tells us that "he can no longer bring forward his own thoughts, but has only to repeat the dicta of recognised authorities; and never loses the oppressive sensation of gathering roses in the garden of another." Written in this spirit, the work has a condensation of information; and it has an orderly grouping which might well fit it to be used in the higher work of education. The subject is treated first in a synthetic manner by discussing the physical and other characteristics of mankind—the proportions and forms of skulls, brains, limbs, pelvis, hair, and skin in the several races; and the value of language and of various phases of intellectual development as race characters is considered in a suggestive, chatty way at considerable length; while in the introduction the best evidence or information is given upon such questions as the nature of man's relation to apes, the plurality or unity of our race, its place of origin, and its antiquity, the statements being made with a good deal of tact, so as to offend few or no prejudices. Occasionally there seems to be a slight want of appreciation by the author of the principles which he explains, owing to laborious anxiety to rest everything upon authority. Thus the migration of races is attributed perhaps too much to instincts and habits, and too little to the larger changes in the relative outlines of land and water which are known to have been manifested during the human period. The second part of the book is devoted to the races of men, and describes their geographical distribution and national characteristics and customs. Seven races are recognised, which are arranged as Australians, Papuans, Mongoloid nations, the Dravida of Western India, the Hottentots and Bushmen, the Negroes, and the Mediterranean nations, the last term being a new name for the Caucasian race of older writers. The causes of their several kinds of civilisation are briefly indicated, while each is illustrated by a selection of facts drawn from the works of all available writers.

The natural history of fishes is commenced by Dr. Hubrecht in the present number of "Bronn's Classes and Orders of the Animal Kingdom."²⁰ The contributions to our knowledge made by all the earlier writers are briefly mentioned, while the classifications of some modern writers, Müller, Bonaparte, Bleeker, Gill, Günther, Fitzinger, are contrasted in parallel columns. Then comes the literature of the subject. The author adopts Dr. Günther's sub-class Palæichthyes,

¹⁹ "The Races of Man and their Geographical Distribution." From the German of Oscar Peschel. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

²⁰ Dr. H. G. Bronn's "Klassen und Ordnungen des Thier-Reichs, wissenschaftlich dargestellt in Wort und Bild." Fortgesetzt von Dr. A. A. W. Hubrecht. Sechster Band. 1te Abtheilung, Fische. 1te Lieferung. Leipzig und Heidelberg: C. F. Winter'sche Verlagshandlung. 1876.

which includes the Elasmobranchs and Ganoids; and gives a careful account of the anatomy of cartilaginous fishes, which is illustrated with plates, showing the structure of the skin and its appendages.

The success of large marine aquaria throughout Britain has almost necessitated the existence of a well-illustrated handbook which should be a general guide to the subject. Mr. Taylor accordingly offers an elegant and well-written account of the various sorts of aquaria,²¹ and light descriptive notices of their many kinds of inhabitants, abounding in good illustrations. These notices are essentially popular, but contrive to give a good deal of interesting information about the ways of life of the animals and plants. There are chapters on the aquarium as a garden of aquatic plants, and as a nursery wherein may be grown objects for the microscope, of some of which suitable figures are given; and all necessary information is supplied concerning the management of aquaria in rooms. It is perhaps a defect that the book is not in advance of recognised wants, and does not endeavour, except in one of two instances, to advance the cause of education by indicating the work which may everywhere be done in tracing the development and life-history of animals which hatch and thrive in aquaria. Nor is any effort made to show the kind of observations which any one might make on these organisms with the certainty of adding to the common stock of knowledge. We should hardly have remarked on these points had not the author announced the educational work to be done by aquaria as the *raison d'être* of his book.

The Royal Society of New South Wales is the means of publishing from time to time much of the original scientific work which is done in that colony.²² The present volume contains the first systematic account of the mineralogy of New South Wales by Professor Liversidge. He enumerates more than sixty metallic minerals and more than fifty non-metallic minerals, of most of which analyses have been made by the author. Another paper treats chiefly of the tin deposits of Tasmania. It is written by Mr. S. H. Wintle of Hobart Town. The mines of tin are at Mount Bischoff, George's Bay, and Mount Ramsay, which latter also contains great deposits of bismuth. The other memoirs relate to the water-supply of Sydney.

A large amount of new matter, often in the language of the original author, is introduced by Dr. Page into the new edition of his advanced geological text-book,²³ and in this way, as well as by giving figures of newly-found and important fossils, the author has done what he could to bring the subject up to the requirements of his readers. But the work still remains unsatisfactory as a text-book, being throughout too

²¹ "The Aquarium; its Inhabitants, Structure, and Management." By J. E. Taylor, Ph. D., F.L.S., F.G.S., &c. London: Hardwicke & Bogue. 1876.

²² "Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales for the Year 1875." Vol. IX. Edited by A. Liversidge. Sydney: Thomas Richards, 1876.

²³ "Advanced Text-Book of Geology, Descriptive and Industrial." By David Page, LL.D., F.G.S. Sixth Edition, Revised and Enlarged. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1876.

vague, ambitious, and wanting in appreciation of the importance of exactness, to meet the requirements of those who conduct higher public examinations. The weak features of the book are an almost total want of figures of natural geological sections, the omission of specific mention of the fossils which characterise the several geological formations, the useless enumeration of names of genera as distinctive marks of stratified formations, without figures or an idea of generic characters, or of range of the genera in time. The treatment of the igneous rocks is antiquated, and though the author briefly describes several in the old classification of granitic, trappean, volcanic, he neither mentions the nature of the physical relation of one kind of rock to another, or enumerates mountains or sections where each of the igneous rocks may be observed.

The wants of ladies' schools, and other schools in which pupils can give but little time to geology, and are often very young, have called into existence such books as Jukes' "School Manual of Geology."²⁴ The present edition has been carefully revised, and is well suited to those who must gain their knowledge of the subject in from three to six months, or for readers who require some brief compendium for reference which gives the chief facts of the science as now taught. But its language is sometimes too technical for the readers to which it must be chiefly addressed. This might be avoided by, for example, a few figures of crystal form, and of the chief minerals, and by more abundant and exact reference to localities in which all the rocks mentioned or described can be studied, and in which the fossils enumerated can be found. Geology is so practical a subject that no one can be content with even a good book like this unless it sends the student to nature.

Thirty years ago, Mr. Darwin published as separate works, "Observations on South America," and his "Geological Observations on Volcanic Islands." Since then geology has advanced with strides as great as those which have been stimulated in biology by Mr. Darwin's own labours. It therefore appears singular that these two books should be reprinted verbatim now,²⁵ and issued in one volume as a second edition, with a confession on the part of the author that corrections were required. Mr. Darwin remarks in his preface concerning this subject:—

"As I believe they still contain matter of scientific value, it has appeared to me advisable that they should be republished. They relate to parts of the world which have been so rarely visited by men of science, that I am not aware that much could be corrected or added from observations subsequently made. Owing to the great progress which geology

²⁴ "The School Manual of Geology." By J. Beete Jukes, M.A., F.R.S. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Edited by Alfred J. Jukes-Browne, B.A., F.G.S. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1876.

²⁵ "Geological Observations on the Volcanic Islands and Parts of South America. Visited during the Voyage of H.M.S. Beagle." By Charles Darwin, M.A., F.R.S. Second Edition, with Maps and Illustrations. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

has made within recent times, my views on some few points may be somewhat antiquated, but I have thought it best to leave them as they originally appeared.²⁶

The main truths in this volume are adopted into geological science, and are to be found in daily use in all public lectures; but the book, as a whole, will probably be found too technical for readers who are familiar with the author's more popular works.

The chief additions made by Mr. Geikie in the new edition of his "Great Ice Age"²⁶ are such as to leave his views practically unchanged. Mr. Geikie believes the ice age to have been a succession of glacial periods separated from each other by genial interglacial intervals. In Norfolk and Lancashire four glacial periods are supposed to have existed. The last of these is believed to have been more recent than the cave deposits and river gravels which contain the palæolithic flint implements. And accordingly, no difficulty is found in adopting the alleged discovery of flint implements near Brandon, in a deposit older than the boulder clay, as an addition to knowledge. No one doubts that the deposit is beneath boulder clay, but there is considerable difference of opinion as to whether the boulder clay may not be a mere reconstructed accumulation consequent upon the last emergence of the land from the water. The newest information is in every case given by the author upon all parts of the subject, and this edition is materially improved by the addition of new woodcuts.

The "Primeval World of Switzerland"²⁷ is a treatise by Professor Heer on Swiss geology, or rather upon the geological formations and fossils of that country. It is well illustrated with a small geological map of Switzerland, many woodcuts and plates of fossils, and plates and woodcuts giving ideal restorations of the life of the several periods and supposed outlines of land and water. But there are few geological sections showing the structure of the country, and no picturesque views of famous geological localities, for the palæontological point of view is altogether dominant. The book is well written and rendered into excellent English by Mr. W. S. Dallas. It will no doubt meet to some extent the demand for a geology of Switzerland; but though written for general reading, has almost too much of the character of a high-class text-book.

The oldest of the Swiss fossiliferous rocks is the carboniferous, largely spread along the Rhone, in the Valais, and in the district of the Arve, where the coal has been converted into anthracite. The rocks are full of coal-plants similar to those of this country, and have yielded the wing of a cockroach. Then succeed the salt-bearing rocks of Triassic age, which form mountains of pure rock-salt in Transylvania.

²⁶ "The Great Ice Age, and its Relation to the Antiquity of Man." By James Geikie, F.R.S., &c. Second Edition, Revised. London: Daldy, Isbister, & Co. 1877.

²⁷ "The Primeval World of Switzerland." With 560 Illustrations. By Professor Heer, of the University of Zurich. Edited by James Heywood, M.A., F.R.S. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Longmans & Co. 1876.

The chief deposits in Switzerland extend from near Rheinfelden to Basle. The plants of the Trias number twenty-five, all land species, and chiefly *equisetum*, *zamia*, and ferns. The Lias occurs at Schambelen, with plenty of characteristic fossils, and a vast number of insects, of five orders, but chiefly coleoptera. The Jurassic formation is remarkable for its coral reefs, but yields a fair number of land plants. The formation is widespread on the north of the Rhone, and also east of the lake of Neuchâtel. The Cretaceous rocks abound in fossils of the ammonite type, but have yielded no land plants. The Eocene formation yields the famous black slates of Glaris, which are full of the remains of herrings and smelts, mackerel, pipe-fish, perch, cod, and salmon, besides turtles and some indications of birds. The Nummulitic rocks abound in fossils, and extend from the valley of the Rhone to the lake of Thun, following the sandy rocks called *Flysch*. Pea iron ore of Eocene age is spread over the whole of the Jura, but chiefly in the valley of Delsberg. Most of the Eocene mammals of France and England are found in Switzerland, and at Monte Bolca an abundant flora is found similar to that of Alum Bay and Bournemouth.

The Miocene strata form in the canton of Vaud the sandstones termed *molasse*, covering nearly a fifth of the area of Switzerland. The abundant life of this period is well known to comprise a vast number of insects and plants. Then succeeds an excellent account of the glacial history of Switzerland, and the book concludes with a chapter of generalisations on the geological development of the country. Professor Heer remarks:—

“At the period of the Upper Cretaceous formation the land again began to rise; the sea disappeared from the region of the Jura, which during the whole Eocene period was converted into dry land; and this upheaval was continued until the end of the Aquitanian stage of the Miocene period, the sea disappearing also from the region of the Alps, and leaving only a few lagoons, which then became converted into freshwater lakes, so that when the upheaval had attained its maximum, the sea for the first time retired from Switzerland. During this long period of elevation a partial upheaval must also have taken place in the direction of the Alps, after the deposition of the Nummulitic limestone and the *Flysch*, by which the whole region of the Alps was finally removed from the influence of the sea”

To this succeeded a depression which covered the low ground with sea, and then at the close of the Miocene period came the last upheaval, which gave the country its present configuration.

The power of invention has, we believe, been always regarded as no unimportant human endowment, but Mr. J. G. Wood²⁸ appears to esteem the imitative faculty as more useful. Accordingly he has written a book to show that just as existing human inventions have been anticipated by natural arrangements, structures of animals, plants, and of the earth, “so it will surely be found that in nature lie the prototypes of inventions not yet revealed to man. The great discoverers of the future

²⁸ “*Nature’s Teachings: Human Inventions Anticipated by Nature.*” By the Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A., F.L.S., &c. London: Daldy, Isbister, & Co. 1877.

will, therefore, be those who will look to nature for art, science, or mechanics." This conviction the author tries to enforce by pointing out what he regards as instances in which nature is superior to art, or has suggested appliances in use. These convictions are illustrated by some 750 woodcuts showing supposed parallelisms between nature and human constructions, which are always curious, sometimes amusing, and occasionally so far-fetched as to be ludicrous. Thus the inverted sea-anemone swimming boat-like is taken as one of the prototypes of a boat; comparison is made between the claws of carnivorous animals and a fish-rake; between a lobster or armadillo and a suit of plate armour; the cocoon of the silkworm and a fire-proof safe; a lobster's claw and sugar-tongs. The subject is treated under headings such as "Nautical," which treats of rafts, oars, paddles, screws, masts, sails, cables, and anchors. Under the heading "War and Hunting," Captain Hall's amusing account of an Esquimaux story as to the way in which a bear gets on a cliff and rolls great stones down so as to crush in the skull of a walrus underneath, is repeated in good faith as a natural prototype of the defence of a pass by hurling stones on the advancing enemy. Other sections relate to architecture, tools, optics, the useful arts, and acoustics. If the quaint purpose of the book is forgotten, it will be found amusing and gossipy, grouping interesting natural history facts in new and sometimes suggestive ways. It is rather a book for young people and for general reading than a scientific treatise properly so called, or a rational account of nature's teachings.

In 1862 Mr. Darwin showed by his book on the fertilisation of orchids how admirably the structures of those plants are formed to necessitate, favour, or permit cross fertilisation by means of insects. The author has since followed the subject out experimentally in other groups of plants, and gives his investigations and their results in the present memoir on "The Effects of Cross and Self-Fertilisation in the Vegetable Kingdom."²⁹ It is found that plants which are fertilised from another plant, or crossed, grow higher in most cases than plants which are fertilised each from its own male organs or flowers. The plants experimented upon were grown in parallel strips or on two sides of the same pot, and as far as possible under the same conditions, except that the self-fertilised plants were covered with a stretched net, with meshes a tenth of an inch square, which keeps out all the insects except Thrips. But the results do not seem attributable to the influence of the net, which obviously must materially affect the heat and light reaching the plant, because some of the crossed plants also have had a net stretched over them in several of the experiments, which have been carried on for eleven years. The book consists of an introduction, five chapters of experiments on convolvulaceæ, labiatae, cruciferæ, leguminosæ, solenaceæ, and various other natural orders; three chapters showing the results of these experiments on height, weight, constitutional vigour, and sterility, in all of which the evidence is in favour of

²⁹ "The Effects of Cross and Self-Fertilisation in the Vegetable Kingdom." By Charles Darwin, M.A., F.R.S., &c. London: John Murray. 1876.

cross fertilisation. Then follow two chapters on the means by which fertilisation of flowers is carried on, while the twelfth chapter gives the general results. The book is so full of detailed facts, valuable to original observers, that it more resembles memoirs issued by scientific societies than works published in the ordinary way; and it is not impossible that it would have been more read had the author shown more consideration for those of his readers who do not find it necessary to follow his every experiment. There surely can have been no need to present the whole of this evidence, since, by its nature, it is capable of being greatly added to. The subject, however, is a small one, and has been amply worked out to establish the points which are thought to be important. The practical bearings of the investigation would appear to be of the greatest value, since self-fertilised cabbages, for instance, had only a quarter of the weight of those crossed with a fresh stock; while in many cases the fertility of plants which are crossed is twice as great as in the self-fertilised, a single cross often being sufficient to remove the influence of continued self-fertilisation when that has been bad. In concluding, Mr. Darwin speculates on the reason for the separation of sexes, and for the existence of males, and seems to see some light thrown on the problem by the deterioration of the race under self-fertilisation, this deterioration appearing to result from the conditions of existence remaining unchanged. Since males often have different ways of life from females, they are supposed thereby to counteract evils which have usually been attributed to breeding in and in.

One more treatise on the whole science and art of medicine, specially so called, has appeared to contest the field with its many predecessors. Dr. Bristowe's treatise³⁰ has been long expected, and from the well-known ability and judgment of the author a favourable reception was assured for it. Nor can we say that anticipations so raised are without their fulfilment. Dr. Bristowe's treatise is in many respects an admirable one. The matter is arranged more in accordance with philosophical method than in preceding treatises, and we think that this has been done without any loss of practical usefulness. Moreover, the work is one which has evidently been written by a full man—by a man indeed more full than ready, we should say. We have turned the volume over a good deal, and referred to many important chapters, and we have rarely or never failed to find adequate teaching and argument in all that relates to pathology and clinical observation. The author presents us not merely with sufficient facts, but he treats his facts broadly and simply, and treats them not as a scribe, but as an experienced and ripe observer who has definite views of his own. We certainly advise those of our readers who are concerned directly with the subject to buy the work; but, at the same time, they must not suppose that it is in all respects attractive or valuable. Its chief defects are two—the style is wearisome and verbose, and the sections on therapeutics are perfunctory and uninteresting. As regards the style, it is not that the writer is

³⁰ "Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Medicine." By J. S. Bristowe, M.D. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

discursive or rambling, nor is he turgid, but he fails to lay hold on the reader's attention. We think it will be found that this is due to a lack of terseness and incisiveness. Very few authors are masters of the charming style which distinguishes such teachers as Watson or Trousseau, but a good scientific style is within the reach of a greater number. For instance, the work of Dr. Ferrier, which we review in this present section, aims neither at brilliancy nor ornament, but it attracts the reader by its clearness, point, and compactness. These qualities Dr. Bristowe misses by verbosity, by the use of quantities of little valueless words. On many pages of the book perhaps fifty little words might be erased with positive advantage to the reader. For the same reason, the volume is a couple of hundred pages longer than it need have been. The therapeutics, again, are the therapeutics, not of a man of fertile resources, or of one who has used diagnosis only as a means to the end of cure, but of a hospital physician who examines his cases laboriously and thoroughly, and having read the puzzle, leaves the diet and treatment to the apothecary.

The discovery that the so-called organisms described by Klein as present in the body in typhoid fever are not organisms at all, but are molecular aggregations determined by the method of preparation of the parts, is a severe blow to the germ theory of disease as a whole. If so able and trusted an inquirer as Dr. Klein be wrong in so prominent and so important a series of observations, what are we to think of the numerous observations recorded by men who, if as able, are far less well known? Although Dr. Maclagan³¹ makes great use of Klein's observations, his book by a cruel fate being, we presume, already printed before their reversal was generally known, yet he may fairly say, that however valuable to him such corroborative evidence would have been, nevertheless his purpose has been only to show that the phenomena of disease, as observed by physicians, are consistent with the theory that they are due to the growth of germinal life within the body. Where phenomena are so numerous and their combinations so complex as in continued fevers, it would go hard with us if we could not by manipulation draw a picture of their congruity with almost any kind of antecedents. At the same time such an argument must be wholly based as yet on inference, and as in all cases of inferential argument, it is easy to point out difficulties against which probabilities can scarcely contend with success. For instance, in all parasitic diseases known to us as such, the parasite once introduced finds a home in the body invaded until the body is destroyed or the parasite recognised and eliminated by artificial means. And again, in all parasitic diseases known as such, one invasion, so far from preventing, rather favours its own repetition. Now, in infectious fevers, we find an attack conferring a future immunity upon the patient. So that Dr. Maclagan's essay, able as it is, and significant as it is of the ability and culture of the author, reads to us more as a "prolusion".

³¹ "The Germ Theory of Disease." By T. Maclagan, M.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

than as a definite contribution to our knowledge of the subject. As a fresh handling of an old subject, it is, therefore, well worth reading, whether the author's views be accepted or not.

In previous volumes of this "Review" we have expressed our high opinion of this cheap and handy reissue of Henle's "Anatomical Hand Atlas."³² We have only to now announce the appearance of the fifth part, descriptive of the nervous system, and to say that the variety, accuracy, and excellence of the plates is as great as in former parts. The price, about four shillings per part, is marvellously cheap, and the atlas will be found almost wholly intelligible to students ignorant of German.

This volume³³ calls but for a passing notice, as it is little more than a reissue of the first edition. Mr. Brodhurst's work is well known, and although it is not free from those errors and tendencies which cause a wholesome distrust of specialism, yet it has doubtless aided largely in the advancement of this department of surgery.

Dr. Greenfield, in his preface to the present volume,³⁴ reminds us of a truth which is almost startling, that no adequate study of alcoholism, in its clinical and pathological aspects, can be said to exist in England. Isolated sketches and clinical studies of this or that morbid condition are to be found, and are perhaps numerous enough, but we really cannot point to any single treatise dealing adequately with the subject as a whole. Certainly Dr. Magnan's treatise does not fill up this want, although it contains valuable materials for a more systematic work. It consists of little more than a record of some physiological experiments, notes and comments upon a number of fairly recorded cases, almost all being cases of nervous disorder, and finally a great cry for Governmental interference on behalf of drunkards who will not help themselves. Epilepsy, according to Dr. Magnan's experiments, results more certainly from poisoning by absinthe than from poisoning by alcohol. At the same time, our own experience proves to us repeatedly that epilepsy is a common result of chronic alcoholism in the human subject. Dr. Magnan's appeal for Government aid against drunkards is in no way modified by any of those scruples as to the limits of Governmental interference which would occur more readily to an Englishman than to a Frenchman. There is much in Dr. Magnan's treatise which is well worth reading, and much of that logical clearness sadly lacking to this subject, and which a Frenchman can best supply. The translation seems to us to be well enough done.

The increase of treatises on the historical aspect of the art of medicine is a good sign, for the better we interpret the past the better shall

³² "Anatomischer Hand-Atlas." Von Dr. J. Henle. Heft V. "Nerven." Braunschweig: Vieweg. 1876.

³³ "Lectures on Orthopedic Surgery." By Bernard E. Brodhurst. Second Edition. London: Churchill. 1876.

³⁴ "On Alcoholism." By Dr. V. Magnan. Translated by W. S. Greenfield, M.D. London: Lewis. 1876.

we foresee our course in the future. Dr. Petersen,³⁵ in this German edition of his lectures at the Danish University, has placed before us a very readable and instructive little volume, conceived on a somewhat new and excellent plan. The author's lectures are discourses on the main tendencies and issues of past and present doctrines, a summing up of what medical history has to teach. The whole subject is well divided into two main divisions, entitled respectively, "The Dogmatic Tendencies," and "The Empirical and Empirico-Rational Tendencies of the Healing Art." Under the head of the dogmatic periods the author describes mystical doctrines, teleological doctrines, methodism, and chemistry. Under the empirical and empirico-rational are chapters on empirical doctrines, on therapeutics under the influence of pathological anatomy, on therapeutics under the influence of pathological anatomy and physiology, and finally, a chapter summing up the chief features of the therapeutical standpoint of our own time. This summary of contents is sufficient to show that the subject is treated with breadth and philosophical method, and the work is one which shows in detail a mastery of the subject, and a corresponding felicity in the presentation of it to the student.

Sir John Cormack's two volumes³⁶ are so attractive in appearance that we took them up readily, and anticipated much pleasant reading therein. They are handy in size, and very neatly got up, the edges are cut, and the printing of text and headings is excellent. The Messrs. Churchill and Mr. Adlard at any rate deserve exceptional praise. And our final judgment of the merits of the contents is certainly favourable, though we did not form our judgment of the interior so quickly as we did of the exterior. After we had turned over a few pages, we were so much offended by the dull and turgid style in which the chapters are written, that we had gone near to throw the books aside, and to say in our haste that they were pompous and vain. Full reports of cases are more fitted for archives of various kinds than for short clinical essays, and for this reason alone the well-padded cases here given at length, unenlivened by any very brilliant flashes of acute observation or comment, become tedious. The style is Johnsonese throughout, and in places really reminds us of Dr. Thomas Diafoirus. Who would have reported of a patient that "the mental faculties remained obtunded" (p. 504)? Nevertheless, it must be admitted that Sir John Cormack's cases are well chosen and worthy of record; that they are discussed with a good deal of care and with adequate knowledge; and that his own part in them seems to have been that of an "eminently judicious" practitioner. Many of the chapters add little to our knowledge, others are more interesting. Among the latter are the reissue of the account of the "Edinburgh Relapsing Fever" in 1843-44, and the chapter on "Cholera," which is also a republication. Other papers, of old date, did not deserve re-

³⁵ "Hauptmomente in der geschichtlichen Entwicklung der medicinischen Therapie." Von Dr. Jul. Petersen. Kopenhagen: Kost. 1876.

³⁶ "Clinical Studies." By Sir J. R. Cormack, M.D., &c Two Vols. London: Churchill. 1876.

issue, notably one on "Infantile Remittent Fever," in which at the autopsy no examination was made or recorded of the small intestine. In 1849 this was not to be wondered at, but in 1876 such a record is not worth republication. The more recent histories are far more valuable, as they were observed with more modern advantages. The chapter on "Diphtheria," with a case of recovery after tracheotomy, for instance, is well worth reading.

The present volume³⁷ may be called a new work, as it is an amplification of a like essay published twenty years ago. No one who knows Dr. Bennet and his clinical essays will fail to look for clever suggestive views, for positive opinions clearly set forth, for ingenious and successful points of treatment, and for a light, gossiping, pleasant style of writing. More than this we shall not find, at any rate in the present work. Although it forms a good-looking octavo of 240 pages, yet this is in great part due to large print and thick paper. The staple of the argument itself is barely sufficient to weave into a couple of clinical lectures. Moreover, a great deal of the volume is either too elementary or too flimsy for the professional reader. We mean that a great deal of it is too familiar to any tolerably instructed practitioner to require repetition, unless the truisms are regenerated by some novelty of application or by some novelty of proof. A fresh array of experimental evidence in favour of the oldest proposition is always welcome, but this work reiterates the old arguments in favour of temperance, cleanliness, and godliness, much as they are already known to medical men of the most modest acquirements.

If the book, however, be written for the public, this is a different matter, and we trust the public will read it, and employ Dr. Bennet when they have done so.

This remarkable work³⁸ is not only the chief work of the present season, but it is one which marks an epoch in the physiology of the nervous system. Up to the year 1870 it was universally accepted among such teachers as Longet, Majendie, Schiff, and others, that the brain substance was unexcitable, and was therefore necessarily withdrawn from experimental investigation. In 1870, however, it was found by Fritsch and Hitzig that the brain was not unexcitable, but that it responds readily to one stimulus only, namely, to electrical currents. By applying this discovery to the brains of animals, these observers were enabled to map out a few regions of the brain which are in relation with certain parts of the muscular system. During the same time Dr. Hughlings Jackson had satisfied himself that in disease the irritation of definite parts of the cerebral hemisphere is followed by spasm or convulsion in definite combinations. The present writer also had collected certain facts strongly supporting the views of Jackson and of Fritsch and Hitzig when he became aware that Dr. Ferrier at the West Riding Asylum had made an invaluable addition to the facts given by the

³⁷ "Nutrition in Health and Disease." By J. H. Bennet, M.D. London: Churchill, 1876.

³⁸ "The Functions of the Brain." By D. Ferrier, M.D., F.R.S. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

latter observers. These observers had used the continuous galvanic current, and only obtained muscular movement when the circuit including the brain was made and broken. Such movements were, therefore, of the briefest kind, and were mere indications of their character. Dr. Ferrier, by using the Faradic current, a current interrupted with great rapidity, was thus able to keep up the action upon the brain, and to turn the indefinite twitch of Fritsch and Hitzig into a complete and continuous movement. In this way he was able to demonstrate their character and separate their combinations more completely and accurately, and to map out with great precision the region of the brain corresponding to each combination. Thus his discoveries went very quickly forward and left those of other inquirers far behind. As a natural consequence, Ferrier's assertions have been keenly contested. But he has not only conclusively answered all objections, but he has published a double set of observations, the one set supplementing the other as the proof supplements the sum. For he has also shown conversely that on the removal of those districts of the brain which, when irritated respectively, cause definite combinations of movement, all power of producing such movements is lost for ever. This part of Dr. Ferrier's work seems to us to present great difficulties to Mr. Lewes, who, we believe, admits the author's facts, but who puts a different interpretation upon them. Into the details of these questions it is impossible for us here to enter. We will content ourselves with urging all the more intelligent of our readers to obtain Dr. Ferrier's exposition for themselves, and to master its contents. The subject is one of general interest to students, both of mental and physical phenomena, and Dr. Ferrier's volume sets the whole subject so clearly before the reader that, be he an anatomist or not, he cannot fail to understand the matters under discussion, and to realise for himself the most remarkable physiological discoveries of recent times.

This large and closely printed volume³⁹ is published in order to instruct the physician in the historical side of his art—a study of the greatest value, even from a directly practical point of view.

The first section deals with the medical history of those nations whose development is concluded, as of the Egyptians, Jews, and so forth. Then comes the history of medicine among the Greeks and Romans; after this of course comes medieval medicine; thirdly, comes a section on later times (1492–1800), the discovery of America being taken as the first date; and finally a section of 250 pages devoted to our own century. These latter chapters are more needed than the earlier, for with the work of Haeser and Daremberg before us, we are sufficiently informed of the history of ancient medicine. Dr. Baas' treatise of course would be incomplete without the earlier sections, but they do not seem to us to have any special merit of their own deriving either from a new treatment of the subject or from any original investigations. And indeed, when we turn to the later chapters, we are

³⁹ "Grundriss der Geschichte der Medicin." Von I. H. Baas, Dr. Med. Stuttgart; Enke. 1876.

tempted to make the old criticism that they would have been better, had the author taken more pains, for they seem to us in many respects to be both deficient and inaccurate. At the same time the author takes an intelligent and philosophical view of his subject, and his work is one which is so useful, that we regret its defects the more. It is hard to do without the book, as it fills up an important gap; but, in the second edition, we trust that the author will bring it up to a higher standard of accuracy.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

ONE of the weakest parts of a public schoolboy's education used to be the department of history. He was generally left with an impression that there were only four peoples that ever had a history, and that there was no connection whatever between these. Adam, of course, was the beginning of things; and there was an unbroken succession of names, occasionally enriched by events in which their owners took part, from Adam down to about the Babylonian captivity. Here Jewish history abruptly ended, and that interesting people made only one fitful appearance afterwards—viz., during the time of Christ. The fact that we still saw Jews every day around us, making cheap clothes, and often wearing very splendid ones, and often leading lives of nobleness and utility, was not thought to be worth alluding to in teaching the history of the people. Again, the Greek nation suddenly came into being just before the siege of Troy, and lasted in an interesting manner until about 350 B.C., when it as suddenly disappeared. With Romulus began the history of a people which bore his name, and which also ended abruptly with the death of Julius Cæsar. The Roman history was remarkable as being slightly connected, in the legendary period and in that of Æmilius Paullus, with the history of Greece. After Cæsar's death nothing happened anywhere, until history revived in this country with Alfred the Great, since whose time it has flourished in an uninterrupted career down to the "Times" of to-day. It would be hard to say what the student thought about other countries, or about the other periods of these four favoured races. The other countries were probably most often assumed to be uninhabited; while the untaught periods of Jews, Greeks, Romans, English, were referred to incursions of the barbarians, or *caruerunt quia vate sacro*, or the comprehensive veil of the Dark Ages. We had, however, hoped that different views were beginning to prevail, and that it was now recognised that the world has for a long period been going on as a whole, and that all its parts and all its periods are more or less interdependent. We think that Mr. Freeman's "General Sketch" should be the type of the school history of the future, just as we would give the main features of the globe as the foundation of geographical teaching. Details fit themselves almost naturally into such a framework of knowledge; and a

boy who has a broad idea of the relative dates and places of the chief events of history may with advantage study from the best authors the periods with which he ought to be specially familiar. Publishers, however, think differently, and they can influence writers. And now we are deluged with small books, each containing the history of a reign or some such analogous period. "Epochs of Ancient History"¹ are edited by Mr. G. W. Cox and Mr. C. Sankey. Mr. Cox brings out "The Greeks and the Persians" and "The Athenian Empire," two books forming a continuous narrative, for which, as the author remarks, his "History of Greece" afforded much material. The story is very graphically told, as we might know beforehand. Dr. Ihne's volume on "Early Rome" brings the history down to the capture of the city by the Gauls, and contains many valuable pages on the criticism of ancient history. "The Roman Triumvirates," by Dean Merivale, is a good narrative, beginning with the rise of Pompey and ending with the battle of Actium. Mr. Capes follows the example of Mr. Cox, and gives us in his two volumes, "The Early Empire" and "The Age of the Antonines," a consecutive story, which is interesting and scholarly.

A similar series is the "Epochs of Modern History,"² edited by Mr. E. E. Morris and Mr. J. S. Phillpotts. Mr. Creighton's "Age of Elizabeth" and Mr. S. R. Gardiner's "Puritan Revolution" are consecutive, and describe the period between 1520 and 1660 somewhat briefly. After a gap of eighteen years, Mr. Hall's "Fall of the Stuarts" carries on the thread from the Peace of Nimwegen to that of Ryswick. Mr. J. M. Ludlow's "War of American Independence" is a really fair and able account of that fruitful episode. All these books, in both series, are well printed, of handy size, and admirably furnished with maps and indices.

Messrs. Rivington publish a similar series of "Historical Handbooks,"³ in somewhat larger form, under the editorship of Mr. O. Browning. Mr. Pearson's "English History in the Fourteenth Century" is a careful account of the reigns of Edward II. and III. and Richard II. Great care is spent in the work in giving a view of the social condition of the times. In Mr. Willert's "Reign of Lewis XI." we find an excellent biography of that undoubtedly able monarch.

¹ "Epochs of Ancient History." Edited by Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A., and Charles Sankey, M.A. "The Greeks and the Persians," by Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A. "The Athenian Empire," by Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A. "Early Rome," by W. Ihne, Ph.D. "The Roman Triumvirates," by Charles Merivale, D.D. "The Early Empire," by W. W. Capes, M.A. "The Age of the Antonines," by W. W. Capes, M.A. London: Longmans & Co.

² "Epochs of Modern History." Edited by Edward E. Morris, M.A., and J. Surtees Phillpotts, B.C.L. "The Age of Elizabeth," by Rev. M. Creighton, M.A. "The Puritan Revolution," by S. R. Gardiner. "The Fall of the Stuarts," by Rev. E. Hall, M.A. "The War of American Independence," by J. M. Ludlow. London: Longmans & Co.

³ "Historical Handbooks." Edited by Oscar Browning, M.A. "English History in the Fourteenth Century," by Charles H. Pearson. "The Reign of Lewis XI.," by P. F. Willert, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

In all these series, the separate volumes are generally good as monographs; but we fear that they cannot but tend to confirm the school-boy in the erroneous idea to which we have already alluded, that the various periods of history are perfectly separate and independent episodes without any mutual relation. Each series, when complete, will be costly, and yet will not be sufficiently authoritative for a work of reference. Written as they are by different authors (Mr. Pearson, for instance, sending his book from Australia), they must show a want of homogeneity, and there must be gaps. Indeed, we notice already that, in the "Modern Epochs," the first seventeen years of Charles II. are omitted; and it can hardly be proposed to devote a whole volume to this period. They all err in not referring to authorities; they nearly all possess the virtue of considering the contemporary doings of foreign states at greater length than the schoolboy has hitherto been accustomed to.

"Historical Biographies,"⁴ edited by Mr. Creighton, form a somewhat similar and less ambitious series. We have before us Lives of Simon de Montfort and the Black Prince, both interesting narratives, clearly and judiciously told, and illustrated with maps. As books to attract the young to the study of history, we should praise them highly. If they are to be used for historical text-books, our objections to the above-noticed series will obtain here also. We believe that a very excellent school history might be made by taking a continuous succession of the most interesting of the leading personages in history, and by grouping the events around the biographies of these men, as they are now grouped around the kings. The gain would be in attracting the student, and in making known and accentuating the careers of great men, instead of merely following the succession of a set of kings, whether they are important or not. How much more attractive and instructive, for instance, the series Marlborough, Swift, Walpole, Pitt, Clive, Wellington, than George I., II., III. Such biographies as these of Mr. Creighton's are such as we would choose; but we would have a continuous series of them, in one work, by one hand.

Professor Nichol sends us a well-designed "Table of Dates."⁵ He places English history and literature in two central columns, with a column for foreign history and one for foreign literature on either side. Emphasis and distinctness are giving by the use of underlinings in various colours to the most important names and events. This work is very clear, and will be found of the greatest use by the student.

Mr. M'Lennan's "Studies in Ancient History"⁶ comprise a reprint

⁴ "Historical Biographies." Edited by Rev. M. Creighton, M.A. "Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester," by M. Creighton, M.A. "Edward the Black Prince," by Louise Creighton. London: Rivingtons.

⁵ "Tables of European Literature and History, A.D. 200-1876." By John Nichol, LL.D., Professor of English Language and Literature, University of Glasgow. Glasgow: J. Maclehose.

⁶ "Studies in Ancient History." By J. F. M'Lennan, M.A., LL.D. London: B. Quaritch.

of his well-known "Primitive Marriage," with additions, and several chapters on kinship. We could not but think of Mr. M'Lennan in noticing, in our last issue, Dr. Post's "Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit," and are glad to welcome this reappearance of his now rare treatise. All the papers are of very great interest, and the numberless facts are told and arranged with perfect clearness. The author defends his proposition that kinship through mothers only is traceable in Homer against Mr. Gladstone's attacks with the greatest success. Indeed, one is surprised that the latter writer could ever have opposed the statement. Mr. M'Lennan's book will be read and welcomed in every scientific circle of Europe and America.

The first part of Dr. Herzog's "Kirchengeschichte" contains the history of Christianity down to the end of the seventh century. The work is very full and comprehensive, and is moderately clear. It is written from a Protestant standpoint, and seems to us to be unusually fair for a book of the kind. It will be more difficult to preserve a judicial spirit in the later volumes.

Dr. Döllinger's book on "Hippolytus"⁸ has been well translated by Mr. Plummer of Durham. To the not large class who are interested in the questions who and what Hippolytus was, and whether what he said against Callistus is true, the book will doubtless be of value. Dr. Döllinger maintains that Callistus was unjustly handled by Hippolytus, and pronounces against the theory that Hippolytus was Bishop of Portus, which place, indeed, he asserts to have had no bishop before 313. The book is mainly a reply to the writings of Bunsen and of Bishop Wordsworth; and it seems to us a very crushing reply.

"The Papal Conclaves"⁹ by Mr. T. A. Trollope is not to be regarded as a historical book. It is merely a collection of newspaper-like gossip about the etiquette of the Papal Court, and anecdotes of the Popes, swelled out into a large volume, which will probably find purchasers among the idle if the Pope dies soon. The account of the Papacy down to 1274 is for some curious reason styled "Hierarchy in a State of Fluidity." The period between Gregory X. and Paul III. is still more strangely entitled "Noble Boys at Play." As far as we can see, they might with equal fitness have been called "Factory Girls at Work," or "Petri-fied Priesthood." The style of the work is on a par with its matter. From one page (353) we cull these gems: "It is hardly likely that he should be the successful candidate"—"He showed himself the right man in the right place, as regards the needs of the Church at that time, to a degree which the elections of the Sacred College have rarely equalled"—"Haughty, bold, enterprising, ambitious, every man in the

⁷ "Abriss der gesammten Kirchengeschichte." Von Dr. J. J. Herzog, Professor der Theologie in Erlangen. 1te Theil. Erlangen: E. Besold.

⁸ "Hippolytus and Callistus; or, The Church of Rome in the First Half of the Third Century." By John J. Ign. von Döllinger. Translated, with Notes &c., by Alfred Plummer, Master of University College, Durham. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

⁹ "The Papal Conclaves as they were and as they are." By T. Adolphus Trollope. London: Chapman & Hall.

Sacred College is afraid of him." From an expressive *sic* (p. 306), the author would seem not to perceive that the word *Ultramontane* used in Rome in 1623, and the same word used beyond the Alps 250 years later, can have different meanings; and while in his preface he apologises for using the "vulgar but expressive phrase—much less to say in the matter," in his text he allows himself such expressions as "He only got a snubbing from Farnese for his pains"—"There was an end to the chance of a Jesuit Pope"—"The three or four who each hoped that he might be the man stood by."

Herr Hirsch's "Essays on the Byzantine Historians"¹⁰ form a scholarly work on a branch of literature which has been greatly neglected. Even the editors of the Bonn Collection were not sufficiently interested in those writers to exercise any careful or critical judgment in their task. The present volume compares, thoroughly and critically, the various historians of the period A.D. 800-950; and among its conclusions we note that Theophanes loses much of the credit which he has hitherto enjoyed, and that Georgios and Genesios are proportionately exalted.

In Herr Rochholz's treatise on "Tell and Gessler"¹¹ we have a very full *exposé* of the most remarkable of literary frauds, in which every detail of Tschudi's imposition is picked to pieces. The Tell legend is discussed in all its many ancient sources, all the names and incidents in the revived story are ruthlessly investigated, and all the Gesslers in Switzerland are traced down to the present day. The book is very thorough, though it may be said that the author has been severely kicking a dead lion. Rilliet, in his "Origines de la Confédération Suisse," has said all that need be said on the subject of Tell; and English readers will find a capital short history of the Tell imposture in Dr. Buchheim's excellent edition of "Wilhelm Tell," in the Clarendon Press series.

We have a learned monograph¹² on the relations of France and Spain between 1598 and 1610 from the pen of Dr. Martin Philippson of Bonn. The author presents us with most striking descriptions of the internal state of the two countries. The characters of the monarchs and their advisers are excellently drawn, notably those of Henry IV. and Marie de Medici, both of whom Dr. Philippson treats with a justice which they rarely meet. The course of Henry's long opposition to Spain is clearly traced. The English, who were jealously swift to observe that Henry procured for his country a sort of hegemony in Europe, did not, and do not yet, notice how valuable to them was the French king's policy. He fought and broke their most dangerous foe for them, and that at a time when they were ruled by the feeblest king who ever sat on the British throne. Dr. Philippson's three volumes present a very just and broad view of a most important period.

¹⁰ "Byzantinische Studien." Von Ferdinand Hirsch. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

¹¹ "Tell und Gessler in Sage und Geschichte." Von E. L. Rochholz. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.

¹² "Heinrich IV. und Philipp III." Von Dr. Martin Philippson. Berlin: Fr. Duncker.

The name of Henry IV. suggests that of the Huguenots; and we are glad to welcome an enlarged edition of Mr. Smiles' book¹³ on the English immigration of those noble exiles. We are not disposed to dignify the book with the character of a scientific history; but it contains much useful information on a most interesting subject. It is nothing less than astounding to observe the immense proportion of men of Huguenot descent among the leading minds of this country and of Prussia. Mr. Smiles prints a most useful alphabetical list of eminent descendants of the refugees. Not the least interesting part of the book is a page on which some English corruptions of French names are noticed. Death, Diprose, Huggins, and Dillon are Anglicisms for D'Aeth, De Preux, Huyghens, and De Lean respectively. Perhaps the oddest change of all is that of a family of Lefevre, which chose to translate its name into its literal equivalent, Smith. This will be found a most interesting book.

Messrs. Cassell send us a small book of "Historical Scenes,"¹⁴ described by eminent historians. They are not particularly well chosen, but the book will do well for Penny Readings. "Jane Grey, eldest daughter of Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset and Duke of Suffolk, by Frances Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, and Mary his wife," reads oddly. We would suggest, "daughter of Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset, by Frances, daughter of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, and Mary his wife."

In his "Rambles and Studies in Greece,"¹⁵ Mr. Mahaffy has given us a cheery description of a tour in that classic land, with some sensible, though not very profound, notes on the Athenian remains. The history and scenery of Greece seem constantly to remind the author of Ireland, and remarkable coincidences are pointed out between the Acropolis of Athens and the Rock of Cashel. The book ends with a chapter on Greek music and painting, of which the most striking features are the entire absence of Lessing's name, and some strangely positive assertions as to the demoralising effects of certain kinds of music. And which of our statesmen has done what, to deserve the following? "I do not fancy that Greek statesman in those days studied everything else in the world besides statecraft, and were known as antiquarians, and linguists, and connoisseurs of china and paintings, and theologians, and novelists—in fact, everything under the sun. This many-sidedness, as they now call it, which the Greeks called *πολυπραγμοσύνη*, and thought to be meddlesomeness, was not likely to infect Pericles." Mr. Mahaffy also publishes, in Mr. J. R. Green's series of "History Primers," a small book on "Old Greek Life."¹⁶ The writer has written a capital sketch, which will delight the scholar; but the dress, furniture, morals, law,

¹³ "The Huguenots, their Settlements, Churches, and Industries in England and Ireland." By Samuel Smiles. New Edition. London: John Murray.

¹⁴ "Historical Scenes." Selected from Standard Authors. By E. Spooner. London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin.

¹⁵ "Rambles and Studies in Greece." By J. P. Mahaffy, A.M., Professor of Ancient History, University, Dublin. London: Macmillan & Co.

¹⁶ "Old Greek Life." By J. P. Mahaffy, A.M., Professor of Ancient History, University, Dublin. London: Macmillan & Co.

public and private life of that great people, cannot be described suitably for the beginners for whom these primers are designed in 94 small pages.

Mr. Wood has produced, in a handsome and profusely illustrated volume,¹⁷ the record of his eleven years' investigation of the site of Ephesus. It is well known that Mr. Wood's labours were most successful as far as the attainment of his object, the discovery of the Temple of Diana, is concerned. The excavations, however, though they have made the main features of the old city quite plain for us, have not yielded so valuable a harvest of art antiquities as was hoped; and we agree in the opinion of the Trustees of the British Museum that it was not worth the cost to search further. Mr. Wood appears to be more hopeful of further results. Such hopefulness is certainly very natural in one who has devoted a large portion of his life to the labour. Mr. Wood is indebted for no small part of his success to the assistance of a brave and energetic lady, his wife. His narrative is very pleasantly written, and his conclusions display great judgment. The illustrations are numerous, interesting, and fairly well executed. We do not altogether like the translations of inscriptions, but as the original text is also given, the objection is felt the less.

We have from Mr. Burton a short work¹⁸ upon the origin of the Etruscans, based upon investigations of the northern part of the country, and written in a very interesting style. A great part of the book is devoted to an examination of Professor Calori's labours, and of the antiquities which are preserved on the spot. The author lays greater stress upon the evidence of the comparison of skulls and implements than upon the very slight traces of language. The book is usefully illustrated.

Another volume marks the untiring industry of Mr. J. H. Parker in examining and describing ancient Rome.¹⁹ The present volume contains two papers—one on the Forum, the other on the Via Sacra—which may safely be said to comprise all that is known of those famous localities. The book is furnished abundantly with illustrations, which are of greater value to the student as they have been executed by photographic process, and may, therefore, be absolutely relied upon for accuracy.

We have received a German translation²⁰ of an admirable guide to the Museum of National Antiquities at Stockholm. Ordinarily such a publication would not require notice in our columns; this work is, however, so carefully and thoroughly edited, and so beautifully illus-

¹⁷ "Discoveries at Ephesus." By J. T. Wood, F.S.A. With Numerous Illustrations. London: Longmans & Co.

¹⁸ "Etruscan Bologna: A Study." By Richard F. Barton. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

¹⁹ "The Forum Romanum: The Via Sacra." By J. H. Parker, C.B. Oxford: Parker & Co.

²⁰ "Führer durch das Museum vaterländischer Alterthümer in Stockholm." Ausgearbeitet von O. Montelius. Uebersetzt von J. Mestorf. Hamburg: O. Meissner.

trated, that it deserves our high praise. The numerous woodcuts are quite equal even to those which the "Art Journal" published during the Exhibition of 1867. We could wish to see similar guides to our own splendid collections.

A small book of 150 pages,²¹ by Mr. Freeman, published in Mr. J. R. Green's series of "History Primers," contains a history of the civilised world from the earliest known period to the present day. Our readers may, perhaps, smile at the dimensions of so comprehensive a work; but we give this little book very high praise. It is very clearly written, and narrates only what is essential; and this is, as we have said above, the proper principle on which to begin the teaching of history—to give the outline first, and then to let the details fit themselves in. After Mr. Freeman's recent utterances, we smile to read that after the Peace of Jassy (1792) the nations subject to the Sultan "grew stronger, and tried to revolt whenever they had a chance. In this they were always encouraged by Russia, though they seldom got any real help."

We are glad to welcome an addition to Mr. Collins' "Ancient Classics for English Readers," in the shape of a volume²² on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius by Mr. Davies, who has given us a book equal to the best in that excellent series. The translations, by Mr. Davies, Mr. Theodore Martin, Mr. R. D. Blackmore, the Rev. A. C. Auchmuty, and others, are well chosen; and the literary criticism and the examination of the personality of the three poets are of the ablest and liveliest kind.

Mr. Henri Van Laun²³ has undertaken to supply a notable want in English literature—that of a history of the literature of France. We have before us the first volume of Mr. Van Laun's work, which extends to the Renaissance, ending with Calvin and his friends; and from this specimen we can promise our readers a clear and well-written survey of this interesting field. The earlier chapters, which treat of the various influences which have formed the French language, are very interesting. Rabelais and Montaigne are the only familiarly known names which occur in the period under consideration. Each of these fills a chapter, and both are treated with just discrimination. The quoted specimens of the various writers are given in English, with the original French in footnotes. If we must find a fault, we would suggest that the book would have been better for a larger quantity of specimens.

A very beautifully-printed volume²⁴ by Mrs. Oliphant contains biographical sketches of Dante, Giotto, and Savonarola, with which is interwoven a history of Florence. These are all good; we prefer, however, the sketch—all too brief as it is—of Dante, which is juster than

²¹ "The History of Europe." By Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D., &c. London: Macmillan & Co.

²² "Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius." By the Rev. James Davies, M.A. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons.

²³ "History of French Literature." By Henri Van Laun. Vol. I. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

²⁴ "The Makers of Florence." By Mrs. Oliphant. London: Macmillan & Co.

the records of so great a name generally are. The book is bountifully illustrated with very charming woodcuts, after drawings by Professor Delamotte. It will make a pretty table-book, and we prophesy that it will very often be chosen this season as a gift-book.

Our language boasts the first real biography of Lorenzo de' Medici, that of Roscoe, published two or three generations back. Since that time much that was then concealed has been revealed to the world; and in this illumination few countries have had more light cast upon their history than has Italy. It is not wonderful, therefore, if Roscoe's book is now a little behind contemporary knowledge. Two or three years ago we noticed the appearance of Herr Von Reumont's completed biography, and we now have to welcome an excellent translation²⁵ of that work by Mr. Harrison, the well-known secretary of the London Library. It is not necessary now to say how laboriously and amply Herr Von Reumont fulfilled his task. His work is indeed a thorough history of Italy during perhaps its most extraordinary period, as indeed a real biography of Lorenzo must be, for he *was* the Italy of his time. Mr. Harrison's rendering of the work is thoroughly well done.

From Berlin we receive a criticism²⁶ of the character of Servetus, in which the piety and the entire devotion to Christ of the martyred discoverer of the circulation of the blood are duly marked. This sketch makes it harder than ever to comprehend the spirit of the sixteenth century, in which reformers could suffer the self-created infallible pope, Calvin, to destroy such a man on so-called religious grounds.

The Count Jules Delaborde has written a memoir²⁷ of Eléonore de Roye, wife of that Louis de Bourbon, Prince de Condé, who played such a sorry part in the history of Protestantism in France. This amiable woman devoted herself to her faith and to her husband; and though she had saved the latter perhaps from death, and herself died in her twenty-ninth year, she saw herself basely neglected by him for the sake of a worthless woman designedly put in his way by his enemy Catherine de' Medici. Her brief but exalted life forms a noble story. Count Delaborde tells it simply and gracefully. A very strong religious current is perceptible through the book. The author is of course a Protestant.

Professor Stern of Bern has published the first half of a great work upon "Milton and his Times,"²⁸ which narrates the poet's life down to the time of the execution of Charles I. This will, if it continues as it has begun, be a very perfect work, and will be as valuable a book for

²⁵ "Lorenzo de' Medici the Magnificent." By A. Von Reumont. Translated from the German by Robert Harrison. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

²⁶ "Charakterbild Michael Servet'a." Von Lic. Theol. Henri Tollin. Berlin: C. Habel.

²⁷ "Eléonore de Roye, Princesse de Condé." Par le Comte Jules Delaborde. Paris: Sandos et Fischbacher.

²⁸ "Milton und seine Zeit." Von A. Stern, Auserord. Professor an der Universität Bern. Bücher I. II. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.

German readers, as Mr. Masson's biography is for us. The author has strengthened himself for his task by a careful study of the original materials in our libraries, and has had the advantage of sympathetic aid from several eminent Englishmen, especially from Mr. Masson, of the value of whose work he is very sensible. We are unwilling to discuss so important a work piecemeal. We shall therefore defer a detailed criticism until we have the whole work before us. For the present we will merely say that this first part appears to be very well and thoroughly done.

We recently made brief mention of a sketch of Spinoza's life by Dr. Hugo Sinsberg; and now the same editor sends us Spinoza's correspondence,²⁹ consisting of eighty letters, all in Latin. The letters are accompanied by an introduction and by arguments; and appended to the work is "La Vie de B. de Spinoza par Jean Colerus." The introduction is a very able paper, affording a good survey of Spinoza's writings and doctrines.

A somewhat dull panegyric of Fénelon³⁰ has been written by the author of the "Life of Bossuet," &c. It is a book without any historical or scientific value, and is apparently intended as a sort of book of devotion for persons of a certain religious school.

The third and concluding volume³¹ of Lord E. Fitzmaurice's *Life of the first Marquis of Lansdowne* has just appeared. It carries the narrative through Lord Shelburne's short administration, the negotiations leading to the treaty recognising the independence of the United States, the delicate relations with Mr. Pitt which resulted in Lord Shelburne's marquisate, and ends with his retirement and death in 1805. This volume is quite equal to its predecessors, and the whole work forms a worthy record of the public career of a very honest and courageous statesman.

M. Jules Claretie's biography of the unfortunate Camille Desmoulins appears in an English version by Mrs. Cashel Hoey.³² If this biography is interesting, as it undoubtedly is, it is not owing to our admiration for Camille's character. Its charm lies in his sweet wife, the tragic fate of both, and the light which is thrown upon the events of 1792-94. Camille was weak and vain, and was carried away by premature notoriety. His wife, on the other hand, was a charming girl, filled with the sentimental naturalism which Rousseau had spread so widely, who, after her marriage, made her home a free and most desired resort for her husband's friends. M. Claretie presents us with extracts from her journals, which are indeed often absurd, but reveal a beautiful child's nature. The short idyll of her married life was perfectly happy, but for the mournful presentiment which began to over-

²⁹ "Der Briefwechsel des Spinoza im Urtexte." Von Hugo Sinsberg, Ph.D. Leipzig: E. Koschny.

³⁰ "Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai." By the Author of the *Lives of Bossuet, S. Francis de Sales, &c., &c.* London: Rivingtons.

³¹ "Life of William, Earl of Shelburne." By Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice. Vol. III. London: Macmillan & Co.

³² "Camille Desmoulins and his Wife." Translated from the French of Jules Claretie. By Mrs. Cashel Hoey. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

power her husband, when he saw the horrors of that storm of violence which he had helped to create by his earlier writings, and realised that all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword. There is no more heroic story than that of her death, in which she appears graceful, sympathetic, brave to the very last, showing a courage greater than that of her husband. It is, however, fair to remember that she was nerved by the hope of rejoining her beloved. M. Claretie furnishes us with many interesting extracts from the writings of both Camille and Lucile, some of which are published for the first time. Mrs. Cashel Hoey's translation of this interesting work is very good.

An interesting paper³³ in the "Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Vorträge" of Virchow and Holzfendorf is written by Dr. J. Schmidt to show how Schiller was influenced by J. J. Rousseau. No one will dispute that Schiller was so influenced, because he himself frequently alludes admiringly to Rousseau. His play of "Fiesco" appears to have been suggested by a remark of Rousseau's; and we find both of the illustrious writers very fond of Plutarch. But Dr. Schmidt has startled us by his proofs of the importance of Rousseau's influence, drawn from comparisons of their writings. Notably in the "Robbers," and in "Don Carlos" is it to be traced in the intense yearning towards nature and opposition to the conventional.

There are few persons in the history of the past hundred years whose position and influence are so difficult to understand as those of Rahel, the wife of Varnhagen von Ense. In spite of drawbacks of birth and social position in her early years, without the advantage of beauty, making scarce an attempt in authorship, she nevertheless made her salon the meeting-place of all that was noblest and most intellectual in the Germany of her day, from the king's brother, who died so nobly at Jena, to the youthful Heine. She undoubtedly owes part of her present fame to the somewhat too free publication of her letters by her husband, but her wonderful contemporary influence must be due to causes in herself. She was a woman of deep religious feeling, quite free from intolerance or sectarianism; she possessed great wisdom, and her conversation must have been both clever and delightful; but it is to her large and sympathetic heart that we must attribute the regard and respect which she compelled from so many men and women. Carlyle (to whom this biography is dedicated) first made Rahel known to English readers in this "Review" nearly forty years ago. Mrs. Vaughan Jennings' sketch³⁴ is very pleasant reading, enriched as it is with many extracts from Rahel's admirable letters. We could indeed wish it had been longer, and had given us something more than the glimpses which it affords of some of Rahel's friends. From the charming sketch of Henriette Herz, which is here given, we are sure Mrs. Vaughan Jennings would have fulfilled our wish ably. We cordially commend her work, which appears opportunely now, when attention is so much directed to the culture and position of women.

³³ "Schiller und Rousseau." Von Dr. Joh. Schmidt. Berlin: Carl Habel.

³⁴ "Rahel: Her Life and Letters." By Mrs. Vaughan Jennings. London: Henry S. King & Co.

Mr. Graeme publishes a second edition of his memoir³⁵ of Beethoven. The life of the great composer was not very dramatic; it is, however, interesting, though painful, to know in what poverty the greatest master of his art lived and died, while the world was admiring the fruits of his genius. Doubtless there was much in Beethoven's haughty and occasionally suspicious temper to prevent his success in the world. Mr. Graeme has written a pleasant sketch, wisely quoting as often as possible from Beethoven's letters.

Frederic Ozanam was a young French advocate, who, early in life, quitted the law in order to become Professor of Foreign Literature at the Sorbonne. We do not learn what his qualifications for the post were, though we are told that he visited Italy, England, and Spain after his appointment. He was an extremely earnest and pious Catholic of the more liberal sort, and was an intimate friend of Lacordaire and Montalembert, and was one of the founders of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. He also enjoyed the friendship of M. Ampère. He died in his fortieth year in 1813. There was nothing in his life which is not to be found in that of every sincerely religious man; and we cannot think this biography,³⁶ in which Miss O'Meara tells fully the events of his life, was wanted, unless by certain classes, to whom we have already alluded, as a quasi-devotional book.

We now come to a most interesting work, the biography, or, as it may be more accurately termed, the autobiography of a famous American man of letters, George Ticknor,³⁷ edited by his friend G. S. Hilliard, and by members of his family. His long life (1791-1871) was one of rare happiness and distinction. Among his friends in his own country were President Jefferson, Daniel Webster, Everett, Washington Irving, Prescott, and Longfellow; and in Europe he enjoyed the intimacy of a very large and very illustrious circle, among whom were Byron, Lyell, King John of Saxony (the translator of Dante), Miss Edgeworth, Sir E. Head, Lord Russell, Alexander Von Humboldt, Hallam, the De Broglie family, and many others scarcely less famous. Brought up to the law, he soon found that his tastes were literary; and having the advantage of a most noble, wise, and tender father, he was enabled to abandon law, and to qualify himself by four years of study in Europe for the Professorship of Belles Lettres at Harvard. In this change, and in no other, his career shows a coincidence with that of Ozanam, noticed above. It was his good fortune to be received into the very highest circles in society and in literature during this and his subsequent visits to Europe; and these volumes will be found an almost inexhaustible mine of anecdotes about most of the remarkable personages of Europe during the present century. Many of these, his conversations with Byron for instance, are historically valuable. In the

³⁵ "Beethoven: A Memoir." By Elliott Graeme. Second Edition. London: Griffin & Co.

³⁶ "Frederic Ozanam, Professor at the Sorbonne: His Life and Works." By Kathleen O'Meara. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas.

³⁷ "Life, Letters, and Journals of George Ticknor." Two Vols. Second Edition. London: Sampson Low & Co.

highest society the young American held his own with dignity; and the lives of few men of letters present anything so interesting and so honourable to both parties as the tone of the correspondence of the aged Ticknor with the aged King of Saxony, two friends whom community of studies had first united. It is not news to the well-informed that there is no higher type than the real American gentleman; but there are many who will find it difficult to understand how the simple student and man of letters, the son of a small provincial trader, could make himself so courted by kings and princes. It rarely happens with Europeans, probably because they rarely recognise that genuine high-mightinesses care less for obsequiousness than a head-master, or a bishop, or a lord mayor. Ticknor's chief works are his "Life of Prescott" and the "History of Spanish Literature," which latter will long be *the* book on the subject in our language, and which is a good, though rarely followed, model of what the history of a literature should be. His wide experience of European statesmen had furnished him with a remarkable political prescience and judgment; and his remarks on such questions as those of international copyright, slavery, the war of the North and South, &c., may be read with advantage. He was a true prophet with respect to the great struggle; and we think it a sad thing for the United States that in their political system there was (and is) no worthy place or means of exercising influence for a man of such experience and wisdom—one, moreover, who had seen the country develop from its small position at the beginning of this century to what it is now, and who loved it as a father loves the child whose growth he has watched. The editors of this charming work have done their task admirably. Ticknor has been allowed to tell his own story from his letters and journals, only a few brief and necessary connecting links being supplied. It is a delightfully interesting book, and will be instructive to readers on both sides of the Atlantic.

It would not have been fitting that one who led the manly career of Charles Kingsley should pass away unrecorded. Though a priest, he was a fighter in the world's daily combat; and the nobler parts of his character are such as every good citizen would do well to imitate. We are therefore glad, on grounds both of historical interest and of example, that Mrs. Kingsley has brought out a biography³⁸ of her distinguished husband. This labour of love the bereaved lady has performed with great tact. That her book should be decidedly panegyric was to be expected; but her loving admiration has not carried enulogy to the extent of perverting truth, or of injuring the value and usefulness of the record. With great wisdom she has allowed Charles Kingsley, as far as possible, to describe himself by means of copious extracts from his letters and other writings. Born in Devonshire, in 1819, Kingsley spent the greater part of his childhood in Mid-England, and returned to his native county in his eleventh year. One of his

³⁸ "Charles Kingsley, his Letters, and Memories of his Life." Edited by his Wife. Two Vols. London: Henry S. King & Co.

early memories, and one which made a lasting impression on him, was the sight of the excesses of the Bristol Riots in 1832. It was proposed to send the lad to Rugby, but Helston, in Cornwall, had the honour of training his boyhood. He often regretted that he had not been under Arnold, a regret that was probably suggested or increased by his subsequent intimacy with Arnold's two biographers and pupils, Dean Stanley and the author of "Tom Brown." It is hard to discuss what might have been; but it is certain that in his courage, and in his combination of strict Church of England doctrine with liberal views on religion, as well as other points, Kingsley had much that was like Arnold. That they both became Professors of History is a slight coincidence. Kingsley, however, had much to be thankful for at Helston. Among his teachers were Mr. Derwent Coleridge, who writes, that when he visited the new Canon of Westminster in 1874, "he flung his arms round my neck, exclaiming, 'Oh, my dear old master! my dear old master!'" and that well-known botanist, the late Mr. Johns of Winchester, who probably first roused the lad's passion for that and kindred sciences, and who worked with him in the cause of natural science in Hampshire, when they became neighbours towards the close of their lives. And at Helston he first met his schoolfellow and lifelong friend, Mr. R. C. Powles, whom also fate brought into his neighbourhood in later life. In his seventeenth year his father was appointed rector of St. Luke's, Chelsea; and Charles Kingsley left the west. After spending two years at King's College, London, he went up to Cambridge in 1838. Here he led a life of bodily activity, passed through a stage of religious doubt, and took a good double degree, for which he appears not to have worked very hard. He was at once ordained, and became curate of Eversley, with which place his name is henceforth connected. In 1844 he married. He had exchanged his curacy for another; but almost immediately afterwards the rectorship of Eversley became vacant, and Kingsley was appointed to it. Back in his old parish, he began to write. He made the acquaintance of many rising men, mainly Liberals, among whom were Maurice, Froude, Hullah, Helps, J. M. Ludlow, and Thomas Hughes. After the publication of the "Saint's Tragedy," he was greatly occupied by the political events of 1848, and in this frame of mind produced "Alton Locke" and "Parson Lot's Letters," which, by the way, will be found to be far less violent than their reputation. For the next twelve years he worked hard in his parish; maintained a vast correspondence, in much of which he was a teacher or guide of weaker brethren, often strangers to him; and wrote many tales and sermons. Mrs. Kingsley gives many extracts from unpublished and lesser known writings. None of these do we like better than some marginal notes on a book of hymns which was sent to him for approval. His remarks are excellent, and much needed in these days, when hymns that can only be termed indecent are to be found in nearly every collection. In 1859 he became a Court Chaplain, and in the following year Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, in which post his lectures were pregnant and inspiring, though they were not generally admired in academic

circles, partly, perhaps, because they were so well attended. It is interesting to note that this distinguished and successful writer had never had money to throw away in M.A. fees until he accepted the Professorship. It would be better for our Universities if all men refused to waste money on this mockery; they would then devise more real modes of raising income, such, perhaps, as the teaching of some of those other branches of knowledge that are nearly as useful as scholastic theology. In 1870 Kingsley received a canonry at Chester, which he exchanged for one at Westminster four years later. Not until then did he begin to feel some ease as to his pecuniary circumstances, and he was cut off in 1875. The smallness of the property which he left behind was one of the best proofs of his unselfish character. In surveying this character, we note chiefly how entirely he was possessed by the idea of the Divine Love. This idea was, we believe, the chief ground of his passion for physical science, and it worked out, in another form, in his thorough sympathy with his fellow-men. His perfect honesty and out-spokenness brought on him the sorrow of being misunderstood and misrepresented, as it once brought on him the correction of John Henry Newman; and at various times he was reviled as a demagogue, and as a worshipper of aristocracy. His views, however, changed little; and his earliest writings breathe the same spirit, and mainly the same opinions, as his latest words. In religion he was of the most orthodox, eager to console and help others to the same view, never ready to condemn, often protesting his faith so zealously as to show how deep a struggle he must have gone through. After all, the grand question about such a man is, Was he sincere? There can be no doubt on this point in the minds of readers of these letters, beginning with his boyhood. Least of all, can there be any among those who were privileged to know him, who saw that this favourite of courts was one of the most retiring and humble of men, who knew how he worked for, and spoke of, the many noble causes which he had at heart, and who knew—last and greatest in a certain sense—something of what he was to his wife and children. Every one will be the better for the study of the life and thoughts of this downright, wise, and faithful man.

It is well known that in the days of slavery in the United States, it was a common thing for slaves to cheat their masters by stealing and conveying themselves to Canada. The readers of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" will remember many such cases. It would, of course, have been impossible for an ignorant slave, if unaided, to elude pursuit through the hundreds of miles which separated the Slave States from Canada; for it must be remembered that a runaway was liable to seizure in the Free States, though a slave brought by his master into a Free State became free *ipso facto* if he chose to claim it. There were, however, always many noble Abolitionists in the North who would brave the unjust laws and cruel mobs to help their fellow-man to freedom; and there was a sort of organisation among them for secretly passing these runaways on from one to another until they reached the Canaan of the British Empire. This organisation was nicknamed by the dia-

gusted slaveowners the Underground Railroad; and its chief manager was Levi Coffin, who now puts forth a volume of his reminiscences.³⁹ It is a book full of heart-rending stories; but the pang which they cause is mingled with a relief like the awaking from a terrible dream; the day of such things is past. Who can now believe that only fifteen years since men of our race could forbid slaves to be taught, could forbid them to marry otherwise than as cattle, could deny them any further family tie than is allowed to cattle? That so recently, among men otherwise like ourselves, children were sold by their own fathers, nay, were sometimes begotten for the very purpose of such sale? and that women were put up in open market to be gazed at and punched and discussed as a cow is here? Nay, worse—for we cannot record the horrors of that fearful national crime, nor can any book venture even to speak of some of them. They are only to be hinted at in shuddering speech. That our American brothers could have tolerated them so long, that they could have hesitated for a while about abolition when the war opened the question; the shame of this is almost enough to make them wish to blot out their whole history before the New Year's day of 1864. Honour to those few—to Levi Coffin, to John Brown, to Garrison, and others—who risked something in the hated cause of abolition. The present work is good to read, because it is good to know even the ill that has been. Mr. Coffin is a member of the Society of Friends, and every now and then enlivens his sad book with a little sober quaintness. In 1866 he visited England in the cause of the freedmen; and attended a "meeting at Samuel Gurney's, which was quite aristocratic in character, being largely composed of lords, dukes, bishops, and members of Parliament." At this meeting he conversed with a gentleman who is described as "a prominent bishop of London." It is an honest book.

Mr. Smiles has published a narrative⁴⁰ which does no credit to the representatives of science in Scotland, but which will, we trust, bring benefit to its hero. In Banff lives to-day Thomas Edward, Associate of the Linnean Society, a man of the highest distinction as a naturalist, and one who has largely increased the world's knowledge of his subject. He has lived an honourable life of sixty-two years, bringing up a large family respectably. And this man has always been—and still is—a working shoemaker pinched by poverty. Well was it said that a prophet has no honour in his own country; and we fear that Mr. Edward's remark, that not a copy of this book would be bought in Banff, may prove only too true. It will, however, be read in many other places; and we are quite sure that the story of his admirable career will bring him some material prosperity, as well as respect and honour. The book is illustrated by a portrait and some charming sketches by George Reid, A.R.S.A. The portrait is very

³⁹ "Reminiscences of Levi Coffin, the Reputed President of the Underground Railroad." London: Sampson Low & Co.

⁴⁰ "Life of a Scotch Naturalist: Thomas Edward." By Samuel Smiles. London: John Murray.

finely etched by Mr. Rajon. As we go to press, we are very glad to see a letter from the Prime Minister, who is at least good to his fellow-men of letters, announcing that the Queen has bestowed a well-deserved pension on Mr. Edward after reading this book. We congratulate Mr. Edward and Mr. Smiles.

The second series⁴¹ of Messrs. Cassell's "National Portrait Gallery" contains twenty chromo-lithographic portraits of contemporary celebrities, with brief literary sketches. The portraits are beautifully executed, a trifle too smooth, perhaps, and rather flattering in some cases.

BELLES LETTRES.

IT is perfectly useless to judge novels by any high standard. They do not aim at it; the public do not require it. Here, for instance, is Mrs. Macquoid, who has brought out three volumes of what may be called novelettes. Mrs. Macquoid has already obtained a respectable standing as a novelist. She is, as far as we can judge, a favourite with the public. It is evident that she could do a great deal better; but what is the use? No amount of work would raise her higher in the opinion of the subscribers to Mudie's. If she indulged in any lofty vein of reflection, or in any profound analysis of character, they would not like her half so well. She has attained her reputation, like so many more novelists, by her easy commonplace style, which any one who runs may read. Let us, for instance, take one of the tales in her new work,¹ "A Sailor's Story." It is neither the best nor the worst, but one of the shortest. Of course, the tale is founded upon the old, old theme of love, of which the world never tires—of love, too, "whose course never does run smooth." The hero is in the navy—what navy Mrs. Macquoid does not say. He is, however, drawn as the typical sailor—bluff, hearty, honest—such as the late Canon Kingsley used to write about, and the public always love to read about, and the "gods" delight to see on the stage hitching up his trousers. Such a character is bread and cheese to the novelist, as Sterne used to say Romanism was to the Protestant parson. Of course he falls in love with a young lady whom he has known ever since he was a child. Of course, too, there is another suitor in the road, rich and vulgar. Suitor No. 2 is the type of the British manufacturer as he is always described in the typical novel—a sycophant to those above him and a bully to those below him. The sailor bids farewell to his love, and makes a speech which, on the stage, would have brought the house down,—

⁴¹ "The National Portrait Gallery." London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin.

¹ "Lost Rose and Other Stories." By Catherine S. Macquoid, Author of "Patty," "The Evil Eye," &c., &c. In Three Volumes. London: Chatto & Windus. 1876.

"My darling, we musn't blame your father. Mr. Pembridge is a first-rate match, and I am nobody beside him. But your father is a good man, Lucy, and if I get a ship, I don't think he will refuse you to me, spite of his disappointment." With these sentiments he sails for the Gold Coast, where yellow fever and ague are raging. Time, however, flies even at the Gold Coast. The sailor returns. Lucy, rather than marry the purse-proud millionaire, has become a governess. The sailor, after bearding the millionaire, and still more courageously bearding his future mother-in-law, discovers his Lucy and marries her in triumph. Now here, where most novelists would have ended their story, Mrs. Macquoid really begins her's; and this not only shows her mastery as a novel-writer, but her knowledge of the requirements of the British public. Here, then, we have a typical mother-in-law, "one's natural enemy," as the saying is, a typical British millionaire, a typical sailor, and an adorable woman. Here the contrasts are of that strong character which even the most hardened novel-reader loves. The sailor is ordered off to sea before scarcely even his honeymoon has waned. At Cape Verde he hears of his own death. Now come a page or two of mystery and agony, which Mrs. Macquoid piles up with an accomplished hand. The gallant sailor is filled with suspicions. The report of his death must be the work of the millionaire. The millionaire has thus been able to marry his Lucy. He sails for England. He takes the first train. Who should enter the carriage but the detested one. The sailor recognises him by his diamond ring. To use his own expressive language, the sailor feels as if he was "travelling with a poisonous snake," or, as he finely puts it a few lines before, with "an evil spirit" who has a confirmed habit of sneering at everything. This new Mephistopheles "stared at him with a searching look that thrills him." Then for another two or three pages Mrs. Macquoid again piles up the agony, enough this time to make the most hardened novel-reader's hair stand on end. Words go through the gallant sailor like knife-blades. The poisonous snake's face "grows convulsed," and so on and so on through the whole of Miss Braddon's dictionary of sensational phrases. At last, after telling him that Lucy is dead, the evil spirit opens the carriage door and vanishes into the outer darkness of a tunnel. The gallant sailor wakes up, for it is all a dream. He had, with admirable forethought, fed the guard not to allow any one to enter the carriage. Lucy is alive. She had never even put on mourning for him. Now, against this kind of writing criticism is powerless. Criticism has nothing to say to it. There is neither wit, humour, character-drawing, happiness of expression, or high feeling, nothing but a torrent of words. Ninety-nine popular novels out of a hundred are of precisely the same stamp as the "Sailor's Story." We are not going to blame Mrs. Macquoid. The public like this sort of thing, and will have it. "*Qualis populus, talis sacerdos.*"

The inventor of an entirely new style of novel must certainly be a genius. Such an inventor is Mr. Hawley Smart. He has brought out a sort of double or twin novel. The name of this wonderful pro-

duction is "Courtship in 1720 and in 1860."² It is in two volumes, and each volume has nothing to do with the other. If this style of novel should prove successful, publishers will, perhaps, for the future, sell novels in pairs or couples, as drapers sell stockings and poulterers rabbits. Just as the year 1875 is famous in the annals of shipbuilding for the production of the twin-ship the "Castalia," so will the year 1876 be memorable in the annals of literature for the invention of the twin-novel. We are quite aware that the man who makes two blades of wheat grow where only one grew before is a benefactor to his country, but we are doubtful whether the author who writes two novels where one would do is a benefactor to Mudie's. He certainly is not to the critics. The puzzle to us is, what is the connection between Mr. Hawley Smart's two volumes? The candidate for holy orders who, in answer to the question, what is the connection between the Old and New Testament? replied, that in his Bible there was a blank page, would be perfectly right in the case of these two courtships. We are utterly at a loss to account for their connection. Still, just as there are double stars which revolve round one another in a wonderful way, so perhaps there may be double novels which revolve round one another in a manner which defies human intelligence. Mr. Hawley Smart may have discovered a new example of the law of gravitation. When we come, however, to examine the contents of this double novel, we regret to say that our hopes are greatly disappointed. Mr. Hawley Smart appears to have exhausted his genius on the outside of his production. The first volume contains what we have no doubt is a painstaking historical novel of German life, which concludes with a sergeant being flogged by order of Frederick the Great with three hundred lashes. This second volume contains a great many modern hunting scenes and hard runs, and the only connection that we can see between the two volumes is, that in one men are flogged, and in the other, horses.

"Come deaf, or come blind, or come cripple,
Or come any o' them a'!
Far better be married to something,
Than no to be married ava."

Such is the burden of most ladies' novels. Marriage at any price is their cry. Mrs. Craik, however, preaches the contrary doctrine with great unction. Her marriages are made in heaven. Her heroines are the most patient Griseldas. They think nothing of waiting fifteen years for their lovers. Time, as usual with a woman, has no effect upon them. Her heroes, too, are painfully good. Their talk is goody-goody. The "Laurel Bush" is³ no exception. Here and there in it, as in all Mrs. Craik's writings, there are some touches of human nature,

² "Courtship, in Seventeen Hundred and Twenty, in Eighteen Hundred and Sixty." By Hawley Smart, Author of "Breezie Langton," "Two Kisses," &c. In Two Volumes. London: Chapman & Hall. 1876.

³ "The Laurel Bush: An Old-Fashioned Love Story." By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." London: Daldy, Isbister, & Co. 1877.

some strokes of true tenderness and real pathos. But harping upon one string is apt to become wearisome. What all Mrs. Craik's novels want is relief. She does not become exactly morbid, but only mawkish. We dare say many a girl will have a good cry over the griefs and trials of poor Fortune Williams. Mrs. Craik is of course intensely moral. We have on another occasion pointed how very different in some points her code of love-making and courtship is to our own, and we need not enter into the subject again.

It is pleasant to be able to praise, and to praise unreservedly, and we can certainly most unreservedly praise "Bessie Lang."⁴ It is a love story, and a very sad love story, but not told in Mrs. Craik's namby-pamby fashion. The scene is laid in the Lake Country. Wordsworth, who we fancy did not often read novels, might have studied it for its charming descriptions and its quaint account of the North-country customs, which are all interwoven with great skill into the story. The characters are flesh and blood, and not lay figures. Bill the hero—the wrestler, who carries off the University prize; the aunt who tells the story, Ormond the good-hearted parson, Ellis the scoundrelly artist, and above all poor Bessie herself—all these people really live, and act, and speak naturally.

A tone of flippancy in one or two places rather spoils "Maude Maynard."⁵ We do not certainly sympathise with much of what passes for religion, but it is as well to speak with a certain degree of respect for what so many people hold to be sacred. Here, however, is a passage which we are afraid is only too true—"Papa presents each of us with a fresh copy of the Bible, beautifully bound, every other birthday. I cannot bear to see the book; it is associated in my mind with—No, I will not say with what; but I cannot believe that, if there be a God, and He made all things so beautiful as they look now, He would ever give those words for me to be tormented and driven wild by them" (vol. i. p. 85). Gipsie's early life is prettily described though here and there we come across passages which raise a smile at the ideal man which a woman so often loves to create.

The first volume of Mr. Green's "Walter Lee"⁶ is perhaps the best. The school theatricals, and especially the cricket-match between Marlborough and Cheltenham, the batting of the former and the bowling of the latter, are told with much freshness and vigour. Some of the scenes in the Indian Mutiny are vivid, but they are painful, and have been so often described before.

Of the remaining novels on our list we must speak briefly. In the average class are "The Owl's Nest in the City"⁷ and "Marks upon

⁴ "Bessie Lang." By Alice Corkran. London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1876.

⁵ "Maude Maynard." By the Author of "Almost Faultless," "A Book for Governesses." London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

⁶ "Walter Lee, A Story of Marlborough College." By H. W. Green. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

⁷ "The Owl's Nest in the City: A Story." By Edward Lovel. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

the Door."⁸ These can scarcely be called dull, but their humour is not very brilliant, and both authors have very slight powers of character-drawing. It is in her character-drawing that Miss Tytler chiefly excels. "What She Came Through"⁹ gives one more proof of the authoress's versatility. It may be recommended to young ladies. Another story which we can also recommend to young ladies is Miss Alcot's "Rose in Bloom."¹⁰ Miss Alcot always excels in describing small social events, and the description of the ball is very happy. Mr. Roe's story "Near to Nature's Heart"¹¹ is very disappointing. It is too full, not exactly of tall talk, but of something which approaches too near to it for our taste. Lastly, let us call attention to "Madeleine,"¹² a Huguenot story. It is marked by much grace and delicacy. Some of the country scenes are very charming. We regret that we have not space to give a quotation or two.

It requires no political economist to tell us that as riches increase, leisure also increases. Year after year the number of amateurs at our exhibitions is increasing; year after year the volumes of poetry, too, are increasing; yet the standard of poetry is not raised. All these volumes of poetry have a curious resemblance to one another. There are the same themes and the same thoughts. The reason is not hard to seek. The Muses demand far greater study and perseverance than most mortals will give. Most of the poets of whom we are now speaking climb a little way up Parnassus, and finding the ascent becoming steeper and steeper, they halt altogether. In plainer words, if they are rich, they are disgusted with the little attention that their works attract; if they are poor, they cannot afford to wait till their works pay, and betake themselves to some more profitable literary employment. It would be entirely unjust to include all these writers in one sweeping condemnation. Many of them possess much true feeling for nature, and give us some notes of the "still, sad music of humanity." For instance, Mrs. Knox's little volume¹³ is full of touches of true pathos. But we are afraid that it will make no mark. Everywhere throughout the book we see the results of culture and sympathy. One of the finest pieces is "Woman's Future," which is worthy of Mrs. Browning. But it is not enough to write one or two striking pieces to obtain a success. A book, to make any reputation, must

⁸ "Marks upon the Door: A Novel." By Mark Mary. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

⁹ "What She Came Through." By Sarah Tytler, Author of "Citoyenne Jaqueline," "Lady Bell," "The Huguenot Family," &c., &c. London: Daldy, Isbister, & Co. 1876.

¹⁰ "Rose in Bloom: A Sequel to 'Eight Cousins.'" By Louisa M. Alcot, Author of "Little Women," "An Old-Fashioned Girl," &c., &c. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

¹¹ "Near to Nature's Heart." By the Rev. E. P. Roe. London: Ward, Lock, & Tyler. 1876.

¹² "Madeleine; or, A Noble Life in a Humble Sphere." By the Vicomtesse Solange de Kirkadec. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

¹³ "Sonnets and other Poems." By the Hon. Mrs. O. N. Knox. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

nowadays stand, so to speak, head and shoulders above the crowd. Whether Mrs. Knox will ultimately attain any position as a poet, we cannot of course say. She will most probably be disgusted with the apathy both of the public and of the reviewers. If, however, she will, by resolute study and severe discipline, serve the Muses faithfully, we believe that she might achieve no mean success.

There is no judging of a poet's future. No one could have foreseen "Hamlet" from Shakespeare's earliest plays. Nothing is so untrue as the trite adage, "A poet is born, not made." He is made. No poem ever yet has been written without severe toil. If poets wish to succeed, let them read Milton's account how a poet is made, and act up to it as near as they can. In "Laurella"¹⁴ Mr. Todhunter shows real feeling for nature; but his poems sadly suffer from want of compression and correction. One of his prettiest pieces is "May Sunshine." Here, for instance, is a description which is far above the average—

"A meadow with its wealth of deepening grass,
Which the cloud shadows lazily overpass,
Receives me from the garden. Taller heads are swayed
Noddingly o'er the sprouted green below
By little puffs of gusty wind, which blow
The ruffling surface into silvery flaws" (p. 251).

Here, too, is a quaint sketch of some birds—

"And one for wantonness chases through the air
A butterfly, which scarcely seems to shun
The rapid pounces of his foe; and one
Is angered at the buzzing of a bee,
And snaps at her right viciously."

Here, again, is another quaint sketch of some more birds—

"In yonder snow of blossomed apple-trees,
There finches peck and twitter at their ease,
Balanced on swaying boughs. One whets his beak
Against the bark, then, with a sudden tweak,
Plucks at the very bosom of a flower,
Scattering the petals in a rosy shower" (p. 250).

Mr. Inchbold's "Sonnets"¹⁵ are considerably above the average, but then the average of sonnets is very low. He shows good taste, good feeling, and culture. But he brings no new insight into things, and does not enlarge our horizon. His work, we perceive, is dedicated to Mr. Dennis. We should advise him to study Mr. Dennis's collection of sonnets which was published a year or two since, as well as a paper on sonnets in Mr. Dennis's newly published volume of essays.

¹⁴ "Laurella, and Other Poems." By John Todhunter. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

¹⁵ "Annus Amoris." By J. W. Inchbold. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

Miss Peacocke's poems,¹⁶ like the illustrations which accompany them, never rise above mediocrity.

"Ripple, ripple, little streamlet,
Ever onward on thy way;
Ripple, ripple, little streamlet,
While I listen to thy lay" (p. 8).

And so, like her own streamlet, she keeps rippling on through two hundred and sixty pages, but we are afraid that nobody will listen to her lay. She was ill-advised to publish a volume which can have only a personal, and, as it appears from the dedication and preface, a mournful interest. Doubtless Miss Peacocke's friends will find in the volume that interest which it is impossible for the public or for critics to share.

"Oils and Water Colours"¹⁷ certainly show a love for form and colour. They are, however, spoilt by affectation and far-fetched conceits. Here, for example, is a piece—

"I, said the sunset, I am far away
And golden-gray.
I gush in breaking, when I please,
And vanish under the seas."

This reads like some sort of a charade or a conundrum. But there are better things in the book than this, which in some respects, especially in its descriptions of natural scenery, reminds us of Mr. Todhunter.

A man must have great confidence in his own powers to think that the public will in these days read a tragedy of nearly three hundred pages in length, and that tragedy founded upon a tale of Mrs. Crowe's.¹⁸ We certainly have not read it, but we have read the shorter pieces at the end, and they were quite enough to show that the author possesses no genuine poetical talent of any kind. There is some poetry which is above criticism, and some beneath it.

Mr. Gibbs¹⁹ seems to be under some alarm lest his verses should at all resemble Tennyson's. We can assure him that his alarm is quite needless, and that his verses have not the very remotest resemblance to the Laureate's, or to poetry of any kind. In fact, we should not know that they were verses, except that they are printed in the form of verses. Whatever poetry is in, them is due entirely to the printer. The printer changes such stuff as this into verse—"For was it not most true that Hugh Montresse indeed had earned the right to

¹⁶ "Rays from the Southern Cross." By Georgiana Peacocke. With Illustrations by the Rev. Philip Walsh. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

¹⁷ "Oils and Water Colours." By William Renton. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas. 1876.

¹⁸ "The Weirwolf: A Tragedy." By William Forster. London: Williams & Norgate. 1876.

¹⁹ "The Battle of the Standard." By William Alfred Gibbs. London: Provest & Co. 1876.

claim fair Elfrid, having rescued her?" (p. 67). As the poem is about a battle, the printer, to give greater effect, has printed it in blood-red ink, which Mr. Gibbs may also consider poetical.

Mr. Ferris's²⁰ poems are evidently the work of a cultivated mind. We prefer, however, his translations to his original pieces. We should think that he might produce a really good translation of one of the Greek tragedians.

"The Boudoir Ballads"²¹ should only be criticised by ladies. Mr. Ashby-Sterry sings of love.

"I rave about a damsel's dress,
And versify on lace;
I burnish gold on tiny tress,
And praise a pretty face."

This, he tells us, is the keynote of his poems. He belongs to the same school as Praed, Mr. Locker, Mr. Austin Dobson, and the late Mr. Mortimer Collins. His book, as is fitting, has been very daintily brought out in gold and blue, and will certainly find an appropriate place in a lady's boudoir.

Mr. Baxter's volume²² is certainly above the general standard of religious poetry. He brings to his task at least an appreciation of the beauties of nature. Unlike many modern hymn-writers, he does not praise his God and denounce His works. Some of the pieces, like "Palm Sunday," possess a good deal of spirit and no little rhythmical power. We have to thank Mr. Chatfield, however, for reminding us that there was a time when hymns and poetry were identical. In England the Latin hymn-writers are far better known than the Greek, and a double debt therefore is owing to Mr. Chatfield for introducing such true poets as Synesius and Gregory of Nazianzus to the English reader. It is a great pity that he did not give us the original poems in an appendix at the end. It is not everybody who possesses the "Anthologia Græca Carminum Christianorum." Mr. Chatfield's translations read more like original productions than translations, so flexible and nervous is his English. His book will certainly be welcomed by all lovers of religious poetry. To each of the hymn-writers he prefixes a most useful and sensible introduction, which will be of great service to the general reader. His preface, too, is marked by culture and good sense.

Amongst the volumes of miscellaneous poetry, one volume²³ alone stands out pre-eminent. Everybody who has read Mr. Dowden's work

²⁰ "Poems." By Henry Weybridge Ferris. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

²¹ "Boudoir Ballads." By J. Ashby-Sterry, Author of "Tiny Travels," "Shuttlecock Papers," &c., &c. London: Chatto & Windus. 1876.

²² "St. Christopher, with Psalm and Song." By Maurice Baxter. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1876.

"Songs and Hymns of the Earliest Greek Christian Poets." Translated into English Verse. By A. W. Chatfield. London: Rivingtons. 1876.

²³ "Poems." By Edward Dowden. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

on Shakespeare must have felt that he was a poet. Whether he possessed the rhythmical power or not, he was to all intents and purposes a poet in feeling and in keenness of insight. His present volume makes good his claim to be ranked amongst the poets of the present generation. He stands on a high level of thought. He accurately reads the signs of the times. He has definite opinions. And though we only look upon his present volume as a first effort, yet it is easy to see that he will contribute much which will go to mould the minds of his contemporaries. A critic might easily show that in the present volume there are too many reminiscences and imitations—here a touch from Tennyson, there an echo of Keats. This is sure to be the case in a man's earliest poems. He can scarcely avoid such faults. He hardly, in fact, is aware of them. Still, taking all these blemishes into account, there remains an amount of vigorous thought, and an insight into human nature, united with melodious expression, such as mark a genuine poet. Mr. Dowden's next volume of poetry will be looked forward to with anxious expectation. In him we fancy that we discern a poet who will unite Browning's vigorous power with Tennyson's sweetness and clearness of expression.

In addition to the volumes of original poetry, we have this quarter three most excellent collections. First and foremost stands Mr. Emerson's "*Parnassus*."²⁴ This will have an especial value for the English reader for three reasons: first, because it will make him acquainted with various American poets who are well worth reading; secondly, because Mr. Emerson's varied reading has led him into many byways of literature, and he does not give the usual extracts of common collections, but enriches his pages with contributions from out-of-the-way sources; and thirdly, because Mr. Emerson has prefixed a most interesting preface, which is, in fact, a short essay upon poetry and poets, written in his very best manner, and without any of that obscurity which is often so great a blemish to his writings. If readers are puzzled by some of the selections, let them remember the truth which Mr. Emerson lays down in his preface—"I consider that there is a poetry for bards proper, as well as a poetry for the world of readers." And the same truth holds good of painting. There are pictures which are only loved by painters, and not by the world at large. So if the reader is puzzled at some of the pieces, let him ponder on Mr. Emerson's words. The fault will probably be in himself, and not in Mr. Emerson's selection. Here is Mr. Emerson's conception of a poet: "The poet demands all gifts, and not one or two only. Like the electric rod, he must reach from a point nearer to the sky than all surrounding objects, down to the earth, and into the wet soil, or neither is of use. The poet must not only converse with pure thought, but he must demonstrate it almost to the senses. His words must be pictures." And again he thus speaks: "Poetry teaches the enormous force of a

²⁴ "*Parnassus*." Edited by Ralph Waldo Emerson. Boston, U.S.: James R. Osgood & Co. 1876.

few words, and, in proportion to the inspiration, checks loquacity. It requires that splendour of expression which carries with it the proof of great thoughts. Great thoughts ensure musical expression." His criticisms on Chaucer, Shakespeare, Jonson, Wordsworth, and Byron are all excellent, full of matured thought, and deserve especial study.

Mr. Morley's "Shorter English Poems" ²⁵ will be welcomed by a very large class of readers. Mr. Morley's book is not so much adapted for students as for the public at large, that vast ignorant public which requires to be instructed at every turn, and told what is to be admired, and why it is to be admired. One great advantage in Mr. Morley's collection is that he gives a great number of pieces from modern poets. Such names as Clough, Matthew Arnold, Swinburne, Morris, are absolutely unknown to the public. The provincial bookseller never keeps their works in stock. The vicar often objects to at least two of them being placed in the parish library. The ignorance about our poets is only known to those who live in the country. The present writer was asked not long ago by a provincial mayor whether he "had ever heard of the poet Browning." Mr. Morley has therefore rightly given a good many pieces from contemporary literature. Nothing can be more short-sighted than the policy of copyright holders in forbidding extracts to be made. An extract is in reality a good advertisement; for if a person sees a poem which he admires, he naturally becomes anxious to know more of the poet, and accordingly buys his works. Not long ago one of Mr. Tennyson's publishers was so foolishly advised as to send round to the critics a notice forbidding them to quote more than a certain number of lines. The effect, we believe, was thoroughly harmful both to Tennyson and the publisher, for the critics, when they were limited in the beauties, not unnaturally turned to the faults of the poem. Mr. Morley's volume, we repeat, will introduce the public to many poets—such for instance as Mrs. Webster and Mr. Lewis Morris—of whom it is in entire ignorance, and for this reason we especially recommend it to all public institutes and parish libraries.

Mr. Wilson's "Poets and Poetry of Scotland" ²⁶ may also, for the same reasons, be recommended. To each of the poets he prefixes a slight memoir with a short account of their works. These prefaces are all distinguished by careful criticism and a sober style. The book should find a place on the shelves of all lovers of Scottish poetry.

One of the best books upon poetry which we have had for a very long time is undoubtedly Mr. Dennis's "Studies in English Literature." ²⁷ All the essays in the volume are good, but the three last on

²⁵ "Shorter English Poems." Selected and Edited by Henry Morley, Professor of English Literature at University College, London. London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. 1876.

²⁶ "The Poets and Poetry of Scotland, from the Earliest to the Present Time." By James Grant Wilson. London: Blackie & Son. 1877.

²⁷ "Studies in English Literature." By John Dennis. London: Edward Stamford. 1876.

English lyrical poetry, English rural poetry, and the English sonnet, are especially good. He too, like Emerson, goes to out-of-the-way sources, and he thus enriches his pages with many beauties which will be new to the ordinary reader. It is books of this kind that are especially needed in mechanics' and parish libraries. The public mind wants educating. Mr. Dennis rightly says that Mr. Bickersteth has more readers than Spenser, and Dr. Cumming than Jeremy Taylor. Mr. Dennis is no partial critic. He can admire Milton, and yet do full justice to Ben Jonson's lyrics. He can sympathise both with George Herbert and with Greene or Herrick. It is this comprehensiveness which makes him so good a critic. His criticisms upon Shakespeare and his love of the country strike us as admirable. Equally good, too, are his remarks upon Mrs. Browning's poetry, and upon that almost forgotten poet William Browne, whose pastorals are full of beauties. To Blake, too, whose fame is so little commensurate with his great merits, we are glad to see that Mr. Dennis does full measure of justice. It is difficult to rate Blake too high. In conclusion, let us strongly recommend Mr. Dennis's volume to all lovers of poetry.

We often hear of the renaissance which is taking place amongst our painters and poets, but the movement is spreading far wider than is generally supposed. A love of beauty is growing up far beyond the mere circle of artists and literary men. The public is gradually awakening to a sense of beauty and to a love for nature. Into the causes of this movement we need not now enter; but the movement is real, and manifesting itself in many ways. One of the best evidences of this feeling was the petition to Parliament that the New Forest should not be disforested, but that it should remain in its primitive wildness, so that the nation might enjoy its beauty. The agitation, too, which is going on against the introduction of railways into the Lake District is another sign of the same movement. But the greatest sign is in the improved character of our guide-books. A few years since a guide-book was synonymous with all that is trashy, vulgar, and impertinent. One of the first writers to bring about this improvement was Mr. Nichols, who gave us an excellent handbook to the Forest of Dean. He was followed by Mr. Venables, whose guide to the Isle of Wight is the model of all guide-books. And now we have what has been so much wanted—a handbook to the New Forest,²⁸ by Mr. Phillips. He has very rightly followed the example of Mr. Venables, and obtained the assistance of specialists to describe the botany, ornithology, and entomology of the New Forest. Further, his book is accompanied with what also has been a great want, a good map of the Forest on a serviceable scale, which has been specially prepared by Mr. Roberts, one of the Forest surveyors. It would have been a great improvement, however, had the map been mounted upon calico. If, too, the streams had been tinted with blue, far greater distinctness

²⁸ "The New Forest Handbook: Historical and Descriptive." By C. J. Phillips. Lyndhurst: J. G. Short. 1876.

would have been gained. The map, however, even as it is, is admirable. We should advise the reader to get it separately mounted for himself, and with it in his pocket he will have no fear of losing himself in the Forest. The literary execution of the work is in good taste. We have first a chapter on the scenery of the Forest, followed by one on its history. Mr. Phillips very rightly remarks, that the charm of the New Forest lies not altogether in its woods, fine as many of these are, but also in its wild moors and its open glades. But besides these, the Forest can boast of one of the finest ruins in England—the Cistercian Abbey at Beaulieu. It does not equal in extent the other great Cistercian Abbeys—Fountains, Rievaulx, Tintern, or its own filial home at Netley—but in some respects surpasses them all. The arches of its chapter-house are far finer than theirs. Its refectory still stands perfect, and its stone pulpit, built into the wall, with its arcading, is without a rival. Lyndhurst possesses a church such as, perhaps, no other village in England can show, with Mr. Leighton's striking fresco. Christchurch, too, can boast of its Priory Church, with its round Norman tower, and its stately stone reredos,—that church whose loveliness brought Pugin to live under its shadow. To all of these Mr. Phillips has done justice. The chapters on the ornithology, botany, and entomology are all good. To ornithologists the New Forest is dear, as the only place where the honey-buzzard breeds. Here, too, the merlin nests, not, as it usually does, on the ground, but in the old pollard hollies growing on the open heath. To the botanist the mere name of the New Forest conjures up many treasures. *Pinguicula lusitanica*, *Utricularia neglecta*, *Spiranthes aestivalis*, the lovely *Gladiolus illyricus*, *Bupleurum tenuissimum*, and, as some say, *Isardia palustris*, are all to be found within its boundaries. To the writers of these three chapters on the botany, ornithology, and entomology of the Forest special thanks are due. There is no forest, as far as we know, which can show so many attractions. Neither Dean, nor Savernake, nor Sherwood will for a moment bear comparison. Dean may show a few larger oaks and beeches, though the finest beeches at York Lodge were cut down last year, but the presence of the ironworks and collieries and the smoke and noise destroy much of the poetry of the place. Sherwood can boast of some glades, it is true, of equal beauty with those in the New Forest, and oaks far more weird, such as Sir Walter Scott has described in "Ivanhoe," but its extent is very limited when compared with the southern forest. We should have to go to Fontainebleau before we can find a rival. Altogether Mr. Phillips' is a thoroughly honest and trustworthy guide-book, and we can most thoroughly recommend it to all classes. That man must be in a most perfect state of ignorance who cannot find something in its pages to please and to interest him; and that man must be in a most enviable state of knowledge who will not find something to instruct him. It is a pity, we think, that Mr. Phillips has made no quotation from Mr. Blackmore's "Cradock Noel," where are some of the finest descriptions of the New Forest which we know; or from Mr. Allingham's well-known account of the district. We will add, however, the words of Gilpin, whose "Forest

Scenery" ought to be republished, "Within equal limits, perhaps few parts of England afford a greater variety of beautiful landscape than this New Forest. Its wooded scenes, its extended lawns, and vast sweeps of wild country, unlimited by artificial boundaries, together with its river views and distant coasts, are all in a great degree magnificent. Still it must be remembered that its chief characteristic, and what it rests on for distinction, is not sublimity but sylvan beauty." These words, though written so many years ago, are still true. We hope, therefore, that all further encroachments and all thoughts of disforestation are at an end, and that the New Forest will be preserved for the benefit of the nation, and that the recommendation of the Select Committee of the House of Commons will be strictly carried out, that "the ancient ornamental woods and trees shall be carefully preserved, and the character of the scenery maintained, the Forest remaining open and unenclosed, except to the extent to which it is expedient to maintain the existing rights of the Crown to plant trees." For this happy result we have especially to thank Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Briscoe Eyre, and Mr. Eisdale, and that band of artists and literary men which included, amongst others, the names of Herbert Spencer, Browning, Ruskin, Carlyle, and Dean Stanley, who protested against the doctrine "that man should live by bread alone."

We have from time to time called attention to the excellent Rugby series of select plays from Shakespeare. For boys they are perhaps even better than the Cambridge series. The new edition of "King Lear,"²⁹ by Mr. Moberly, forms no exception to the general excellence. The introduction is carefully written. Mr. Moberly very truly says, "In these latter days a fresh interest has been given to an imaginative treatment of the same subject in the pathetic and most original tragedy of the 'Spanish Gipsy.'" Of course, Mr. Moberly, has not had space to illustrate the comparison which he has suggested, but it is one which would be well worth working out, not so much for the sake of the points of resemblance as for those of difference. The notes, too, are excellent. They are not meant, as we have had occasion to remark before, for any display of mere antiquarian knowledge. They are short, but to the point. Such notes as those upon "debossed," "harlock," "better spoken," "this is a good block," "undistinguished space," are all in their different ways good examples of what notes should be. Lastly, Mr. Moberly is not carried away by any love of innovation upon the text. He sees clearly the weak points of most of the corrections in the notorious Perkins folio. The welcome with which the emendations of the so-called "old" corrector were received at the time of their first appearance only showed how very superficial was the study of Shakespeare's English. Since the subject has been taken in hand by such competent authorities as Abbot, Skeat, and Ingleby, we have no fear that the Perkins emendations will be foisted

²⁹ "King Lear." *Select Plays of Shakespeare. The Rugby Edition.* Edited by Rev. Charles E. Moberly, Assistant-Master in Rugby School. London: Rivingtons. 1876.

into the text. To them indeed may be applied the saying, "What is true is not new, and what is new is not true." There is no better test of a Shakespearian critic than the way in which he judges of these emendations, which have already done so much mischief. Mr. Moberly brings sound judgment and knowledge of the subject to bear upon them.

Mr. Emerson³⁰ has become quite a popular author in England. Some five-and-twenty years ago, when his first series of essays was brought out here, he was denounced by the press as a socialist and atheist, those convenient words for denouncing anybody whom we cannot understand. His present volume, of which a second edition has just appeared, promises to be more popular than any of his former works. We can now do no more than call attention to it.

Christmas books are exempt from any severe criticism. They are generally nothing more than picture-books. And we must remember that in this case the books are made for the pictures, not the pictures for the books. Mrs. Haweis's "Chaucer for Children"³¹ claims the first place, not only for its splendid binding, its illustrations, and clear print, but for its good sense and excellent notes. We can recommend it not only for children, but for everybody who loves Chaucer or wishes to understand him. Amongst fairy tales we must especially recommend "The Pearl Fountain."³² To ourselves it seems rather like an Alhambra extravaganza, but this will probably make it all the more popular. Another fairy tale is "The Rose and the Lily,"³³ bound like the lily in delicate white, and illustrated by Cruikshank. Not content with giving us English fairies, the publishers invent Greek fairies,³⁴ who are illustrated by Mr. J. Mohr Smith in what has been called the "Irish-Greek style." Probably some day we shall have a comic version of the friese of the Parthenon. Then, of course, we have the usual allowance of tales and adventures. The terrible frontispiece to "The Pampas"³⁵ will alone cause all boys to long to read the story. Besides "The Pampas" we have "Legends of Gascony,"³⁶

³⁰ "Letters and Social Aims." By Ralph Waldo Emerson. London: Chatto & Windus. 1876.

³¹ "Chaucer for Children: A Golden Key." By Mrs. H. R. Haweis. Illustrated with Eight Coloured Pictures and Numerous Woodcuts by the Author. London: Chatto & Windus. 1877.

³² "The Pearl Fountain, and Other Fairy Tales." By Bridget and Julia Kavanagh. With Thirty Illustrations by J. Mohr Smith. London: Chatto & Windus. 1876.

³³ "The Rose and the Lily; How they Became the Emblems of England and France: A Fairy Tale." By Mrs. Octavian Blewit. London: Chatto & Windus. 1876.

³⁴ "The Prince of Argolis: A Story of the Old Greek Fairy Time." Illustrated by J. Mohr Smith. London: Chatto & Windus. 1877.

³⁵ "The Pampas: A Story of Adventure in the Argentine Republic." By A. R. Hope. Illustrated by "Phiz," Junior. London: William P. Nimmo. 1876.

³⁶ "Tales and Legends of Gascony and Lusatia." By W. Westall. With Illustrations by H. W. Petherick. London: Griffith & Farran. 1877.

profusely illustrated, and a brilliantly-bound edition of the "Arabian Nights,"³⁷ full of Dalziel's woodcuts, and lastly, a book the animals of which neither Darwin nor Hækel could possibly classify, but which is a mass of illustration from beginning to end.³⁸

MISCELLANEA.

THE articles by the late Mr. Lancaster which are here collected from the "Edinburgh" and "North British Reviews"¹ are well worth reprinting. They are specimens of real criticism—a thing which in these days is exceedingly rare. They are thorough and thoughtful, careful and discriminating, each of them evidently the work of a man who wrote only when he had something to say, and not because he had to spin out so many pages of "copy." Mr. Jowett has written a few very touching pages on his "deceased friend and former pupil." They serve to call up to the memories of the Oxford men of five-and-twenty years ago a man who was a remarkable figure in the undergraduate life of his day—one, as Mr. Jowett says, "not easy to manage, though generally industrious and always energetic"—one who had the faculty of drawing others around him by his vivacity and the geniality of his temperament. Those who knew Mr. Lancaster in those days will recognise in these essays many of the qualities of their friend, and will regret anew that a life of so large promise and considerable performance came to so early an end.

Mr. Dutton Cook has produced a work² which has in it many good things, and is often extremely amusing; yet we hesitate to call it a good book, since it might have been so very much better. It is in great measure the reminiscence of a state of things which has wholly passed away from us, and has chiefly an antiquarian interest. The past would have a new life if brought into more living connection with the present. If, in fact, each section of Mr. Cook's volumes were treated historically, and brought down to our own day, there would have been no need to criticise the merits and demerits of modern actors in dealing with their theatrical surroundings, though we do not see why one in Mr. Cook's position should shrink from what is done every day in un-

³⁷ "The Arabian Nights' Entertainments." With One Hundred and Fifty Illustrations, Drawn by Thomas R. Dalziel. London: George Routledge & Sons. 1877.

³⁸ "Public and Private Life of Animals." Adapted from the French of Balzac, Droz, Jules Janin, E. Lamoine, A. De Musset, Georges Sand. By J. Thompson. With Illustrations. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

¹ "Essays and Reviews." By the late Henry H. Lancaster, with a Prefatory Notice by the Rev. B. Jowett. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas. 1876.

² "A Book of the Play." By Dutton Cook. Two Vols. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

signed articles which are not really anonymous. The book reads, too, like a collection of magazine articles; there is not enough continuity and coherence about them. But after allowance is made for all drawbacks, the book is well worth turning over.

As against the examinership and licensing of plays, Mr. Cook's arguments appear conclusive. Whatever may be said in favour of the Lord Chamberlain's authority in this matter may be said also for a censorship of the press, and once for all Milton disposed of that in his "Areopagitica." That the two questions were really the same was urged by Lord Lytton (then Mr. Bulwer) in 1832, when addressing the House of Commons on the laws affecting dramatic literature:—"I am at a loss," he said, "to know what advantages we have gained by the grant of this almost unconstitutional power. Certainly with regard to a censor, a censor upon plays seems to me as idle and unnecessary as a censor upon books."

No doubt those who uphold the authority of the Chamberlain or his deputy will remind Mr. Cook that by it was stopped the spectacle of the counterfeits of three eminent statesmen dancing an absurd jig upon the stage; but there is no essential difference between this dance and the caricatures of "Punch," which no one thinks of licensing. And how little a political allusion can be suppressed, if the public choose to find it or create it, was seen last year, when, in the height of the discussion about the Queen's title in India, Mr Tennyson's line in Queen Mary—

"I am English Queen, not Roman Emperor,"

fairly brought down the house.

The chapter on licensing is almost the only portion of the book open to discussion, and we have no space to quote any of the pleasant gossip in which the book abounds.

Sir Edmund Beckett has written a most useful and amusing book³—very self-confident, not to say conceited. But the defect enhances our entertainment, while it is so apparent, that due allowance is made at once by the reader, and it scarce detracts from its utility. Whoever builds, restores, hires or furnishes a house, will do well to get this excellent manual. He will find not only all he wants to put him on his guard against the various persons with whom he has to deal, but a quantity of incidental information by the way. It is quite refreshing to find a man who makes a sturdy protest against the enforcement of the fashion of the day, whatever it may be. A few years ago, whoever would build a house or rent a villa was all but dragged by a squadron of architects into what they were pleased to term Gothic houses, wherein every room seemed to consist of nothing but corners, and a broad wall space was as impossible as in a lighthouse tower. Now, again, we are told that nothing will do but to return to the Queen

³ "A Book on Building." By Sir Edmund Beckett, Bart., LL.D., Q.C., F.R.A.S. London: Crosby, Lockwood, & Co. 1876.

Anne style; and though this is most useful as a reaction against the Pugins and the Streets, there is reason to fear that a Queen Anne tyranny is setting in, all the harder to bear because it shelters itself under the name of that good-humoured and easy-going lady.

Sir Edmund Beckett says, "In ordinary building, I can only say that people must gratify their own taste, and use whatever style they may prefer, doing the best they can to get the work done really in that style." It is true that he admits that the most comfortable and substantial-looking houses are generally more in the Dutch or Queen Anne style than any other, or somewhat later, but he is careful to say that he does not mean that modern version of the style which is just now in fashion with some architects. His vigorous protests against Mr. Ruskin's whims, and against the "plaster-skinning iniquity" of the inferior extreme Gothicists, against "churches scarified under the name of restoration," are highly satisfactory, and his strong common sense makes short work of a great deal of other people's nonsense. All that he writes on the situation and aspect of houses and rooms is simply admirable, though we confess that when he comes to reduce his theories to practice, the plans of the ground and bedroom floors of the house he would build are not such as commend themselves to us. We take it, however, that every sensible man gives an architect his own views of what it should be, and the architect must then bring the idea into possibility.

Furniture, of course, comes only incidentally into this book, but the few words on it are invaluable. The final chapters are concerned with certain curious notes on the size of domes, chapter-houses, and the great Pyramid, wherein the theories of the Astronomer-Royal for Scotland, Mr. Piazzi Smyth, are dealt with but roughly. Sir Edmund is no Ritualist. He describes the dress not unfrequently to be seen in our churches nowadays as "that modern copy of Mrs. Squeers's jacket in an inferior half-cotton fabric, over a long dark petticoat, with a row of close rivets up the front like a boiler, which the Ritualists have adopted with equal regard for antiquity and beauty."

But here come in Mr. Loftie and the Misses Garrett,^{4 5} with the severest views on Queen Anne architecture, with furniture of the most rigid patterns, with panelled drawing-rooms and brackets for china, with old oak chests cut up to make sideboards. Their books are the first two volumes of the "Art in the House Series." With much of what they say we are in cordial agreement, but the protest against Brussels carpets, and staring flower patterns, against shaded chintzes, and wall-papers of watered white and gold, is not for the first time made by them, and we think it would be disastrous to true art that these little books, which have their merits, should be taken as the modern art gospel on the subject of house furniture. It may be supposed that these authors

⁴ "A Plea for Art in the House." By W. J. Loftie. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

⁵ "Suggestions for House Decoration." By Rhoda and Agnes Garrett. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

differ pretty frequently with Sir Edmund Beckett. He says, "Mind that you have a central table in your drawing-room," while Mr. Loftie regards a central table as a deadly sin in the art of decoration. "Polish your woodwork with wax," says Miss Garrett; "Don't polish it at all in any way," says Sir Edmund Beckett.

Of the two manuals of "Art in the House," the Misses Garrett's is by far the best written and the most useful. Mr. Loftie tells a number of anecdotes which are not particularly relevant, and on bidding us remember the "blacks" in London, makes a feeble joke about the slave trade. In the short space of one hundred pages he tells the same story of Mr. Gillott of Birmingham twice (pp. 14 and 44). We should have thought that so practised a writer would have avoided the slip-slop style of "he commenced to buy." "A Book on Building" is worth tons of such manuals as "Art in the House."

A biographical dictionary⁶ is always useful, and "A Brief History of Painters" a fair book of reference. Judged by any higher standard it is a poor production. It is a mere hotch-potch of all sorts of books and authors, criticisms good, bad, and indifferent huddled together, united by some one who writes a peculiarly bad style, and illustrated by engravings from worn-out *clichés*. As an art book it is contemptible.

Professor Baur's introduction⁷ is suited to senior classes at our public schools, and to students at the Universities. It contains in small space the pith of what is to be found in larger works on philology, and is an excellent introduction to these. The translators have broken up the somewhat involved and cumbrous sentences of the original, but in all other respects it is a faithful rendering of the German edition. It is likely to be very useful.

We had occasion to praise Mr. Sidgwick's excellent introduction to Greek prose a few months since, and here again from Rugby comes a valuable addition to our school-books. The stories⁸ are for the most part adapted from a Latin translation of Herodotus, which is a guarantee for their interest. Their Latinity is rendered unexceptionable; the notes are terse yet sufficient. It is a first-rate little book.

Mr. Hart, in editing a selection of Goethe's prose⁹ for American students, notices the great want of such reading books, and the error that is made in giving the young learner dramatic poetry almost exclusively. The selection is made from certain autobiographical passages and letters of Goethe, and two extracts from "Werther" and "Wilhelm Meister." These are rather difficult, and are certainly not adapted to the young beginner, while the notes do not often explain difficult constructions or

⁶ "A Brief History of the Painters of all Schools." By Louis Viardot and other Writers. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

⁷ "A Philological Introduction to Greek and Latin." By Frederick Baur, Professor in Maulbronn. Translated by C. Kegan Paul, M.A., and E. D. Stone, M.A. London: Henry S. King & Co.

⁸ "Easy Latin Stories for Beginners." By George L. Bennett, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1876.

⁹ "Goethe: Ausgewählte Prosa." Edited, with Notes, by James Morgan Hart. New York: G. Putnam's Sons. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

difficult words. But to a student in the upper classes of a school the book may prove much more interesting than the ordinary bits of Schiller's "Thirty Years' War" on which he is usually pastured. The notes "relate almost exclusively to matters of history, biography, geography, or to foreign customs and manners with which the American reader cannot be familiar." These are not quite accurate or adequate; for instance, "*Saale*, a river near Halle." This is true, but it is also the river on which Jena stands, and in Jena Goethe lived when he wrote his "*Farbenlehre*;" so that Jena, far rather than Halle, should be named in connection with the Saale and Goethe. Where a translation is given, it is often not one to be followed. Slang is always a mistake where it can be avoided; and it is in this light a mistake to translate "einen verteufelten Spuk" by "a terrible rumpus," and to talk of "square" and "round" dances. And it is absurd to translate "*Grosse Welt*" by "aristocratic circles," when "the great world" has precisely the same shade of meaning.

Mr. Sweet "provides the student with a series of texts in the classical West-Saxon¹⁰ dialect of Old English, with such help in the way of grammar, glossary, and notes as shall enable him to acquire a sound elementary knowledge of the language, without at the same time neglecting the literature." This large promise is excellently performed. Incidentally it is most valuable as a help to the understanding our modern English, which can only be truly studied with reference to its earlier forms. The book leaves nothing to be desired.

The fifth volume of the "*Encyclopædia Britannica*"¹¹ does not fall short of the general excellence of this new edition. It is full of articles of very high merit. The first in the book is also one of the most important, that on the "*Canon of Scripture*" by Dr. Samuel Davidson. It is, we see, already advertised for separate publication, which it well deserves. Mr. Minto's "*Chaucer*" is only less important than the "*Byron*" by the same writer, because much must rest on speculation rather than on exact knowledge, and the subject is one of antiquarian and literary rather than direct human interest.

Among other biographies which call for notice is that of "*Chatham*" by Mr. W. Browning Smith, which is very well done. It is curious, however, that the admirable "*Life of Chatham*" by William Godwin, author of "*Political Justice*," seems to have escaped his notice. The work was published anonymously, but there is no doubt about the authorship. Professor Robertson Smith contributes valuable articles on "*Canticles*" and "*Chronicles*," distinguished at once by learning and by a courageous freedom of treatment. Mr. Mark Pattison condenses his valuable "*Life of Casaubon*." Mr. Reeve is solid and sensible, if, as is his wont, he is dull, in writing on Clarendon. Dean Merivale's contributions on Cicero and Cato are among the best in

¹⁰ "*An Anglo-Saxon Reader, in Prose and Verse.*" By Henry Sweet, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1876.

¹¹ "*The Encyclopædia Britannica.*" Ninth Edition. Vol. V. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1876.

the volume. Mr. H. E. Watts, so well known as a Spanish scholar, has written a full and excellent account of Cervantes, which we trust is, like Dr. Davidson's contribution, the germ of a larger work.

But Messrs. Black are so careful to find the best writer on each subject, to get Dr. Carpenter to write on the Caspian Sea, Mr. Pollen on "Carving," Major Russell on "Cavalry," Mr. T. A. Trollope on Italian matters, that to name a signed article is generally to speak of what is the best that can be done in that line. The weakness of the book is its sub-editing. Some more competent person ought to be responsible for the selection of subjects. Why should "Clapham" be left out, while "Chelsea" finds a place? Why should we have no word on "Chestnut," surely important among trees? And some literary person should pass the style of every article under revision. Even a good and careful writer should not be allowed to say that a search in the public records "resulted in several important finds;" nor should we be told in a minor article on Chastelard that he was a "*sworder* and *amorist*." But these defects and omissions are trifling. The work as a whole is so far most successful.

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
I. <i>Popular Fallacies Concerning the Functions of Government</i>	305
II. <i>Courtship and Marriage in France</i>	337
III. <i>Charles Kingsley.</i> Charles Kingsley : His Letters and Memoirs of his Life. Edited by his WIFE. London: Henry S. King & Co. Fourth Edition. 1877	382
IV. <i>Slavery in Africa.</i> 1. Last Journals of David Livingstone in Central Africa. By HORACE WALLER, F.R.G.S. 1874. 2. Across Africa. By VERNER LOVETT CAMERON, C.B., D.C.L., R.N. 1877. 3. The Lost Continent; or, Slavery and the Slave Trade in Africa. By JOSEPH COOPER. 1875. 4. Central Africa : Naked Truths of Naked People. By Colonel C. CHAILLE LONG, of the Egyptian Staff. 1876	394
V. <i>Lord Macaulay as an Historian.</i> Selections from the Writings of Lord Macaulay. Edited, with Occasional Notes, by GEORGE OTTO TREVELYAN, M.P. London : Longmans, Green, & Co. 1876	424
VI. <i>The Factory and Workshop Acts.</i> 1. Report of the Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Working of the "Factory and Workshop Acts," with a view to their Consolidation and Amendment, together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index. Vols. I. and II. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1876. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 2. Progress of the Working Class, 1832-1867. By J. M. LUDLOW and LLOYD JONES. 1867. Alexander Strahan	462

ART.	PAGE
VII. <i>Russia.</i>	
1. <i>Russia.</i> By D. MACKENZIE WALLACE, M A, Member of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society. London Cassels, Petter, & Galpin. 1877.	
2. <i>Savage and Civilised Russia.</i> By W. R. London Longmans, Green, & Co. 1877.	
3. <i>Russian Wars with Turkey.</i> By Major Frank S. Russell, 14th Hussars. London Henry S King & Co 1877	492
 <i>Contemporary Literature.</i>	
Theology	519
Philosophy .	528
Politics, Sociology, Voyages, and Travels	536
Science . . .	553
History and Biography	567
Belles Lettres	585
Miscellanea	600

THE
WESTMINSTER
AND
FOREIGN QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

APRIL 2, 1877.

ART. I.—POPULAR FALLACIES CONCERNING THE
FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT.

IF there be at present any lack of clear and diffused thought respecting the political future of the working classes, and of the country at large, should the power of those classes be augmented, it is assuredly not because the subject has been neglected, or has been studied only by a small section of the public. From the beginning of the present century, and especially from the commencement of the agitation which resulted in the great Reform Bill, it has been a foremost topic of national interest; and, ever since the necessity for the Reform Bill of 1868 came to be generally recognised, it has probably inspired a greater amount of interest than any other social or political problem. Nor has this interest been either excessive or unnatural, since it is evident that even the most momentous of the measures, which every session occupy the attention of the Legislature, become insignificant when compared with the widely inclusive questions, whether, and to what extent, the legislative power itself is to pass, into the hands of a different class,—a class which possibly may develop great capacity for its wise and just exercise, but which, admittedly, neither knows nor is anxious to learn the political and diplomatic methods of the past; which has few political traditions, and those mainly of a subversive character; which is accustomed to imagine its interests to be directly opposed to those of the classes at present enjoying something like a monopoly of power; and which, therefore, if absolutely supreme, would act with

[Vol. CVII. No. CXXII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LI. No. II. v

fundamentally different objects, and by entirely dissimilar means, from those hither pursued by the governing body.

Although nearly ten years have passed since we gave to proletarian voters the majority in borough elections, the excitement aroused by the measure has not even yet passed away. It is true that some writers and debaters, whose interest in a political matter requires the stimulus of crisis or panic, and who were thrown into wild alarm by the Paris Commune and the subsequent declarations of the International League, have ceased to regard working-class questions as urgent ever since their worst fears were allayed by the result of the last general election, and have relapsed into a self-gratulatory quiescence, which is now and then just a little disturbed by news of demonstrations and strikes, Stoke-upon-Trent elections, Fenian constituencies, Tichborne riots, and the like, but which otherwise endures contentedly enough. More far-seeing politicians, however, have perceived that the small use which the Proletariat then made of its newly-acquired power to outvote its social superiors was owing, more to its lack of organisation and of able leadership than to any diminution in its thirst for power, or to any affectionate subservience to the classes from which it selected representatives. Therefore, the majority of politicians still regard the attitude and prospects of the working classes as perhaps the most important factor in their calculations respecting the political future, and the flood of literature and discussion which followed upon the Reform agitation, though it has certainly abated of late years, has by no means completely subsided.

Whether the concession of 1868 was justifiable, and whether it was inevitable; whether it was premature or tardy, adequate, inadequate, or excessive; how much power it conferred, both theoretically and practically, and to what use that power would be put; whether it would content the classes who demanded it, or whether they would require larger concessions, and, if so, to what extent and how soon;—these, and a multitude of similar questions, have, during nearly a decade, been incessantly put and answered, from almost every possible point of view, with every imaginable bias, and with the usual varied degrees of ability and futility, of impartiality and prejudice.

This being so, it may appear that further writing on the subject is superfluous; and, in truth, an author should be largely endowed either with genius and originality, or with very ignorant presumption, if he aspires to put forward a theory at once new and true respecting a matter which has been so thoroughly, and often so ably, discussed. There is, however, one aspect of this particular question which, although *not* new, is, in our opinion, at once *so* true, *so* vitally important, and *so* very inadequately recognised,

that good work may be done by any who will urge it home to the public mind with all emphasis of iteration and insistence. It has been magnificently argued out by some of the greatest writers of the present century; and, therefore, in presenting a few of its principal points for consideration, there can be very little attempt at originality in the perception of truths, or even at novelty in their combination. It is hoped merely that, by the help of a few great principles, which sociologists have repeatedly elaborated, and which the public have too generally neglected, some light may be thrown on the true solution of two great questions:—1. Why would democracy at present be dangerous? 2. What is required to make it safe? What, in fact, is the precise nature of that unfitness for rule which is complained of in the labouring classes? and in what precisely does the education and development consist which would fit them for equality or supremacy?

It will be evident, from the questions which we have chosen for consideration, that there are some classes of politicians whose premises would differ so widely from our own that it would scarcely be useful to address them in the present paper. Firstly, for instance, there are those who, from the extreme of class-selfishness or conservative and sectarian prejudice, regard democracy, at any stage of society, as an essentially immoral and anarchic form of rule, which, if ever it does become established in this country, will reduce its civilisation to chaos, and consummate its ruin, social, political, and industrial. Secondly, there are those who, professing much the same creed with regard to democracy, are believers also in coercion and repression as agencies for staving it off. They think that democratic tendencies can be checked by diplomatic manoeuvring, by legislative enactments, by restrictions on popular expression, and, in the last resort, by military force; and they choose to resist them by such means, rather than to prepare for them, to elevate them, or to direct them. Thirdly, there is a growing party of ardent Radicals, chiefly responsible for the threadbare condition of the much-misapplied maxim *Vox populi vox Dei*, who have been driven, by the reaction which the previously-mentioned schools have created, into a fanaticism of devotion to the populace; who believe that democracy could not possibly get itself established too completely or too soon, and who have unbounded faith in the capacity of the masses for all conceivable duties and contingencies.

To these, and to cognate schools of political thinkers or talkers, it is impossible that the thoughts contained in the following pages should commend themselves in any degree. They are addressed, therefore, by preference to those whom we conceive to form a majority among intelligent and instructed Englishmen, and who, if we speak only of the broad principles which they profess in

common, and ignore for the moment their many and important points of divergence, may be described approximately in these terms:—They are men who have sufficient generosity and culture to look above and beyond the interests of their class or party, or at least to make an honest endeavour to do so. They are aware that coercion and repression are not merely futile, but suicidal, when directed against any general popular tendency which is the spontaneous product of social evolution; and they can sufficiently discern the signs of the times to recognise a tendency of this resistless kind in the gradual approximation of civilised nations towards republican and democratic institutions. Whether or not they regard democracy as “the ultimate form of political development,” they desire to weigh its problems impartially, and to make the best of it if it be inevitable; and, if they are anxious that its advent should be postponed, or at least that it should not be precipitated, they are so, not from selfishness or narrowness, but because they discern, in the average individual of the working class, a twofold unfitness for rule. They perceive that he is ignorant of truths which it is most important for a ruler to know, and they perceive that he cherishes positive misbeliefs which, in a ruler, would be in the highest degree dangerous.

This perception, and consequent apprehension, must by no means be confounded with the timid conservatism which looks, in each successive age, with vague fear, and with something of holy horror, on the most splendid forms of advance, and on the speculations of the most grandly-gifted minds. The class of politicians we have been describing may, and practically does, include some of the most daring and enlightened thinkers of this, or of any, age. The experienced social philosopher cannot, it is true, anticipate any permanent evil from a change, or regard it as premature and mistaken, if he can see that the feeling in which it originates is deeply implanted in the nature and consciousness of the people; that it has grown gradually, and under natural conditions, till it has become strong and widely diffused; and that the same causes which have created and strengthened it have been silently preparing men's natures for the actual duties and emergencies to which it must eventually give rise. But no one knows better than the philosophical sociologist that tumultuous impulses of popular desire may easily be set in motion by external causes, when they have no source in any permanent and wisely-realised need, or in any disciplined preparedness for the results which they will of necessity create. In the French Revolution we have the completest and most appalling instance of this. The people rose frantically in the name of liberty, but they were urged in reality by horrible anger and hunger, and by wretchedness untellable and intolerable. They were of all great European nations the most

educated into dependence on their Government, the most emasculated by supervision and protection, and, consequently, the least disciplined in any vigour of self-reliance and individualism. They neither understood what liberty was, nor, if they had been well fed and well governed, would ever have imagined or desired it. Consequently the freedom they obtained was not the basis of an ennobled and progressive political life, but only a brief and tragic anarchy, subsiding inevitably into despotism.

Doubtless in England the conditions are extremely, and very happily, different. Our whole institutions and history have been a long education in the love and comprehension of liberty, and in gradual fitness for its fuller and fuller possession; and we suffer under nothing that in any degree parallels the horrible condition of oppression and distress which preceded the era of the "Encyclopædists." Nevertheless, thoughtful politicians can perceive, first, that the education of the English populace towards fitness for complete and equal liberty, though hopefully and healthfully progressing, is still very far from complete; and, secondly, that causes are in operation which may easily intensify, and, as it were, exasperate the popular longing for greater freedom, and may spur it on to creating, or at least to striving after, institutions for which public feeling, in its normal and natural state, is not ripe. Liberty, or a phantom of liberty, may, as we have said, be hotly pursued for other reasons than those which render the pursuit rational or its result beneficent: rights, too, may come to be recognised before their correlative duties can be fulfilled. And indications are not wanting that this mischievous antedating of natural development may be, for ourselves, a near possibility of danger.

The external causes which appear calculated to over-stimulate our democratic tendencies consist, to some extent, of *real grievances*, possessed and felt by the people—that is to say, of sufferings and hardships which really result from the government of a large proletarian class by a smaller titled or moneyed class, and which might, *cæteris paribus*, be remedied by a more completely popular form of government. But they consist, also, to a far greater extent, as it will be the business of this paper to show, of what may be called *false grievances*—that is to say, of grievances which are merely sufferings looked at ignorantly and in the wrong way—hardships and distressing conditions, which are transmuted into grievances by certain quite erroneous views as to their real causes and remedies. It may be true that, as long as human nature remains selfish, the classes which have the greatest amount of power will be the classes whose interests are best cared for, and that the upper ranks of society do not legislate with entire fairness for those whose political authority is less direct and exten-

sive. It may be equally true that, until they began to protect themselves by combination, working men were hardly dealt by in the competition between capital and labour, and that, even now, the class interests of capitalists are more consulted in trade negotiations than the interests of mechanics and labourers. But these causes of disaffection are small compared to the vast grievance which is erected when once the general unprosperity of the working classes, their poverty, the lowness of their wages, the scarcity of work, and the alternation of flush and slack times in industry, are traced to direct and conscious selfishness in the higher classes, and primarily in the Government itself—when once it is assumed that patrician cupidity, cruelty, and indifference are the reasons for plebeian privations (whereas, in reality, those privations proceed from over-population, congestion of labour, personal improvidence, and a variety of disturbed economic and social conditions)—when once, in brief, the idea gains ground that Government could make happiness if it chose, and that, from selfish interests, it does not choose, and never will choose, until it is transferred to men who, in legislating for the poor, will be legislating for themselves.

It is a curious fact that so few political writers have hitherto fathomed this underlying cause of the disaffection of the masses and their thirst for political power. Hardly any have perceived that working men distrust and dislike their superiors because, rightly or wrongly, they believe that those superiors, having power to give them prosperity, prefer to keep them in adversity. Hardly any have perceived that they long for power because, rightly or wrongly, they believe that, having it, they could give *themselves* prosperity, and defeat the schemes of a selfish and unscrupulous caste.

Those who hazard speculations concerning the "political rock ahead" of democracy are, as we have said, numerous, and form singularly varied anticipations. We have politicians who talk of large and powerful minorities of "Conservative working men," who congratulate the masses on their prosperity, and reproach them with ingratitude for being discontented; or who believe that there resides, in the upper and middle classes, a reserve of resistless power which they have hitherto refrained from displaying, after the manner of slumbering lions, conscious of their majestic strength, and not arousing themselves to exert it for the annihilation of quite insignificant assailants.

We have other political writers who tell us that we have "a social volcano seething in our midst"—"a volcano of which French Communism, English working-class Republicanism, and the Workmen's International Association are open craters; . . . that the condition of the masses is becoming unbearable, both in itself and by contrast with that of the rich; and that it is making men

desperate and devilish." A great practical politician has recently spoken of "the force of democracy, which cannot be resisted, but which may be regulated," and has told us that "there is no use mincing the matter. Unless the world goes back democracy must go forward. The will of the people must more and more prevail. We cannot prevent numbers ruling; we can only hope to persuade them to rule well." And then, in words well adapted to heighten the dramatic picturesqueness of terrific prophecy, Mr. Carlyle tells us to "wait a little till the entire nation is in an electric state; till your whole vital Electricity, no longer healthfully Neutral, is cut into two isolated portions of Positive and Negative (of Money and of Hunger), and stands there bottled up in two World-Batteries. The stirring of a child's finger brings the two together, and then—What then?" We have pessimist politicians like Mr. Greg, who tremble for delicate questions of policy, such as the management of our Indian Empire, if men uneducated in the science of government are to be thrust into positions of responsibility. We have economists who dread that the commercial supremacy of the country, and even its commercial prosperity, may depart beyond recall during the interval in which popular leaders are making fruitless experiments in the way of *ateliers nationaux*, the recognition of the *droit au travail*, industrial protectionism under new forms, and similar socialistic fallacies. And we have a vast number of not very audacious thinkers, whose minds have little affinity for abstract theories, but who have a deference for castes and churches, and a general respect for the established; and who feel that they have everything to dread from the irruption into high places of men whose chief animosity is directed against those very things which they themselves suppose to be eternally essential to order and propriety.

All, however, seem fairly united in the idea that, if the industrial classes are dangerous, it is because of their fanaticism for liberty and their fierce distrust of governments; and few see that they are dangerous because they have, as yet, scarcely any idea of true and equal liberty, and because (like too many of their superiors, and to a still greater extent than those superiors) they place in the omnipotence of governments an extravagant and most unfortunate faith. Whether we peruse the publications of the International League or listen to the orations of "leaders," whether we watch the columns of working-class organs or examine the programmes put forth at political meetings and conferences, everywhere we find more or less evidence of the common and fundamental idea that omnipotence belongs to rulers, and will belong to working men if they can become rulers. And their suspicions dislike to the existing government is a result, not a disproof, of this conviction.

The Nepaul king who cannonaded his national gods because, in spite of his sacrifices and prayers, they had allowed his beautiful queen to have small-pox; the priests of Baal, when they made the decision, "The god that answereth by fire, let him be god,"—did not thereby show any want of trust in the power of divinities to work miracles and suspend natural laws. Had they not possessed such a trust they would have resorted neither to petition nor desertion, any more than the intelligent Theist of modern times, who, neither expecting nor requesting any interposition between physical cause and effect, neither prays that a thunder-storm may be averted nor reproaches and abandons his God on account of the mischief it has caused. The Nepaul king and the priests of Baal rose in indignation against their gods because they started with the unshaken conviction that their gods had power to help them, and therefore concluded that their continued inaction must result from malignity or indifference.

The parallel which is presented by the modern consciousness of the working classes is thus strikingly summed up by Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his comment on the words of a great French historian, whose own distrust in governments seems, by the way, to have found verbal rather than practical expression:—"It is a gross delusion to believe in the sovereign power of political machinery," says M. Guizot. True; and it is not only a gross delusion, but a very dangerous one. Give a child exaggerated notions of its parents' power, and it will by and bye cry for the moon. Let a people believe in government omnipotence, and they will be pretty certain to get up revolutions to achieve impossibilities."* So true is this, that we are almost driven to wonder how it is that faith in governmental omnipotence has not created deadlier class hatred and stimulated more frantic seizures of power. What would be the indignant resentment of a child who underwent the ordinary experiences and vicissitudes of life in the full belief that the parent could save it from every pain and avert from it every sickness, could give it knowledge without the trouble of study, and perfection without the discipline of effort? What would be the feelings of the tortured victim of an operation if he believed that the physician was wilfully and causelessly withholding the anæsthetic, or could otherwise have achieved the result without any penalty of pain? What will be the state of mind natural in a struggling, unskilled labourer, whose family are barely supported by his earnings even in the best of times and by dint of the utmost care and self-denial—whom any one of a variety of probable emergencies reduces to a condition of abject

* *Social Statics*, pp. 318, 319.

pauperism—who has no hope of providing for his old age or of raising himself or his children out of a condition of ceaseless and squalid toil, and who firmly believes that the nobles who roll in gorgeous carriages through miles of park and pleasure-ground, and the prosperous gentlemen who flatter him for his vote on pretence of representing his interest, have only to emerge for a moment from the isolation of their cruelty and greediness, have only to lift up their voice in the great assembly of the nation, and there would go forth irresistibly the fiat—“Let there be competency in the homes of the poor!” “Let there be work for all who will do it!” “Let there be a due measure and possibility of happiness, throughout the length and breadth of the land, for every hungry sufferer and every toiling worker, as well as for those who have wealth to buy it, and power to seize it, and strength to keep it to themselves!”

For this is scarcely an exaggeration of the theory which, in a latent, “semi-articulate” form, underlies the political grievances and the political hopes of an immense section of workmen. Truly the wonder is that the International League has been estimated at *only* 17,000,000. The wonder is that the “drudgical sect” have shown such patience in waiting and hoping. The wonder is that “the stately homes of England” stand undisturbed by fire and pillage while “the cottage-homes of England” shelter a dozen human beings in a room, and are spoken of as “a disgrace to our civilisation,” and a “horrible sarcasm on our Christianity.”

Most happily, men seldom carry theoretical convictions to their logical issues, or act on them with consistent thoroughness; and the uneducated especially can hold absolutely conflicting doctrines, allowing them mutually to neutralise one another, and remaining quite unconscious of their irreconcilability. Moreover, a number of influences act upon the working man, and counteract the effect upon his mind and life which would naturally result from his political creed or tone of thought. There are not many working men who are entirely free from excessive faith in governments, but there are many who are too spiritless, too absorbed in toil, or too engrossed with other matters, to take much interest in politics; and there are others who have become indifferent to legislative proceedings, since so many measures from which they were led to expect brilliant results have left their condition scarcely altered. There are a few so cultured as to perceive that the popular class-opinions are fallacious. There are some of the most powerful and energetic who have come to possess property themselves, and are beginning to look upon these questions with the bias that property gives. Not a few, perhaps, have a vague

misgiving that there is more in such problems than they can see and grasp. A considerable number place a good deal of confidence in individual politicians of liberal views, and of a higher class than mere agitators and demagogues. And, lastly, a very large section, while they fully believe that nothing satisfactory will ever be done for the working man as long as the powers that be remain in the ascendant, are prone to a gloomy conviction that those powers are, for the present, practically unassailable, and that resistance of them would be resistance of the inevitable. Moreover, they are soothed by the possession of a political power greater than that of their ancestors, and by actual and prospective additions to it; and, like other classes, they are not exempt from the influences of habit, early teaching, and association, of kindnesses sometimes interchanged between class and class, of the impressiveness of splendour and "decorative inutilities," and of actual hardworking and blameless lives not infrequently led in their midst by individuals of the higher ranks.

For these, and for many similar reasons, tranquillity exists and continues, but the prevalence of the beliefs we have described, or at least of ideas which approximate to them, is nevertheless an undoubted fact. There is, of course, an infinite ignorance displayed by any speech-making or theorising which treats of the working class as one homogeneous entity, of which, taken as a whole, facts and characteristics may be predicated with the utmost detail and accuracy. The working class is divided into sections, differing almost as completely in opinions and way of life as the subdivisions of the upper and middle classes. No one explains this more clearly, or deprecates more strongly the unintelligent confusion and massing together of widely-separated social groups, than the working-class politician Mr. Thomas Wright, yet he speaks with sorrowful emphasis of the wide diffusion of the particular fallacy we have alluded to, throughout nearly all those sections of proletarians who concern themselves about politics at all. His words have covered the subject so completely as perhaps to justify a quotation of somewhat inordinate length:—

"It is, in no spirit of unkindness, but merely with a view to candour, that we say that the chief obstacle to the improvement of the condition of the working classes is—the working classes. . . . They fail to see that, as regards them, a very large proportion of the needed reform must be self-reform,—self-wrought, and involving self-sacrifice. They have a perniciously misleading notion of the limits—or rather of the limitlessness—of the functions and capacities of governments, which causes them to overlook or neglect substantial and obtainable things, while wasting their energies, embittering their spirits, and weakening their position, in pursuit of political will-o'-the-wisps."

Speaking of the "Programme of Eight Points" * put forth by the Association of London Republicans, he goes on to say:—

"Its manifesto embodied ideas which are largely prevalent among those of the working classes who take any active interest in politics, and will serve as an illustration of the visionary—and, as visionary, injurious, and progress-delaying—views with regard to the functions of governments, and the possibilities of governmental power of which we speak. . . . The least that can be said of those who put forward such things as a 'Republican Areopagus,' as part of a present-day political programme—and it is only in degree of foolishness that it differs from many of the ideas put forward in programmes issued in the name of the working classes—the least that can be said of such men, and of those who put faith in them as guides, is that they show themselves to be lacking in common sense, utterly incapable of dealing with the great social and political questions which involve the problem of the improvement of the condition of the working classes, ignorant of what constitutes the essence of those questions, of what are or are not practical politics, and what does or does not come within their domain. . . . Those entertaining the belief would put governments in the place of, or rather above, 'natural laws.' They have a vague general notion that but for the selfishness of statesmen, aristocrats, and capitalists, any government in the present day could practically realise the bombastic promises which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of his Jack Cade when he tells his followers that 'There shall be in England seven halfpenny loaves sold for a penny, . . . and the realm shall be in common.' They are persuaded that men could be made happy by Act of Parliament; that government could create a state of things in which the working classes need take no heed for the morrow, or of anything but to eat, drink, and be merry; increase and multiply. That such notions are largely held among the working classes, no *cardul* observer inside those classes will deny, no *careful* observer outside them but will know. How much they stand in the way of the social and political advancement of the working classes, how they embarrass statesmen who are willing to work for that advancement, and what a handle

* The programme, quoted *in extenso*, is as follows:—"1. Application of the federation principle to all republican states; 2. Abolition of aristocratic titles and privileges; 3. Suppression of all monopolies; 4. Abolition of standing armies; 5. Compulsory gratuitous secular and industrial education; 6. Obligation of the state to provide suitable employment for all citizens, and sustenance for the incapacitated—none to live upon the labour of others; 7. Nationalisation of land; 8. Direct legislation by the people." Among the means of gaining these points was "the establishment of a high court of republican equity, under the name of the 'Republican Areopagus, which shall judge all violations of the laws of humanity and the rights of man committed by crowned heads, statesmen, parliaments, law-courts, &c.'"—"The Social Improvement Question," *Our New Masters*, p. 218, *et seq.*

for scoff and scorn, and excuse for obstructiveness, they afford to any who are really opposed to working-class interests. To what an extent they draw upon the working classes the machinations of flustering, self-seeking political adventurers, and how much it is the duty of every disinterested 'friend of the working man,' and all who would assist in the work of neutralising the antagonistic social forces, to point out, no matter at what risk of resentment from feelings of bigotry or wounded vanity, the foolish and mischievous nature of such notions—all these points are, we think, so obvious, that there is no need to occupy space in demonstrating them here."

It is perfectly true, as Mr. Wright has elsewhere said, that this notion of governmental omnipotence is, among working men, rather a tone of feeling than a positive confession of faith, and is seldom expressed with such definiteness as in the programme of eight points; but a tone of opinion may be as influential in determining the action and tendency of a party, and, if erroneous, may be fully as well worth opposition as a distinctly-mistaken creed expressed in distinct propositions, especially as, from its very indefiniteness, it is the less subject to challenge or collision, and, unlike a series of dogmatic statements or positive arguments, often produces no opposing school of thought. Although, as we have said, the doctrine that government can do all things is seldom expressly stated, it would unfortunately be easy to multiply quotations and illustrations which would show how very generally it is tacitly assumed. Traces of it, often strong and unmistakable, are to be found wherever the views of the working class find expression, and, unhappily, it is not only fostered—sometimes ignorantly and sometimes designedly—by those who follow the "trade of agitation," but it is too often indirectly encouraged, or at best very indolently let alone, by those more cultivated and philosophical politicians who take a genuine, and really intelligent interest, in working-class affairs. Even the prevailing intensity of feeling with regard to the extension of the franchise, though it is not, when considered singly, by any means an unhealthy symptom, is so far out of proportion to the interest taken by working men in important questions of politics which do not directly affect their own power, or in measures in which their welfare is regarded from a non-political standpoint, that it is in itself an unmistakable indication of their tendency to identify all their chances of bettered conditions with their chances of personal rule. Legislators, even when they are also Liberals or Radicals, are, as a class, naturally not the most prone to realise the fact that the scope and value of legislation have been overrated. Such truths are the last which their class-bias is likely to let them perceive, or which it is to their interest to urge home in addressing working-class constituencies. Yet Mr. Glad-

stone, in a celebrated speech at Greenwich, felt it needful to utter a serious warning against helpless dependence on government :—

“While,” he said, “I would impose on the Government and the Legislature every burden that they are in their own nature capable of bearing, in my mind they are not your friends, but your enemies, who teach you to look to the Legislature for the removal of the evils which afflict human life. It is the individual man, the individual conscience, and the individual character on which much of human happiness and human misery depends. The social problems that confront us are many and formidable. Let the Government labour to its utmost, let the Legislature spend days and nights in your service, but after the very most has been achieved, the question whether the English father is to be the father of a happy family and the centre of a united house is a question that must depend mainly on himself.” *

It is true that exaggerated ideas of what government *can* do, and consequent discontent at the little that it *does* do, produce in this country a very different kind of political restlessness and disaffection from that which is rife in the Belleville district of Paris, and in Continental capitals generally. It is far less intense and explosive, and, as might be expected under the most stable constitutional government in the world, far more practical, healthy, and moderate ; but the chief difference between the two is perhaps this : The Russians, Austrians, and Prussians throughout the whole of their modern history, and the French up to the time of the great Revolution and throughout the entire course of the two Napoleonic Empires, have been accustomed to governments from which no real and equal representation of working-class interests could be expected, which were formed on despotic principles, and which embodied no hope or suggestion of gradually-increased authority, and eventual equality or supremacy, on the part of the working classes. Their power could not develop itself naturally to meet an increasing demand ; government, as they knew it, made no place for them in its theory, offered them scanty opportunities for action or agitation, and seemed in no way a machinery adapted to their needs. Consequently they have had no resource but to imagine institutions of which they had acquired no experience, and the worth or worthlessness of which they can never have put to the test. Their creed is socialism ; their hope is in revolution ; their politics are almost entirely ideal and theoretical.

The English, on the contrary, enjoy considerable power under present institutions ; they obtain an addition to it from time to time, and they see their way to obtaining still larger concessions in the future. Therefore they seek to achieve the objects they

* Quoted by Mr. Thomas Wright, “Our New Masters,” p. 225.

desire, by means of existing institutions rather than by their violent subversion. They do not, as a body, believe, passionately in civil war or rebellion, and they rarely create serious riots, much less revolutions and conspiracies. The government at which they aim differs from the present, less in its external form than in the class by which it is to be administered, and in the measures it is to bring into prominence. They are interested in present facts rather than in immense future possibilities. They prefer republicanism to socialism, agitation to revolution, and the franchise or the trades-union to phalansteries and Comtist organisations. As a last significant fact, it may be noticed that the International League, which is eminently socialistic in its tone, numbered a few years since, in spite of its English origin, only about 186,000 English members out of a total which was estimated, at the same time, and by the same authority, at 17,000,000.* The foreign ruling classes have to dread the horrors of revolutions, but may perhaps, if that is a consolation, look forward not irrationally to a speedy reaction of despotism. The English Government, we fully believe, need have no more fear of a Reign of Terror than of a Massacre of St. Bartholomew; but they have to face the serious possibility that resistless popular pressure may force them to cede to the less-educated classes certain legislative functions which they are still unfitted to exercise, because they have no just conception of their limitations. And the fact that they seek political power by political means, and not by force of arms or by riot, is no proof that they would refrain from the grossest despotism of majorities, or that they would fail to use their power in the attempted control of departments of human action with which it is most mischievous for a government to meddle. It has been said that "new Democracy is but old Despotism differently spelt," and, more than that, it has become a familiar fact that democrats can contemplate schemes of coercion and of interference with the national life, far too dangerous and too wildly impossible to be attempted by individual autocrats.

"How deeply rooted," says Mr. Spencer, "is this sentiment excited in men by embodied supremacy, will be seen on noting how it sways in common all orders of politicians, from the old-world Tory to the Red Republican. Contrasted, as the extreme parties are, in the types of government they approve, and in the theories they hold respecting the source of governmental authority, they are alike in their unquestioning belief in governmental authority, and in showing almost unlimited faith in the ability of a government to achieve any desired end. . . . Whatever the governing body decides to do, can be done, is the postulate which lies hidden in the schemes of the

* See calculation by Mr. B. Cochrane, quoted by the "North American Review," in an article entitled "The International Working Men's Association: its Origin, Doctrines, and Ethics." 1872.

most revolutionary reformers. Analyse the programme of the Communists, observe what is hoped for by the adherents of the social and democratic republic, or study the ideas of legislative action which our own trades-unionists entertain, and you find the implied belief to be that a government, organised after an approved pattern, will be able to remedy all the evils complained of, and to secure each proposed benefit."

Similar expressions of opinion are numerous in the writings of modern political philosophers, but space will not permit a multiplication of quotations which might besides be rather wearisome than instructive. What has been said may suffice to suggest our solution of the first of the two problems which we have stated. To the question, Why would democracy at present be dangerous? we would answer,—*Not* precisely because the masses are uneducated, for a much higher degree of general education than any which, for generations, they are likely to receive has failed to eradicate from the minds of many in the upper classes the particular fallacy we have been deprecating. Still less because they have a fanaticism for liberty, or because they place small confidence in the reigning sovereign and her advisers; but, primarily and chiefly, because they would have no conception of the true functions, and in especial of the true limitations, of whatever government they might erect.

When, however, we pass to the consideration of the second question, What would make democracy safe? we become regretfully conscious that we shall probably be at issue with many of those who may thus far have agreed with our conclusions. It is true that the answer to the second question may seem to be, verbally at least, implied by, and included in, the answer which we have given to the first. If it be ignorance of the limited nature of the functions of government which makes democracy dangerous, it must be a better knowledge of the limitations of those functions which is required to make democracy safe. But when we attempt to fix these limitations with some degree of definiteness, and to describe the principles upon which, in our opinion, they depend, we are aware that we shall appear, to many intelligent thinkers, to take an extreme and an indefensible position. There are few educated statesmen or politicians who would not agree that the conception of governmental functions indicated by the "Programme of Eight Points" is essentially exaggerated, and must be proportionately mischievous; but we fear there are many who will dissent from our opinion, that the only principles upon which the falsity of these conceptions can be adequately demonstrated, must, if pursued to their legitimate conclusion, bring us somewhere very near to the theory of Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Wilhelm von Humboldt, Mr. Buckle, and many less celebrated thinkers—namely,

that the only benefit which a civilised government should seek to supply to its subjects is the utmost amount of liberty for each individual which is compatible with the equal liberty of others; and that the only means which it can legitimately take to that end, and for which it may justly exact compulsory contributions, is the maintenance, by direct means, of security, national and individual. In other words, *the* function of government is to afford to its citizens protection of life, rights, and property by a strict administration of justice, and an efficient armament for national defence; the corollary being that government is a temporary expedient, necessitated by the faultiness of the human race, and its imperfect adaptation to civilised life; and that the necessity for governments will disappear as soon as men are sufficiently perfected to abstain, spontaneously, from aggression, either international or individual.

In point of fact, the error of perennial faith in legislation is, as might be expected, by no means confined to any particular class, and although it is being more extensively modified by culture in the upper than in the lower ranks of society, it still retains a strong hold upon all sections of the community, and especially upon those who are embarked in political interests or political careers. Our reason for speaking of it with special reference to the proletariat has been twofold. Firstly, its effect on the educated and legislating classes has been more often considered and described than its effect on the wage-earning classes. Secondly, its prevalence among the latter classes is fraught with certain elements of danger which are different entirely from those produced by its prevalence among the former classes, and which are in some respects more threatening and more imminent. If, as is undoubtedly the case, the upper classes believe overmuch in their government, their condition under that government is so far satisfactory that their faith creates in them very little irritation and disappointment. But the lower classes, believing their government to be omnipotent for good, and finding their circumstances to be evil, have every ground for resentment against authority, and for a desire to resist it, or to seize it for themselves.

Meanwhile, it is in every way natural that the higher classes of society should very slowly relinquish the ancient fiction that government is an embodied beneficence, and the principal agent of progress. It is true that history is one continued chronicle of a battle between governmentalism and individualism, in which individualism has always been gaining ground. It is true that multitudes of things have been, one after another, withdrawn from state protection and administration, and with admittedly valuable results. It is true that a logical pursuance of the course which has made us the freest among European nations, would involve a

constant restriction of the functions of government within narrower and narrower limits. But even if history were more generally searched for its principles instead of for its facts, even if the average history-book were not chiefly a chronicle of "dates seasoned by crimes," there would be plenty of reasons why the average English politician should discern, slowly and unwillingly, in the chronicles of the past, the evidences of a growing individualism.

In the middle age of nations, as in the middle age of individuals, when the ardent one-sidedness and partisanship of youth has been chastened by experience and knowledge, and has given place to conceptions of truth at once maturer and more polygonal, there arises too often an undue proneness to the paralyzing assumption that, where opposite opinions are entertained, the truth must lie somewhere about half-way between them; and that either opinion, by itself, must of necessity be Quixotic and extreme. It is found that when one aspect of a truth, or one set of facts bearing upon a question, has been exclusively delineated, the resultant conclusions require to be modified by a due consideration of other aspects and other sets of facts, equally valuable and important. Therefore the deduction is too often made that a truth *complete in itself* had better be tempered by a judicious admixture of the opposite error or falsehood. The English, in particular, can rarely realise that there are matters in which every onward step brings us nearer and nearer to the perfect ideal. They are given to practical compromises which ingeniously combine most of the drawbacks of two systems with few of the advantages of either. They try to find an indeterminate happy medium between ignorance and knowledge, truth and falsehood, sin and perfection; and in each generation, they are apt to suppose that the clear insight of those who are in advance of their fellow-men, and are carving out the path of the future, is likely to lead to extravagant theories which, in practice, will be useless and unworkable.

Those people who live comfortably under an existent régime are specially inclined to rest in it as final, and to suppose that it is the nearest probable approximation to that *juste milieu* which constitutes their ideal, or their substitute for one. Because they are content with their institutions, they think that the progress from which they resulted was good and desirable on the whole; but they suppose that the world, or at any rate their own country, has arrived at, or very near to, the point beyond which further progress is needless and dangerous. If they are Conservatives, they wish, perhaps, that the movement had been stopped a few paces short of the present stand-point, before certain victorious advances were made by the Liberal party, which, having been recently contested inch by inch, are still remembered with irritation. If they are Liberals, they would probably defer the halt till they have

traversed that short space immediately ahead of them, which has been already marked out by the programme-makers of the party. But whether their sense of the "eternal fitness of things" indicates to them a halting-place a little in the van or a little in the rear, it is sure not to be very remote. Ardent Radicals and Tories may place their ideal anywhere between primitive barbarism and the most utopian socialism, and many enlightened politicians of both schools are, of course, able to think of the present order of things as only "a modest link in the chain of evolutions;" but, if the average members of any particular class consider the conditions surrounding them to be radically wrong, it will usually prove to be because their existence under those conditions is a painful one.

Moreover, there is something peculiarly fascinating about the ideal of strong government. It is delightful to imagine a free and united people transmuting the obedience of compulsion into the obedience of love and reverence, and laying their wills at the feet of the man, or the group of men, whom they feel to be noblest and most perfect. It is, in fact, a conception so pleasing that we forget to inquire into its practicability. We forget to ask and answer the questions, What will keep the ruler from being corrupted by power? What will prevent the ruled from being enervated by irresponsibility? How, if men are ignorant, selfish, and bribable, are we to ensure their recognition and selection of their greatest? What will prevent the unfittest from being valued for their very unfitness? And, if men have grown altruistic, cultured, and incorruptible, what need have they of strong governments at all?

The "strong man" of Carlyle, and the strong "administration" of Mr. Matthew Arnold are modifications merely of the same notion. Everywhere some of the most idealistic and cultivated thinkers echo the poet's longing—

" Oh, for a man with a heart, head, hand,
Like some of the simple great ones gone
For ever and ever by,—
! One still strong man in a blatant land,
Whatever they call him, what care I?
Aristocrat, autocrat, democrat—one
Who can rule, and who dare not he."

There is a picturesqueness, too, about systems which abound in strong social contrasts—on the one hand, magnificence of royalty and titled nobility; on the other hand, squalor, suffering, and privation, euphemistically spoken of as hardy toil and simple gladness, unspoiled by worldly pomp. A nation presenting all these extremes, linked to past institutions by sentiments more reverent than rational, clinging to many time-honoured and picturesque

absurdities, and richer in obedience, faith, and traditional loyalty than in knowledge, energy, and width of toleration, seems to a thinker of the Ruskinian school as much more poetic than the thoroughly prosperous and enlightened republic, as a tract of hoary peaks and mountain glens is more poetic than the fertile and abundant plain, or as the era of mighty revolts and splendid achievements is more poetic than the tranquil century which is blessed in having no history, save the record of silent growth in liberty, knowledge, and commerce. Only when we learn to see the truest poetry in that which is most beneficent, and which best fosters the perfect joy and complete development of every single life, shall we cease to fear lest poetry vanish with the invasion of the loom and the locomotive, and cease to preserve, for aesthetic reasons, things which, on grounds of humanity and philosophy, must be condemned.

There is a special importance about the unphilosophical views of government entertained among educated people, which has induced us to devote some space to its consideration. A true theory of government is precisely one of those things which cannot easily originate except among men who possess a large amount of information, and who have, through experience and mental training, acquired some strength and breadth of thought. If once it be accepted, generally and thoroughly, by men of this stamp, their tone of thought will insensibly influence that of the social strata immediately beneath them; but it is almost impossible that direct teaching respecting the functions of government should be, in the first instance, imparted to the industrial classes, while it remains unknown to their superiors in position and education.

A short time since we stated our strong opinion that ignorance of political economy was one of the chief sources of political error among the masses of the people; and that a wide diffusion of certain fundamental economic truths would constitute a valuable "safeguard of democracy." * In urging this idea we were quite aware that we did not cover the entire subject, and that there were many "popular political misbeliefs" which a knowledge of political economy would fail to correct. We laid special stress, however, on this particular branch of knowledge for these reasons:—Firstly, because it consists of definite truths, susceptible of demonstration and of plain illustration, and therefore capable of being popularised. Secondly, because it would do much to shake the government-omnipotence theory, by showing that some of the most extensive changes contemplated by advocates of that theory would be either entirely impossible or destructive of their own objects. Thirdly,

* "Political Economy as a Safeguard of Democracy." Westminster Review, October 1876.

because few of the more abstract considerations which may be urged against excessive state-agency can, in the same concrete and definite way, be taught to the industrial classes. We are therefore entirely prepared to admit that, if it be useless to indicate the true nature of an evil unless one be prepared with a complete remedy, then the present article may not unfairly be accused of being unpractical, since the general run of electors have not yet reached a stage of culture which will enable them to be strongly swayed by abstract principles.

Happily, however, abstract principles are gaining ground upon those empirical deductions from a few of the nearest and most palpable facts, which are commonly spoken of as practical considerations. Speeches like some of those made by Mr. Forster show how practical politicians are beginning to seek philosophical culture, and to test their opinions by philosophical methods. Careers like those of Mr. J. S. Mill show that the legislator and the philosophical theorist can be combined in one individual; and Professor Cairns has very regretfully admitted that Mr. Spencer's doctrine of social evolution is beginning to have a paralysing effect upon the energies of legislators and philanthropists. It is, in fact, undeniable that the literary opinion of the country is increasingly influencing its practical workers, and that the broad lines of thought upon which educated politicians proceed, will not be without a powerful effect upon those who must be, for the present, their constituents, and therefore in some sense their followers and adherents.

The upper classes are largely responsible for the popular notion that politics are the means of social salvation. They have flattered the political vanity of the people and stimulated their extravagant hopes, and it is certain that a great change would be perceived in political action and speech-making, and in their effect on the wage-earning classes, if each legislator were anxious to concentrate the hopes of the people, not upon himself and his prospective parliamentary achievements, but upon the undeveloped capacities of their own natures, upon the possibilities of their own culture, and upon a future in which they may become so patient, energetic, intelligent, and self-restrained, as to require neither coercion nor assistance from a centre.

It must be borne in mind, too, that if the people could by any means be brought to modify their excessive estimate of governmental authority, then the time of transition, during which they may possess great power and very little education, would probably be tided over with comparative safety. Even if they obtained a universal franchise, they must still, in the absence of a revolution, rule, for a considerable period, chiefly by proxy. They could elect working-men M.P.s; but many practical difficulties are known

to stand in the way of any extensive adoption of this plan; and these difficulties, combined with habit, precedent, and common sense, would naturally induce them to choose most of their representatives, as heretofore, from the educated and propertied classes. Nothing is likely to prevent this, unless it be a general feeling of distrust and resentment towards those classes; and where such distrust and resentment exist, they originate, as we have endeavoured to show, chiefly in an exaggerated idea of the power which the classes in question possess to influence popular destinies and to remove popular hardships.

Nor must it be assumed that *all* the arguments against statecraft and bureaucracy are beyond the comprehension of our more educated industrials. It is impossible, in the present article, to do more than allude, very briefly, to a few of the most important among these arguments, but we hope to be able to show that some of them can be explained in a fairly accurate and simple manner.

First, there are the arguments which are based upon the value of individuality, and upon a consideration of the means by which alone it can be strengthened. In human life, as in the physical universe, every faculty is developed in proportion to the need and the opportunities for its exercise, and to the penalties which would attend its inactivity. Therefore the most energetic, self-reliant, and perfectly developed human beings will be produced in the society, as they are produced in the family, by the system which throws them most on their own resources, which shields them least from the penalties of their various faults and incapacities, and which is least inclined to diminish the range of their duties and responsibilities. There is an early stage of existence in which nations, like infants or children, cannot be set free from authority, because they cannot judge wisely enough, or act with sufficient self-control to avoid fatal or irretrievable mistakes. But the wise government, like the wise parent, endeavours so to develop their faculties by exercise and experience as to emancipate them from this condition as speedily and safely as may be possible; and tests the perfection of the rule, not by the number of the things that are wisely done for the ruled, but by the number of things which the ruled have learned to do wisely for themselves. Moreover, it has been powerfully shown by Wilhelm von Humboldt, who devoted his book on government almost exclusively to the theory of individuality, that a strong despotism or administration not only lessens the *strength* of individual development, but also discourages its *variety* of form and manifestation, and tends to create unnatural uniformity of circumstance, which does much to produce unnatural uniformity of character. These arguments have a special value, because they apply to efficient and disinterested govern-

ments as well as to those which are corrupt. How useless enlightenment is in the ruler, unless it is to some extent shared by the people, is shown in the extraordinary history of Spain under Charles III. and his two successors. How useless liberty is, unless the people have been strengthened by energetic personal action, is shown by the example of France, where every revolution ends in a despotism, and where even socialists themselves "expect government to be maid-of-all-work in their phalansteries."

Again, there is the fact that, by arranging a certain number of persons according to a certain system, and by delegating to them certain functions or certain powers, it does not become possible to evolve from their combination any wisdom or power which was not originally present in the community, so that by causing itself to be governed by some of its number, the community effects a transfer and not a creation of power.

It is urged, moreover, that the problems of social life are most intimate in their connection and interdependence, and are infinitely various and complex. Something very little short of omniscience is required to determine, in a given state and at a given time, what is the highest good of the people, and by what means it may best be brought about. Each generation reverses the decisions made by its predecessors, and in each generation the wisest men should feel certain that their best insight or knowledge will be surpassed by that of their successors. It is therefore in the highest degree dangerous to allow any number of men, even if they be an overwhelming majority, to coerce the rest of the community with a view to their positive welfare; and it is especially dangerous to allow an opinion respecting that welfare to crystallise itself into a law, which will probably survive the time, if such a time ever existed, when it was in any degree needed or in any degree defensible.

As an actual matter of fact, such ignorant, but well-intentioned, coercion has, perhaps, been of all sources of needless suffering the most prolific, and of all obstacles to progress the most serious and insurmountable. Attempts to force men to believe rightly have produced horrible cruelties and persecutions, an utter stagnation of thought and knowledge, and a frightful aggregate of perjury and hypocrisy. Attempts to secure the interests of trade have dwarfed commercial operations, have brought countries to the verge of financial ruin, and have called into existence an extensive system of smuggling. We have had poor-laws that have destroyed the independence and providence of the industrial classes. We have had laws against usury which trammelled the enterprise of nations, and almost kept them destitute of a trade. And, moreover, owing to its extreme complexity, "a society," as has been truly said, "is of all kinds of aggregates the kind most difficult to

affect in an intended way, and not in unintended ways." The persecutions strengthened heresy; the protection laws damaged trade; the poor-laws increased poverty; the usury laws raised the rate of interest.

A law or a philanthropic measure not only, in a majority of cases, defeats or fails to achieve the object for which it was created, but it has often the most sweeping indirect effects, which its promoters could never have contemplated. It has been pointed out that the plan of closely watching a slave-coast has not only failed to destroy the trade, but has led to horrible cruelties in the concealment and close packing of the negroes below the decks of the ships, and has caused whole cargoes of them to be thrown overboard in order that detection might be avoided. It has been shown that an Act to secure the substantial building of London houses not only did not achieve that object, but made house-building for the poor unprofitable, threw into other channels the capital which would have been employed in such enterprise, and so became, in part, responsible for the overcrowding, and consequent vice and misery, of the homes of the London poor. And, lastly, it must be always borne in mind, that the less government does, the less are its expenses and the lighter its taxes; so that it can only take charge of the positive welfare of the subject, by exacting from that subject heavy pecuniary contributions, or, in other words, by diminishing his means of activity and enjoyment, and by narrowing the range within which his faculties can be exercised.

"L'ETAT," says M. Bastiat, "*c'est la grande fiction à travers laquelle TOUT LE MONDE s'efforce de vivre aux dépens de TOUT LE MONDE.*"

Again, powerful arguments against over-legislation are derived from a just recognition of the sufficiency of human desires to ensure their own gratification, if such gratification be possible. The thing which is desired, but which at present cannot be obtained, is manifestly a thing which neither government nor any other agency can usefully attempt to supply. The thing, which can be obtained, but which is not desired, cannot be forced justly, and will not be forced successfully, upon any community of people. And the thing which is desired, and is attainable, will, as a rule, be forthcoming without any assistance or compulsion. The natural laws of demand and supply have, by their mutual action and reaction, created nearly all the advantages and appliances of civilisation, its literature, its commerce, its means of communication, its arts, its manufactures, and its recreations. Under the stimulus of human desire there grow up, as Mr. Spencer has said—

"Agencies alike the most gigantic and the most insignificant, the

most complicated and the most simple—agencies for national defence and for the sweeping of crossings ; for the daily distribution of letters, and for the collection of bits of coal out of the Thames mud—agencies that subserve all ends, from the preaching of Christianity to the protection of ill-treated animals ; from the production of bread for a nation to the supply of groundsel for caged singing birds.” *

There is this advantage also about the spontaneous operation of these natural laws—that directly a want ceases, the supply of it ceases also ; directly a new want arises, its supply is probably prompt ; directly a want undergoes modification, the supply of it must be modified till it corresponds ; and, lastly, whenever a want has to be supplied, the pressure of competition forces those who supply it to do so as efficiently, and with as little waste, as possible. In the case of governmental agency, on the contrary, the natural conservatism of humanity is counteracted by none of these checks. It is only indirectly to the interest of government officials that the wants of the people should be provided for promptly, effectually, and at the least possible cost, or that the supply of any temporary want should cease with the cessation of the demand. For this, and for various reasons, the government is almost invariably excelled or undersold by private enterprise whenever it possesses no monopoly, and is therefore brought face to face with competition. And when a bad law, institution, or method of administration is once created, it usually survives till the abuse has become so flagrant, and the resultant suffering or inconvenience so great, that the most beneficent acts of a ministry commonly consist in a repeal of former statutes ; and some of the worst burdens of the people are those laid on them by the rulers of their forefathers.

Without assuming that the members of a government are exceptionally selfish, foolish, or venal, or possess a character in any way lower than the average character of the community, there are abundant reasons why they should, as a body, be “slow, stupid, extravagant, unadaptive, corrupt, and obstructive.” And since, as a body, they usually *are* all these things, there arises against over-legislation a multitude of arguments and complaints derived directly from facts. Instances of governmental mismanagement, waste, or delay are recorded in the papers almost daily. A wealth of such illustration adorns the political works of Mr. Spencer ; and our great satirist, Charles Dickens, has indicated his views about centralised administration in his brilliant sketch of the “Circumlocution Office,” of which the motto is, “How not to do it,” and in which the faithful official, who has laboured all his life

to carry out that motto in the letter and in the spirit, at length "dies at his post with his drawn salary in his hand." It may be remembered, too, that the last-named writer has elsewhere told us that his "faith in the people governing is, on the whole, infinitesimal," while his "faith in the people governed is, on the whole, illimitable."

Moreover, it is contrary to all experience that any agency which undertakes numerous and heterogeneous duties, should perform them all satisfactorily; and if it be assumed that the first and chief duty of the State is protection, it is to be expected that its assumption of other functions will cause it to attend to this one less adequately. That, for this and other reasons, the special function in question is grossly neglected and mismanaged, is shown by the bewildering complexity, the costliness, the partiality, the complete uncertainty, and the utter disproportion of penalties which characterise our judicial system. And it is difficult to believe that if government existed only for the administration of justice, it would either venture to administer it so disgracefully, or would be tolerated in doing so by the nation.

The last argument which our space permits us to mention is one which it is difficult to bring home to the uneducated, and to which it is impossible to do justice in a brief summary like the present, because a thorough comprehension and comparison of various ethical systems is required for its complete appreciation.

It is based upon the broad principle that happiness is the highest aim of legislation, and of life in communities; and that the utmost amount of liberty which is compatible with the equal liberty of others, is the chief essential of happiness, and the only means to its attainment; the word liberty being in this sense understood to mean, the completest attainable freedom and scope for the enjoyable exercise of every human faculty. If this principle be once assumed, it follows that whenever the government endeavours to provide any advantage for the people, at the cost of an infringement of their liberties, it chooses for them the lesser good at the expense of that which is greater. It follows, too, that as liberty is at once the highest good for the individual, and the only good which is equally and permanently essential to all, it is the only good for which the money of a citizen may justly be taken on compulsion. Lastly, it follows that as the appropriation of his money for other purposes than the protection of his liberty is in itself an infraction of his liberty, it is an attempt, as we have before indicated, to secure for him a good which is relative, temporary, and partial, in preference to one which is positive, permanent, and universal.

It may be objected that the arguments which we have adduced

in favour of limited legislation are utopian and unpractical; it will perhaps be urged that, whatever may be the theoretical limitations of government, or however superfluous it may eventually become, the actual government of an individual country must do, this year and next year, very much what it did last year and the year before—that we must take men and things as we find them, and that we must control and arrange for people, in spite of their abstract rights, whatever they cannot at present control and arrange for themselves. Much of this is, in a certain sense, true. Mr. Mill has justly said that “liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when men have become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion. Until then there is nothing for them but implicit obedience to an Akbar or a Charlemagne, if they are so fortunate as to find one.”* He certainly goes on to state, what few will be prepared to deny, namely, that this period has been “long since reached in all nations with whom we need here concern ourselves,” but it nevertheless remains true—and his political career shows him to have felt it to be true—that the changes which would bring our system into harmony with the principles he has laid down, must be very gradually accomplished, and that it would be most unfortunate, even if it were possible, to carry them out with revolutionary abruptness.

Some of the men whose minds were most penetrated with the philosophy of ideal liberty have been among the most patient in waiting for that liberty, and the most practical in helping forward immediate measures, which, as they were wise enough to realise, were the best that were to be had under the circumstances. Wilhelm von Humboldt was so emancipated from the opinions and prejudices which surrounded him, that he was able to evolve a most advanced theory of liberty, and a most beautiful conception of individuality, at a time when his country and his contemporaries were so far behind him in thought that even the publication of his book was prohibited. But he laid it down as a fixed principle that “the possibility of a higher degree of freedom presupposes a proportionate advancement in civilisation—a decreasing necessity of acting in large compacted masses—a richer variety of resources in the individual agents.” He saw, too, that the theory and the actual sovereignty of a powerful and despotic government were in his own country so strong and so deeply rooted as to be, for the time, practically irresistible.

Therefore, with a nature of singular beauty and transparent sincerity, he became actually more distinguished as a politician and diplomatist than as a writer against all known systems of

* Essay on Liberty, chap. i. p. 6.

politics and diplomacy, and (as Mr. Matthew Arnold triumphantly remarks) "soon after he wrote his 'Sphere and Duties of Government,' Wilhelm von Humboldt became Minister of Education in Prussia, and from his ministry all the great reforms which give the control of Prussian education to the State—the transference of the management of public schools from their old boards of trustees to the State, the obligatory State-examination for schools, the obligatory State-examination for schoolmasters, and the foundation of the great State University of Berlin—took their origin." We are far from agreeing with Mr. Matthew Arnold's consequent severe condemnation of an able article in the "Westminster Review" for October 1854, in which the English translation of the "Ideen zu einem Versuch, die Gränzen der Wirksamkeit des Staats zu bestimmen," is reviewed with much power, and in which prominence is very naturally given rather to the principles advocated in the book than to the practical action which Wilhelm von Humboldt had felt to be compatible with them. We see far more "flexibility" than justice or "literary tact" in Mr. Arnold's implication that Wilhelm von Humboldt, whose theory of national liberty is so very far ahead of any practical government that has yet existed, would, if he had lived at the present day in England, have written on the side of authority and coercion, in the conviction that the English people had already carried the principles of independence and individualism too far. Least of all can we endorse his assertion that the English are a people "whose dangers lie on the side of their unchecked and unguided individual action, whose dangers none of them lie on the side of an over-reliance on the State." We may, however, cordially approve the quotation from M. Renan with which he concludes his criticism: "A Liberal believes in liberty, and liberty signifies the non-intervention of the State. But such an ideal is still a long way off from us, and the very means to remove it to an infinite distance would be precisely the State's withdrawing its action too soon."*

We may hold the belief that perfect men would need no government at all—we may even believe that men no nearer to perfection than our own countrymen in the present day, are advanced enough to need nothing from the government but protection. And we may believe that if legislators had, throughout the past, been more willing than they have been to efface themselves, and had steadily aimed at teaching the people to do, instead of at doing on their behalf, we might now be living under a government at least so far approximated to the true ideal; although, owing to our social imperfection, the work of affording

* See *Culture and Anarchy*, pp. 139-141.

protection might still be an extensive and an expensive one. But legislators have not so effaced themselves. They have not stimulated the people to take charge of everything concerning their own welfare, except their security from aggression. The government actually does for its subjects a multitude of other things, which men, untaught and unpractised, cannot instantly and miraculously be made capable of doing for themselves. In the words of Wilhelm von Humboldt, "We have to estimate the difficulties of such a course by means of prepossessions derived from the action of a willingness debilitated by ages of interference and restraint." Private enterprise, expanding itself gradually to meet expanding needs, might have created a postal system as it has created a railway system and a mercantile marine; but the sudden transfer of the post-office to a firm or a company at the present time would probably reduce the postal communication of the country, and in consequence a variety of its other business, to anarchy and financial collapse. The people might have been accustomed to provide for themselves, and, in case of emergency, for one another, without the intervention of a poor-law, and with an enormous gain to the community in providence, self-respect, and prosperity; but the sudden abrogation of the poor-law at the present date would produce a crisis of acute and unequally-distributed distress, which in its turn would let loose a torrent of indiscriminate relief of the most mischievous and pauperising kind. There are, too, some very debateable questions which have to be carefully considered when we attempt to decide in detail how far the limitation of State duty to mere protection of rights could, in the present state of society, be with advantage rigidly carried out, even if it were legislatively possible, and if the people had gradually acquired a considerably greater fitness for the discharge of all remaining duties. Mr. J. S. Mill, it will be remembered, makes several classes of exceptions to the principle that government should only provide security, and should abstain from otherwise endeavouring to promote the positive welfare of its subjects.

He would, under certain conditions, permit the government to provide education for the people, chiefly because he conceives education to be a commodity of the quality of which the mass of the people are less competent than the government to judge, and which, moreover, they cannot afford to pay for without assistance either legal or benevolent. He would extend special State-protection to infants, imbeciles, and lunatics, because they are incapable of judging and acting for themselves. He would suggest that the State should refuse to enforce life-contracts, such as marriage, because the individual who forms them "attempts to judge irrevocably now what will be best for his interest at some future and

distant time." He would permit State or municipal supervision in the case of large enterprises, such as canals, gas companies and water companies, because the individuals concerned are already obliged to "manage the concern by delegated agency," and because that agency is of a kind even more prone than the agency of the State to mismanage and neglect their interests. He would tolerate compulsory factory Acts, and compulsory regulations of colonisation, principally because in such matters it is often to the interest of a minority to hold out against measures which would be highly beneficial to the majority. He would allow the State to administer poor-laws, because the advantages of a poor-law cannot be secured for a class by its own individual action, but requires the intervention, on its behalf, of another class which must act in the matter disinterestedly. He would allow the government to defray the expense of schemes of emigration and colonisation, of scientific expeditions and discoveries, and of other enterprises in which "important public services are to be performed," because it is likely that such enterprises, if undertaken by private individuals, could not be made to pay, and would not therefore be pursued except on an insignificant scale, and because the welfare of the community at large, and not merely of the individuals engaged in them, requires that they should be carried out adequately and thoroughly.*

It is probable that these exceptions, or others based upon cogent arguments, will for a long time commend themselves to the majority of those who are engaged in practical politics; but it is very questionable whether many of them might not effectually be condemned by a fuller application of the same arguments which are employed to prove the general principle. Most of them seem to be discarded, and many of them are very powerfully disputed in Mr. Herbert Spencer's work on "Social Statics;" and Mr. Buckle, who wishes the futility and mischievousness of over-legislation to be one of the principal lessons inculcated by his "History of Civilisation," distinctly says, that "to maintain order, to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak, and to adopt certain precautions respecting the public health, are the only services which any government can render to the cause of civilisation." And, speaking of the evil effects produced upon European society by legislation which has overstepped these duties, he adds—

"When put together they compose an aggregate so formidable, that we may well wonder how, in the face of them, civilisation has been able to advance. That, under such circumstances it has advanced, is a decisive proof of the extraordinary energy of Man; and justifies a confident belief, that as the pressure of legislation is dimi-

* See Political Economy, vol. ii. book v. chapter xi.;

nished, and the human mind less hampered, the progress will continue with accelerated speed. But it is absurd, it would be a mockery of all sound reasoning, to ascribe to legislation any share in the progress; or to expect any benefit from future legislators, except that sort of benefit which consists in undoing the work of their predecessors. This is what the present generation claims at their hands."

Certainly, however, as a practical political programme, that of Mr. Mill is still very far ahead of us; and although, as a matter of theory, we shall do well to push our fundamental principles to whatever may seem to us their logical conclusions (and the "exceptions" of Mr. J. S. Mill form excellent texts for essays and debates), it is likely that a long period will elapse before we have any chance of confining the actual zeal of legislators within limits narrower than those which he has suggested. For a long time those who believe in individualism, in preference to State control, will have a more extensive work to do in the education of public opinion than in distinct attacks upon existing institutions and laws. A patient faith in gradual growth is a cardinal philosophical virtue. "Tout vient à qui sait attendre," might be the motto of the enlightened sociologist. Freedom, if it is to be exactly in proportion to the fitness of men for its exercise, must be augmented by increments as small as the delicate and infinitesimal gradations by which men are adapted to civilisation.

But it is not because the goal is far off that it is unpractical to keep it steadfastly in view, and to tend towards it with patient earnestness. A true conception of a true ideal is the highest essential and the strongest stimulus to the nobler kinds of progress. With regard to practical politics, also, it is certain that there will be an immense difference, both as to aims and means, between the man who believes that happiness and welfare are to be achieved for the people by the government, and whose chief object, therefore, is to make government strong for its work; and the man who looks for progress towards perfection to the strengthening and ennobling of the people, and who has it at heart that the State should decrease and the individual should increase, as fast as circumstances will permit. In especial there will be one field of practical action, in which the lover of individualism can labour with something of energy and confidence. He can combat, by every legitimate means, those fresh encroachments of legislation, which, having been dispensed with in the past, can scarcely be a necessity of civilisation, but which the widespread philanthropic enthusiasm of the present day, with its intense perception of suffering and abuse, its too impatient zeal for their immediate removal, and its scanty faith in any but external and apparent remedies, have made so increasingly and dangerously fashionable. Unfortunately

these are encroachments upon the true liberty of the people, but not upon such developments of liberty as they have learned to estimate at their full value. The creation of each new piece of legislative mechanism is sanctioned by the will of a clamorous majority, who, in their anxiety to see a philanthropic end achieved, a public vice checked, or, desirable culture imparted, entirely fail to perceive that, in employing the State for their purpose, they are employing an agency which in the past has usually failed, which ordinarily aggravates the evils it would remove, and creates others of greater magnitude, and the interference of which it is in every way undesirable and perilous to encourage. We have, in the present day, a school of political philosophers who seem almost inclined "to do without a President, and no government at all;" but there exists, it is to be feared, a larger unphilosophical school, which approximates rather to the "second-rate Moral Idée" of Hans Breitman, namely, that "government for every man most always do every thing."

It may be interesting to our readers to learn that already there are some observers of this increasing taste for legislation, who are disposed, if possible, to meet it by extra-parliamentary opposition. An association has just come into existence in London which asserts that its objects are:—I. "To protect and enlarge personal liberty." II. "To oppose the multiplication of laws; and the tendency to control and direct, through Parliament, the affairs of the people." And in its somewhat lengthy programme the following striking passages occur:—

"What we do not wish to see is, on the one hand, that system of administration which is called a strong government, with great departments of State, with armies of inspectors and officials, supported by an ever-increasing taxation, and possessed by a feverish desire to annex and place under its control new departments of social life; and, on the other hand, a people spiritless and helpless, looking upon government as their earthly Providence, with no power of self-direction and self-organisation, no will, no conscience, no sense of responsibility of their own, but leaving their moral feelings as well as their material interests to be regulated for them within the walls of the State bureaus. What we do want to see is a system of government which, undertaking but little, discharges that little thoroughly well. Let the administration of justice, as the basis of all liberty, be rendered quick, cheap, efficient, and, above all, completely impartial. Let it deserve the confidence of every man, poor or rich, in the country. When this great task has been faithfully discharged, let government forbear as much as possible from interference in the other concerns of life, and from all action which replaces or depresses the natural forces that exist in society, . . . Individual liberty, as defined by Mr. Herbert Spencer, to whom,

in this matter, so much is owing—liberty, limited only by non-interference with the liberty of another, complete in thought, word, and action, is, to us, the root of all good. Without this liberty there can be no morality, if morality imply the free choice of a free agent; no awakening of new moral convictions; no possibility of ever-varying growth; and it can, as we believe, very rarely, if ever, be sacrificed even for a great and good object without in the end, and in directions unforeseen at the outset, causing a loss greater than the gain. One lesson that needs to be taught to-day is, that reformers of every kind must be content to persuade and not to compel.”

To the members of such an association, and to all who sympathise with them in the general tendency of their views and efforts, there is one thought which must always be full of the richest promise and encouragement. Distrust of interference by force, of multiplied Acts of Parliament, and of all mechanical contrivances for hurrying on society to perfection, is a sentiment which will grow with the growth of higher intellect and culture, and will always be, to a great extent, a test and a measure of that growth. It will be an evidence that the national mind is beginning to be penetrated with the splendid conception that the social world, like the physical, moves by immutable laws towards the fulfilment of a wondrously-devised plan, the condition of which is progress, and the end of which is perfection. It will show that we have so far realised the silent potency of those laws that we are content to stand before them in awe, knowing that if any empirical contrivance of our own be opposed to them, it will be futile or purely mischievous, and that, even if it be in truest harmony with them, its result, as compared with their own, must be insignificant and transient. It will be an evidence of that faith in nature, which is the sublimest and the only rational optimism. It will bring us nearer to the hope of a time, when each highest and most intelligent human being will know that, for himself and his fellow-man, he can aim at nothing greater than perfect freedom to develop perfectly; when individual perfection in himself and others, sought spontaneously without hindrance or coercion, and helped forward in each by the sympathy and example of others, will form the ideal of the gifted and cultured thinker; when leadership in the world of action, as well as in the world of thought, will be yielded to the “servant and interpreter of nature,” of whom Mr. Spencer has magnificently said: “Such an one, no longer regarding the mere outside of things, has learned to look for the secret forces by which they are upheld. After patient study, this chaos of phenomena, into the midst of which he was born, has begun to generalise itself to him; and where there seemed nothing but confusion, he can now discern the dim outlines of a gigantic plan. No accidents, no chance;

but everywhere order and completeness. One by one exceptions vanish, and all becomes systematic. Suddenly what had appeared an anomaly answers to some intenser thought, exhibits polarity, and ranges itself along with kindred facts. Throughout he finds the same vital principles, ever in action, ever successful, and embracing the minutest details. Growth is unceasing; and, though slow, all powerful: showing itself here in some rapidly-developing outline, and there, where the necessity is less, exhibiting only the fibrils of incipient organisation. Irresistible as it is subtle, he sees in the worker of these changes a power that bears onward peoples and governments, regardless of their theories and schemes and prejudices—a power which sucks the life out of their landed institutions, shrivels up their State parchments with a breath, paralyses long-venerated authorities, obliterates the most deeply-graven laws, makes statesmen recant, and puts prophets to the blush; buries cherished customs, shelves precedents, and which, before men are yet conscious of the fact, has wrought a revolution in all things, and filled the world with a higher life.”*

ART. II.—COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE IN FRANCE. 1

I. **O**F all the institutions which constitute, as it were, the skeleton of the modern social body, none is more important than marriage, and none is more certain to undergo a far-reaching reform. In many other questions, the course of future civilisation may seem doubtful; here it is clearly marked. The subjection of the weaker sex, which was natural (shall we say legitimate?) in periods of universal and incessant warring, has now become unjustifiable, and its removal is only a question of time. The day is nigh when woman will be legally enfranchised, when she will be allowed to manage her own property, dispose of her own earnings, compete with men in all branches of labour for which she may be fit, and have a voice in the affairs of the community. Whenever that day dawns, whenever women are admitted to those privileges which the American Declaration of Independence affirms to be “inalienable,” and which have long been the birthright amongst us of every male, however ignorant and brutish, it is evident that the terms on which women join their lot with men will be correspondingly affected, and that the blessings of the Christian

* *Social Statics*, p. 322.

Church will no longer be reserved for a connection in which (as the beadle says in "Oliver Twist") the prerogative of the woman is to obey. In our own country, the marriage code can hardly be otherwise described than as the lumber-room of modern legislation, the harbouring place of savage usages and tyrannic privileges that have long since been suppressed elsewhere, and which even here, in their last refuge, contrast grotesquely with the public opinion by which they are still tolerated. The man-at-arms is no longer allowed to beat or to plunder the peasant; he is still allowed to beat and to plunder his wife. Not only may he gamble away, or squander in licentiousness, the capital intrusted to him for the family support (committing thus a breach of trust which would be punishable in other cases), but when his wife, reduced to poverty, exerts herself to earn a livelihood, he may return to her, and despoil her once and again. It is true that by recent modifications of the law, the wife can in this case apply for protection to a magistrate, and if her husband be condemned, can cause her own earnings to be secured to her own use; but not the less does the principle still obtain, that a man is master of his wife's labour, and that he remains so until a flagrant abuse of power can be proved against him. He may beat her "moderately," without placing himself in the power of the magistrate, and if he breaks her arm, or knocks out her eye, although he be sent to prison for the assault, yet, on recovering his freedom, he can claim his wife again, and punish her for denouncing his brutalities. *He has a right to her person*; he can compel her to follow him about like a dog, and to subscribe, between two periods of neglect or ill-treatment, the indulgence of his sensualism. Even with a well-intentioned husband, the lifelong disorders to which she may be exposed without her own consent, through the ignorance or carelessness of him whom the law constitutes her possessor, and whom the Church enjoins her to obey, are numerous and deplorable enough.

It is not, however, with this aspect of the question that we have to deal; on the contrary, we purpose to consider the institution of marriage in a country where such abuses as the above have in great measure been removed. We shall attempt to trace the development of a typical French girl, her early education as preparatory for her future establishment, the sort of husband which she is likely to meet, the mode in which she will be wooed, and her probable destiny as a wife. We shall avail ourselves for this purpose of what has been written on the subject by the French themselves, comparing the testimony of their best observers, whether in novels or in the drama, and transcribing their own words, whenever these can be assigned a place within our little frame. We discard the preoccupation of any special pleading, whether on the conservative or on the reform side of the question, and

shall exert ourselves solely to make our picture as lifelike and correct as possible. But not the less on this account will such a picture have its philosophical significance. The rôle which is assigned to woman in modern society, the restrictions which are imposed upon her natural expansion, the training which (as Mill expresses it) applies ice to one side of the plant and hot water to another, this is what lies at the bottom of the chief disorders which are found in marriage. It crops forth under one form or under another, according to differences of climate, soil, and race; in one country it reduces wives to household drudges, and excludes them virtually from the society of men, who consequently seek their relaxation in the beerhouse; in another, it urges them to infidelity. In France, the law as respects women is far in advance of what it is in England. The wife is not indeed placed on a footing of equality with the husband, but she is at least recognised as a separate individual, having claims and necessities of her own; her property remains distinct, and the husband who has the care of it is called to a strict account of his stewardship. She retains a joint right in the management of her children (a right which ceases in England when the children reach their seventh year); and, finally, she can obtain a separation from her husband if any act of brutality be proved against him. Her social status is proportionately higher also; she is accustomed to take part in the business of her husband, and be consulted by him in important matters; she is judged worthy of more attention and more deference; and time has been when Frenchwomen were the centre of all literary circles, and when their influence in social—nay, even political—questions was supreme. Here therefore, in a country where comparative equality obtains between the sexes, the defects attaching to the marriage system will be different, if not less grievous, than those which we discern in England, and the study of those defects will offer a new interest, and possibly teach us a new lesson.

II. Before we enter upon the series of our extracts, a word of qualification may be useful concerning the title which we have placed at the head of these pages. A title must of necessity be short; hence we hope to be excused if the five words which we selected (“*Courtship and Marriage in France*”) do not completely define our intentions. We propose to describe French marriages only as they occur in that class of society which with us goes under the name of the “upper ten thousand,” but which in the more democratic France includes all those women whose fortune dispenses them from attending to household duties of an onerous kind, or from taking a share in their husband’s work. Balzac estimates (it is true that prices have doubled since he wrote) that

an income of 20,000 francs in Paris, or of 6,000 in the provinces, is sufficient to ensure this. We shall have occasion further on to state our reasons for this limitation; for the present, our only duty is to guard our readers against considering as general and national, a picture which is true only of a certain circumscription. Rightly or wrongly, a civilisation is usually judged by its costliest fruits, and there is at least this to be said in favour of the rule, that although the real strength and the most sterling portion of a nation lies in its working classes, the upper ranks are more representative, more characteristic of their special phase of culture, and exhibit its virtues and vices in a stronger light.

Secondly and lastly, we must explain that as the general causes which make French marriages what they are, begin to work upon the individual at a very early age, we have judged it advisable, before proceeding to courtship, to make our readers thoroughly acquainted with a specimen of young French girls, and to note the tendencies of the education they receive, at least inasmuch as these tendencies are relevant to marriage. This will indeed make our progress rather slow at first, but our time will not be ill employed. Our first selection is from Taine's "Notes on Paris," otherwise entitled "The Life and Opinions of Monsieur Graindorge." M. Graindorge is a Frenchman who has spent the better part of his life in the United States; where he has earned a fortune of about £3000 a year by trading in oil and salt pork. He returns to Paris on retiring from business, and scrutinises the foibles of his countrymen with all the quick discernment of a Frenchman unbiassed by French training, and unblunted by long familiarity with the scenes around him.

"June 15.—Paid a visit to my friend S. at Ville d'Avray; he is chief of a section in some Ministry; spends 30,000 francs a year. A villa shining with fresh paint, a Swiss lawn of twenty-two square yards, and seven trees. Two daughters—fifteen, sixteen years old—who enjoy the sweet country air in fresh gloves, tulle tippets, tight boots, and unexceptionable stays, as early as eight o'clock of the morning. They are very fond of me: I have my pockets always full of sweetmeats and of knickknacks.

"'Why, if it isn't M. Graindorge,' says Mrs. S. 'Good morning, my dear sir; how nice of you to come so soon! We must show you our cottage. Oh, a real cottage! But we have a few green shrubs around us; we couldn't do without a little green. Our poor children were pining for country air. And they thrive upon it so! Always frisking about on the grass. No constraint—simple gowns, simple jackets, just as when they were seven years old. They are such babies still: you can't imagine what babies they are. Would you believe that yesterday Jenny said to me, when reciting her history

of Louis XIV., 'But, mamma, how could he love that La Vallière, since he was already married? Was he, then, a bigamist?' It brought the tears into my eyes; isn't it a pretty saying? She it was who said to me when she was three years old, 'If God lives in the skies, mamma, He must be like a bird; has He a beak?' Her reasoning power was already developed! Ah, M. Graindorge, what happiness it is to be a mother: men who remain single like yourself know not what they forego. My husband was saying so this very morning; he is still full of gallantry. But so are you, and we are delighted to see you. How warm it is to-day! Pray, take a seat.'

"I bowed. Although I have now been seven years in France, I have not yet learned to bear myself correctly under these showers of Parisian amiability.

"A rocket-like discharge of trills and scales was heard to issue from the little reception boudoir.

"That's Jenny. They are together in their little nest; they have just had it arranged. Let us go in. You shall tell us your taste. They are full of taste themselves.'

"True enough. Never was a more elegant, enticing little nest. The whole room is hung with blue and white chintz of exquisite freshness; a narrow streak of gold climbs up meandering, and encloses the looking-glasses. Large porcelain vases spread out their snow-white calices, full of dishevelled honeysuckle, of moss roses, of azaleas still glistening with dew. The softened daylight steals in under the awning, and sleeps on the table like a sheet of sunlit haze. On the table, a couple of albums, disposed with studied negligence; at the corners of the chimneypiece, sketches signed with their initials; one single painting, a portrait of Marie Antoinette. And what a profusion of graceful womanly gewgaws on the *étagères*!

"Jane is at the piano, Martha standing by her side. Both names are modern; the latest fashion. Martha, with her spare frame and bended neck, looks like a delicate tomtit. The other moves her fingers languidly over the ivory keys, with a half smile upon her pouting lip. Both are clad in white, striped with rose, of immaculate freshness, with poppy-coloured puffs around the neck and wrists. Their dress is hardly open at the neck, and yet sufficiently so. The weather is warm, you know, and we are in the country. Still, they are modest—timid before strangers; they check themselves before they speak; they blush a little if for a moment they have raised their voice; they venture some familiar easy gesture, then of a sudden, hesitating, disquieted, suspend it. I feel in them an inner flame, a quivering sensitiveness, for ever on its guard against itself—the delicacy and the quickness of a bird. The pretty creature is so frail, that we live in constant fear of crushing it; so vivacious, that we constantly expect to see it fly away. The skirts undulate, the little curls against the temples are astir, the voice falters prettily in its first trials to be firm. . . . What fluttering and pulsating is within!

“ ‘Graindorge, my good fellow, you will be fifty-three years old on the twenty-first of next July.’ ”

“ True enough, my dear sir ; all the more reason for feasting my eyes on hothouse flowers. Yes ; on hothouse flowers, for that is exactly my impression here. We understand that the charm of the vision lies in its unexpectedness, in its illuiveness, in its sudden novelty, in our own imagination, which immediately starts off to people unknown regions with its fancies ; we feel that we must not budge an inch, that at our lightest finger-touch the leaves would fade and fall. This gracefulness, this strange suavity, coming after the flat, sour shopkeepers’ faces with which we have been boxed up in the railway carriage, impresses us as would a melody of Mozart’s ringing forth in the midst of a long, vulgar street—as would a beautiful white thorn, flowering unexpectedly from out of a dry hedge. If the white thorn were in a pot on your window-sill, if you had heard the singer’s preliminary runs and flourishes, your emotion would be next to nothing.

“ Gradually the conversation turned confidential, and Martha said — ‘ Will you come to the lecture to-morrow ? It is one of the grand days. Rue d’Astorg, 27—M. d’Heristal. Oh, quite a gentleman—a ribbon in his button-hole. Mamma says he has paternal manners. Everybody goes there now ; I meet all my friends there. He makes little speeches about the happiness of mothers. . . . Oh, he brings the tears into your eyes ! And such a nice man, so amiable ! Never a scolding ; when an exercise is not well done, he consoles you ; he tells you that the next one will be better. Always well dressed, isn’t he, Jenny ?—a blue dress-coat with gold buttons, and such white linen ! We laugh at him a little because he looks too often at his nails, and has a dandified way of drawing out his pocket-handkerchief. Miss Volant, who sits next to him, says that he perfumes it with benzoin. In short, he is as careful of his person as a lady. We are so glad that we go there ; our governess was such a bore. Do you remember her ? Mademoiselle Eudoxie, you know. She had a red nose, and such paws ! What a honey-vinegar face, had she not, Jenny ? Young ladies, you will please to do your analysis over again. Young ladies, sit up straight. Young ladies, that is not the way for a well-brought-up person to walk. Young ladies, no talking at table. She was as bad as a prison door. She wouldn’t let you open your mouth to eat. And the way she had of encouraging us when we were to play the piano before strangers. And her principles ! She had her mouth full of them. Louise Volant pretends it is that which spoiled her teeth. Principles, nothing but principles. She sells them, that’s the way she gets her livelihood. To return, Mrs. Volant told mamma the lectures were delightful, and so we have been there for the last six months.’ ”

“ ‘ And what do you do there ? ’ ”

“ ‘ All kinds of things—themes. We have had the death of Joan of Arc—The conversation of two angels moved by the miseries of earth—A mother on her knees before a lion who is going to devour

her child—Joseph sold by his brethren—A hymn to the sun. Oh, it's hard work, I can tell you. A hymn to the sun! what do you think of that? At first I could find nothing to say, nor Jenny either. We used to cry, we used to think ourselves so stupid. M. d'Héristal told us that we must work ourselves up, that we must stimulate our imagination. So we began to stride about the room, to kiss each other passionately, to clench our wrists; we turned up our eyes as they do on the stage, and presently it all came to us. We usen't to find more than half a page at first; now we find half a dozen. We shall compose the hymn to-morrow morning before the second breakfast.'

“‘And what shall you say?’

“‘Oh, we don't know yet; we must be all to ourselves first, and then we swell our voice, don't we, Jenny? And then, all depends upon the case. Jenny likes to speak of little lambs, of flowering meads, of children kneeling on their rosy beds at night to ask God's blessing. I, on the contrary, speak of the thunder's chariot—of the lightning, God's winged messenger—of the thunderbolt, the voice of the Most High. It reads well. M. d'Héristal is always satisfied. He says that we have style, and he is going to place us on the list of honour.’

“‘Do you read all this yourselves out loud?’

“‘Ah, you are right; that is very difficult. Only fancy, the first time Jenny couldn't do it, and began to cry. As for me, I thought my voice was sticking in my throat; I was as red in the face . . . as red as anything! but mamma made eyes at me, so then I read, without knowing what I was reading; it all seemed dreamlike to me. M. d'Héristal paid me a compliment, then I began to take heart. I swallowed a few drops of sugared water, and then I got back my voice, and I felt such power! It's just like a ballroom; you are half-blinded by the lights, half-dizzied by the music, but you could go on whirling about till five o'clock of the morning. Last time, he told a newcomer that her sentences were heavy; thereupon she burst into sobs; her mother clasped her round the body, gave her salts to smell, and she went into a regular fit; he had to read the remainder of the exercise himself; luckily it was very good, and so she gradually recovered. It is really terrible, you know; everybody's eyes are fixed on you. The mammas, the aunts are there, sometimes the papas too, with their eyeglasses and their bunch of seals. You could creep into a mouse's hole. But in return there are amusing scenes, such comical figures! Last time but one, there came an English girl, a Miss Flamborough, as red as a poppy, with a red shawl that would have made a bull go mad, a kind of jacket without a waist. She didn't dare raise her eyes—she looked at nothing but her copybook and her feet; she will be a plodder. That day mamma was scandalised; would you believe that Miss d'Estaing wore a cashmere? Such a thing is unheard of; cashmeres are only fit for married ladies; but she is a créole, and doesn't understand these things. I assure you it's a pretty sight, almost like an evening

party; there are flowers in the vases, liveried servants to open the doors, fresh toilettes, and such head-dresses! You learn more there than in the journals of fashion. Miss d'Estaing had earrings like those of the Musée Campana, with emeralds. Miss Héric has a brother who is a painter, and who designs her winter dresses for her; she is in black velvet with a border of white swan. Miss d'Argèles has her face and neck rather too long, but she braids her hair into a diadem to make her head broader, and as she has a dark Spanish complexion, she dresses all in blue, with bristling braids, . . . embroideries which stand out from the dress, and fringes all over the bodice. Oh, it will soon be Wednesday. Five days more—Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, each day of twelve hours; no, of twenty-four, for I dream of nothing else. Jenny, my darling, give me a hug.'

"Thereupon they rushed into each other's arms, and skipped about like two kids on a lawn—nervous expansion. Two years hence, they will kiss each other for appearance' sake, and out of coquettishness, just as they would pass a bunch of cherries under a man's nose to make him feel how delicious their taste would be. Four years hence, if they be not married, they will take little children on their knees, in the face of a whole company, will kiss them, pet them with all sorts of tender little names, to show what good mothers they will make. Nerves, coquettishness, maternity—there is nothing else in woman.

"'And the dear old piano?' I asked presently.

"They burst out laughing.

"'Oh, this is very wrong; you are sceptics. I have been in Germany, you know; I adore music.'

"'The key-serpent or the trombone?'

"'Abominable! you respect nothing. And I, who was of such good faith with you! I had even brought with me a little book of Schumann's. What shall I do now? Good heavens! what shall I do now?'

"'A book! what book? A book with a salmon-grey cover? What rigmarole is this? German? And what does your German say, may I ask?'

"'They are precepts—a sort of catechism intended for musical beginners.'

"'A catechism! that must be delightful. O M. Graindorge, M. Graindorge, do please be good, and translate the catechism for us.'

"'The precepts run as follows.' While I was reading, their faces were a subject for a painter; their eyes were wide open, and good reason too, for these twenty sentences express the gravity, the profound conviction, the deep-seated emotion which characterise musical education in Germany. Fancy two drawing-room kittens in presence of a crab.

"'The education of the ear is the main point. Direct thine efforts early to the distinguishing of major, minor moods, and of the various keys. Be attentive to the striking of the clock, the ring of a bell, the tap against a window-pane, and try to note what sounds they render.

“ ‘There are people who imagine that everything depends on mere finger nimbleness, and who employ several hours a day, even up to an advanced age, in mechanical exercises. This is just as if a man applied himself every day to pronounce A, B, C, as fast as possible. Employ better thy time.

“ ‘With respect to time-keeping, the performance of many virtuosi is like the gait of drunken men. Take not such players as thy pattern.

“ ‘When thou playest, care not who listens to thee.

“ ‘Always play as in the presence of a master.

“ ‘It is not enough to know thy pieces with thy fingers; thou shouldst be able to hum them. Exercise thine imagination so as to retain not only the melody, but the harmony of a composition.

“ ‘Thou must learn to understand music by reading it. Never play a piece without first having read it.

“ ‘When thou art older, never play a fashionable piece. Time is precious: the study of sterling compositions alone would suffice to occupy a hundred lifetimes.

“ ‘Do not propagate bad music; on the contrary, do thine utmost to suppress it.

“ ‘Thou shouldst neither play bad music thyself, nor even listen to it, unless compelled to do so.

“ ‘Consider it as an abomination to omit anything from the compositions of good masters, or to introduce into them any new or fashionable ornaments. No greater outrage can be wreaked on art than this.

“ ‘Seek out amongst thy comrades those who know more than thou.

“ ‘The rules of morality are also those of art.

“ ‘Bear thyself steadily, diligently in life, as in the pursuit of art and science.

“ ‘There is always something to be learnt.’

“ ‘Here they yawned with all their might. ‘But, dear M. Graindorge, this is as enlivening as a funeral. It’s a Trappist, is it not, who wrote these rules? He ought to have added: Brother, we must die. It’s easy to see that the Germans feed on sauer-kraut. We don’t make nearly as much fuss. We learn to raise and drop our fingers in succession—do ré mi fa sol; after that scales, then exercises—Cramer, Czerny, Doehler, and the rest of them. I have got as far as Czerny. Louise Volant is still at Cramer. And then the fingers scamper—look, like this.’ And the white fingers begin to rattle off the prettiest flourishes. ‘You sit down properly, you put on a serious expression . . . like this—look.’ And she made the most mockingly sentimental face in the world. ‘You throw back your head for a moment towards the ceiling—like this.’ She arranged gracefully a curl which stood in no need of arranging. ‘Then, pouf! a big note, and away you go! Listen, it’s the *mouvement perpetuel*.’

“ ‘Such indeed is the title of the piece—a regular express train. It lasted ten minutes. Her cheeks were flushed, her eye was glowing—

a real racehorse. Her sister clapped her hands; I clapped mine; the father and mother entering, clapped theirs. We swore that she would be first at Madame d'Héristal's next musical party, and faith she deserves it. At dinner we debated the question of dress. We decided on frizzled hair puffed out with a twisted coil behind. We make sure of a great success.

"She was in high spirits, and when I took leave of her at the top of the garden steps, she said to me, as I kissed her mother's hand in the old-fashioned style, 'Brother, we must die.'

"On my way back I mused over the lot which awaits her future husband. Happy man! If there be an education calculated to excite the nerves and develop vanity, surely it is this."

No truer word was ever spoken. And the education which Taine so charmingly describes is not due solely, or even chiefly, to such finishing-up lecturers as M. d'Héristal; it begins almost in the cradle. Look at the little girls which you will see playing any sunshiny day in the Tuileries gardens: you will discern in their demeanour, in their pretty coquettish little gestures, in their mindfulness of bystanders, all the arts and manœuvres of polite society. They are not real children in frocks and petticoats, eager to run, to romp, to make a noise; they are the miniatures of full-grown ladies, as elaborately dressed, as careful of their finery, as exclusive in the choice of their acquaintance, as flattering or as malicious in their little speeches. What a contrast with the loutish embarrassment of English children, who can hardly be got to say a word to strangers, who are alternately boisterous and shy, who hang their heads, who swing their arms, whose only thought, in the presence of grown-up people, is to slink off and recover their spirits in the playground! The little French girl has not been relegated to the nursery; she has been accustomed from the earliest age to sit at table with her parents, to listen to their conversation, to be presented to their friends; she has been taught to recite her little fables with gestures and inflections, to articulate distinctly, to bow, to pay little compliments, and return thanks for the attentions she receives. Her powers of mimicry have been encouraged to the utmost; the nearer she succeeds in copying the somewhat artificial bearing and speeches of her mamma, the more she is applauded. Her own little achievements and remarks are related to strangers in her presence, and the great importance of public opinion, the praise or blame of others, is thus constantly impressed upon her. Above all, deportment! that is the supreme affair. "Comme te voilà faite, comme tu te tiens mal;" such are her mother's gravest reproaches. It is ill-bred to romp, to play in such a way as to become red in the face and to perspire; it is ill-bred to raise one's voice; above all, it is ill-bred to lose for a moment the consciousness of being exquisitely and

elaborately dressed. You will see the ladies sitting in the Tuileries summon their children from their play simply to adjust a curl, a ribbon, to shake out a portion of the skirts; in a word, to recall to the child's mind the all-important fact. What wonder is it, after such training as this, that Martha should see nothing in Monsieur l'Abbé's religious teaching but an occasion of outdoing her companions and vexing their mammas, or that she should enjoy M. d'Hérial's lectures, because she learns the newest fashions there, and finds such comical figures to laugh at?

In an interesting paragraph upon the mainsprings of social action, Prévost Paradol affirms that the voluntary subordination of private interests to public interests (which subordination is the basis of all social life) may be traced exclusively to three great sources—Religion, Duty, Honour.* "Religion," he says, "is at once the simplest and the most efficacious of the three, and when its influence has not been too much undermined by criticism, there exists no other instrument so potent to obtain of men living in the social state all the various kinds of sacrifice that public weal requires. Nevertheless the influence of religion in society tends steadily to wane by the effect of reasoning, the spread of positive science, and the constant attacks of philosophy. Religion loses first the direction of the cultivated classes, and whatever be the energy of her resistance, we have to contemplate the moment when the governing portion of the nation know her no longer, or at least, if still rendering to her a homage which is rooted in habit, no longer accept her teachings or undergo her ascendancy. This change does not prevent the body politic from subsisting, nor does it exclude the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice. This first bulwark of subordination having been destroyed, unmasks another: the lofty conception of duty, or the wise calculations of self-interest rightly understood. But this incentive, presupposing a certain degree of philosophical enlightenment, has no hold upon those men who understand only the simple dictates of religion. Religion manifests herein its superiority; it requires no preliminary culture in its hearers, no mental effort, no power of analysis: it simply says, This is God's will. Whereas to support voluntarily the inequality of condition, manual labour, poverty, in order to preserve society from the woes of anarchy, . . . whereas to affront death on the battlefield in order to save one's fellow-citizens from ruin and from a foreign yoke, . . . truly, this implies an effort of reasoning and an act of intellectual heroism such as human nature is rarely capable of. A third incentive is therefore indispensable: honour, or rather conventional honour, the last and the most powerful defence of societies that have grown old, and of French society in particular."

We have no time to discuss this paragraph as it deserves to be

* See "La France Nouvelle." In our translation the passage is abridged.

discussed : whatever comments might be needed to rectify or to complete it, its conclusion is admirably true. The French are the most socialised amongst nations ; they have the advantages, and of course also the defects, resulting from this culture. Their enormous love of approbation (which is the social quality *par excellence*) renders them more attentive and more apt to please, as it renders them conversely more keenly sensitive to any lack of attention and amiability in others. Hence the established social type in France is completer and more binding than it is elsewhere. Peculiarities, even when seemingly innocuous, are distrusted. Originality, in popular parlance, is a term of reproach. A French lady of our acquaintance used to bemoan that her little boy was not quite like other children. " Mon Dieu, s'il pouvait être comme tout le monde !" was her frequent exclamation. In our country, to be exactly like other people is not invariably deemed a matter for congratulation. Conventionality is very strong with us, but its range is limited. We recognise emphatically other laws beside and above it—the claim of independence, of the private conscience, of individuality. In France the law of conventionality is supreme. *Telle chose ne se fait pas* (such and such a thing is not admitted) is a sentence without appeal, and the strongest phrase for expressing an irrevocable prohibition. The commands of religion may be matter for discussion ; the notion of abstract duty has no strong hold upon the public mind ; the sentiment of honour (that is to say, being interpreted, the sentiment of what is due to our reputation, to the esteem and praise of our fellow-men) remains, as Prévost Paradol expresses it, the most reliable bulwark of society.

Two consequences are deducible from this state of things. The first is the supreme importance which will be attached to externals. Whereas the rewards of religion are conditional upon the purity of our motives, whereas the idea of duty derives all its power from the single conscience, the award of honour, and, in a great measure, the inward satisfaction we derive from it, is dependent on public opinion, which public opinion can only be based upon our visible demeanour. Society has neither time nor convenience to scrutinise the niceties of character : its classifications must necessarily rest upon a few plain facts ; and providing the individual can answer satisfactorily concerning these, without more, do the label of respectability is pinned upon him. Hence, in a country where regard to opinion is the chief incentive, practices and observances will tend to become paramount. The second consequence is, that in proportion as the national attention is drawn to externals, the recognised social type of dress, deportment, and so forth, will not only become more binding, but will be elaborated more and more into minutiae, until the slightest

departure from it will catch the eye and provoke criticism. Hence, for instance, the astounding frequency with which a Frenchman's sense of the ridiculous is stirred, and the terror in which he stands of stirring that sense in others. Stendhal (a French writer, who is merciless towards the foibles of his countrymen) says he can imagine a Frenchman tumbling from a fourth storey window, yet disquiet in his mind as to the posture he will assume on the ground. A proof of the potency of ridicule in France is that the husbands of unfaithful wives have often been held up as ridiculous, doubtless through the popular instinctive calculation that this epithet would do more than any other to chastise and repress adultery. A husband having been made ridiculous, has no choice but to wipe out the ridicule in blood.

We have somewhat wandered away from the young heroine whose destinies we have undertaken to follow; our excuse must be, that until a husband has been found for her, this interesting young person is compelled to play a very subdued part. We have seen that her early education is likely to develop her vanity, her taste for dress, her regard to proprieties and public opinion; it is certainly not likely to develop in her any intellectual interest, any worthy ambition that might be her staff and her solace throughout life, any reverential sentiment, or any lofty conscientious principle. It will leave her supremely ignorant and supremely cultivated; tasteful, elegant, learned in conventionalities; incapable of taking up a serious book and plodding through a subject, or of following a train of reasoning, but eminently apt to learn from conversation, to adapt herself to the tone and opinions of the social circle in which she moves, quick to pick up ready-made dicta on various topics, and to reproduce them as occasion offers, with graceful fluency and unwavering self-confidence. Phrenologically, our old friend Mr. Binnie, in "The Newcomes," might perhaps have rated her as follows:—Love of approbation, 10; Philoprogenitiveness, 8; Benevolence, 3; Veneration, 2. Large Self-esteem and Firmness, moderate Conscientiousness, large Acquisitiveness, quick Perception (as far as it goes), but very small reasoning powers; large Imitation and Order. She will make a first-rate milliner, a ready though somewhat artificial actress, a trustworthy cashier or overseer in her husband's business, a devoted mother, a skilful hostess, and even (provided that she be kept busy) a true and faithful wife. Alas! here is the hitch, at least in that class of society which we are now considering, for her nervous, restless nature must always find some vent. Monsieur Graindorge thinks that the triumph of a Frenchwoman is to be mistress of a café—a handsome café, of course—and to sit behind the counter. "You see a pretty woman, well dressed, busy smiling and selling, on show and on duty simultaneously, doing the amiable for five

minutes to a customer, yet keeping a sharp eye on the waiters and the receipts; attentive to everybody, and presiding in a saloon which partakes both of the drawing-room and the shop." But we are hurrying on too fast: listen to this other passage on young girls:—

"Suppress the head-dress, the attire, the visible external paraphernalia, and look at the inside. The inner being here is a diminutive hussar, a sharp-witted, wary, daring little scapegrace, in whom the feeling of respect is null, and who takes himself to be equal to the best. We pay for special professors to teach our girls timidity at home; they take nothing but the mask of it, a mask which cracks after three months of marriage and society. Their ideas shoot forth too impetuously, too vividly; in an instant the will is formed, and the act springs forth. . . . In Germanic countries, woman seems to be of another clay than man; here, nothing of the sort: she is a man of refined and sublimated essence; endowed with more excitable nerves, but possessed of the same military instincts, the same love of pleasure, the same thirst for strong sensations. She will be man's comrade on occasion, his equal always, his master if she can. The profound sentiment of the sublime, and that inborn simplicity which engender voluntary subordination, are deficient; they are above and below obedience, incapable of accepting a command or of recognising a superior.

"See now how modern education confirms this imperious and self-willed character. The father and mother made a business match, that is to say, a frigid match, and the asperities of the two characters knocked up against each other without melting, with a painful and continuous friction. They teased each other first, tolerated each other afterwards through resignation and the force of habit. Then came the children—a little girl—and the boundless craving to adore, so long pent up, overflowed into the new bed which had thus been opened for it. She is rosy and fair-haired; all the dreams of grace and of ideal beauty, all the poetry ardently but fruitlessly aspired after by the young man, are awakened in the father, and this time nothing blemishes or mars his reveries. She needs only to be happy in order not to be ungrateful: what wish of hers could be denied, and in what way could she possibly displease? Nothing is required of her, everything is given to her. She is a young colt let loose upon a meadow. 'Eat, my darling, eat; how good it is of thee to be so hungry!' Her follies provoke merriment, her pranks are considered as graces: what is prettier than a foal when it kicks? As she grows older she leaps the hedges, and grazes on the cornfields; pulls after her with gambols her old broken-winded father. 'Papa and I,' says one of these frisky favourites, 'Papa and I do exactly what I please.'"

It would be a great mistake, however, to suppose that the utmost license which a young French girl obtains, is similar in

kind to the natural freedom which an English or American maiden enjoys. Conventionality opposes an impassable barrier even to spoilt children. A French girl before marriage is under constant surveillance; she is guarded just as if everybody were convinced that the moment she were left to her own instincts she would be certain to do mischief. Males, young and old, are kept at a severe distance. Generally speaking, she is not taken into society, or if she is, only under certain restrictions. Thus, she may be allowed to dance, but not to converse with her partners. Flirtation is next to an impossibility. Her reading is mostly of a devotional character; no editions are deemed sufficiently expurgated; no plays are moral enough for her. Like the Roman vestals, she is the object of a special reverence, and the very men who will make hot love to her as soon as she is married, take off their shoes before a virgin as if they stood on holy ground, and would be ashamed to say one word that "a young girl might not listen to." We are well aware that this description would have been much more generally true some fifty years ago than it is now; that young ladies now-a-days are somewhat emancipated; in France, as elsewhere, the type of the "fast girl" is gaining ground (the girl who is perfectly wideawake as to what marriage has in store for her, and who either submits to convention for the sake of establishing herself, and doing as she pleases afterwards, or quietly awaits the age of twenty-one in order that she may choose without her parents' consent); but numerous as these exceptions have become, the type of the cloistered virgin is still a favourite with the public, and is probably a better bait for matrimony than any other. A French mother's favourite boast to her future son-in-law is still, "Here is my daughter; she is twenty years of age, but never for five minutes, by day or by night, has she been out of my keeping." Truly a precious guarantee for future good conduct! Is it not astounding that the very men who, being about to marry, have the strongest possible interest in ascertaining the character of the girl whom they think of as their future wife, should sanction and applaud a system which covers that girl with an impenetrable veil? Yet, so it is; and if we reflect on what we have already seen of French education, as well as on the past history and present condition of the Frenchman who is seeking an alliance, the mystery in great part will be cleared up. In the first place, we have pointed out how great is the importance of externals and conventionalities in a Frenchman's eyes; no wonder, therefore, that for him, ignorance and corporeal intactness should pass as the equivalent of purity. In the second place, he is desirous of a novel sensation; he has sown his wild oats, he has spent his first ardour with Lisette, or perhaps with Catin; he is now past thirty, he is weary of tavern-cookery, of playgoing, of late suppers; he wishes to

lead a soberer life, and his friends represent to him that he could do so very comfortably with a wife whose income should be equal to his own. So far so good, but what species of wife is this man likely to fancy? A girl of twenty-five, that is to say, in a stage of maturity corresponding to his own, a girl who, having seen something of the world, might acquiesce in his desire to retire from it? No, he has had that article already; his palate needs a newer, stronger spice. But a pretty young creature just issuing from her convent, with all the bloom of the peach upon her cheek, timid yet vivacious, blushing at a word, full of repressed sparkle, like champagne before the cork is drawn. . . . Ah! that is exactly what will suit him. How delicious to be the first in this young heart, to be the object of all its awakening emotions and desires! Her mind is a blank leaf: so much the better; he will write upon it what he pleases. He will mould her to suit his habits: as he is tired of going out, she shall like to stay at home. Is she not extremely fond of tapestry, and is she not ignorant of the world with all its wickedness? She is gentle and docile; it will be an easy task to train her, and he, with his rich experience of Lisette and of Catin, is just the man to do it. Poor fool! But his folly is at least not an isolated case, and much as dramatists and novelists have written on the subject, the stupid moth is still attracted to the flame.

For our part, this exalted homage paid to virginity is the sign of a corrupt rather than of a moral age. *It is moral purity which deserves reverence, that purity which may exist in the married woman as well as in the maiden, and which indeed is far more important in the former than in the latter. As Balzac says in his "Physiology of Marriage," "Perish the virtue of ten virgins rather than the sacred chastity of a wife and mother! A young girl abandoned by her seducer may still deserve all our compassion and respect; oaths have been violated, confidence has been betrayed; the unhappy victim is still innocent; she may still become a faithful spouse, a loving mother; and if her past life is overshadowed by clouds, at least her future may be bright and pure. What, on the other hand, are the prospects of a faithless wife? However exemplary her subsequent conduct may be, the fruits of her fault are ineffaceable." In France, where public opinion is so much more severe with unmarried women than with wives, we cannot but suspect that the purity of girls is valued rather from the sensuous point of view than as a pledge of future chastity. The more debauched the men, the more they will be influenced by this sensuous attraction; and, moreover, the more their own licentious life has impressed them with the frailty of woman's virtue, the more severely will they guard their daughters. At any rate, it will be conceded to us that a species of purity

which can only be secured by claustration, does not command much respect. French writers in general seem to think this claustration warranted by the inflammable temperament of their race, by their proximity to the South, by their hot blood and impetuous desires. Georges Sand, for instance, in her novels, usually implies that the man who spends ten minutes alone with the woman he loves without forgetting his good manners, deserves considerable credit for his self-possession. Michelet is of opinion that after the age of four or five, the two sexes ought to be kept carefully apart. Taine relates that in certain schools it has been found necessary to exclude all male professors, even such as are old and ugly. Scraps of letters addressed to these prosaic, unsuspecting Romeos of fifty had been discovered in the desks of the young ladies. A former pupil of the great Legion of Honour School at St. Denis, into which no man is allowed to enter, tells us that on one occasion the authorities were greatly scandalised by the discovery that the word "Amour!" had been scribbled all over its walls. For our part, we think that the mental and physical state indicated by these or similar occurrences, would be remedied rather than aggravated by enfranchisement. The physical appetites of the French are not by any means ferocious; their sensuality lies chiefly in their imagination; now nothing stimulates the imagination so much as mystery and restraint. Fresh air and exercise provided for the body, together with interest provided for the mind through a more rational course of study, and especially through the prospect opened to women of utilising their studies in subsequent professional pursuits, would prove far better checks than convent walls. The very fact alleged in defence of the French mode of education, namely, the fact that the two sexes cannot be allowed to mingle for an instant without danger, is in itself a sufficient condemnation of that mode.

III. We pass from the serious to the grotesque when we consider how the young creature who has been the object of such constant vigilance, is finally bestowed. *For whom* has she been stinted in her liberty, repressed in her eagerness to see and learn? For a husband of her choice, for a man qualified to be her guide in that experience of life which her parents have thought proper to withhold? No; for a stranger! When the time has come for her to leave her convent, her relatives will endeavour to find a "suitable" match for her, viz., a match in which the fortune and social station of both parties may be thought equivalent. Sometimes the husband will be found within the circle of existing acquaintances; in other cases, it is necessary to look for him beyond. The clergy, by their numerous ramifications and connections, are invaluable auxiliaries in this search, and this circum-

[Vol. CVII. No. CXXII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LI. No. II. z

stance contributes in no slight measure to their power. Family notaries also are useful intermediaries.

"My youthful landlord," says M. Graindorge, "was signing, some two months ago, a power of attorney at his notary's. An idea strikes the notary; he looks hard at the client, makes sure that he is not yet bald, adds up mentally the revenues of his different estates, and says, 'Parbleu! my good sir, you have come here in the nick of time. What do you say to a girl of twenty, pretty, blonde, good tempered, of sound family, landed property, 200,000 francs down, 300,000 francs in prospect, perhaps more, with a farm lying in the proposed track of a railway?' The marriage came to pass. My old friend B. was visiting the other day at a house where a female cousin from the country, coming to Paris to get new teeth, had recently put up. He is very courteous, the lady finds him pleasant, inquires about him, hears that he has a daughter, and straightway thinks of a delightful procureur du roi in her department, a first-rate fellow who last year out of twelve trials obtained twelve condemnations, three of which to death, and who will be proposed next year for the Legion of Honour. The marriage came to pass."

Something, however, remains to be said respecting the manner in which these preliminary proposals are followed up. When the gentleman in question has expressed his willingness to barter his single blessedness against such and such a dowry, &c., the curtain is drawn sufficiently to allow a peep at the young lady. This is always a delicate matter, since, in case the interview should not prove satisfactory, either party must be able to draw back without wounding the susceptibilities of the other. A meeting at a church door is not a bad contrivance; a young girl issuing from the performance of her devotions, with the serenity of a pacified conscience upon her face, will generally be seen to advantage. But we prefer to give a French novelist's version of the occurrence. In Octave Feuillet's last novel, "Un Mariage dans le Monde," the hero, M. de Rias, is introduced by a friend of his, Madame de la Veyle, into the house of Madame FitzGerald, who has a marriageable daughter. Madame FitzGerald, who has been informed of the gentleman's intentions, wishes to arrange his coming in such manner as to arouse no suspicion in her daughter's mind. Accordingly a little comedy has been played by the two ladies. Madame de la Veyle, invited to dinner at Madame FitzGerald's country house, writes to say she cannot come, as she has just received the visit of her godson, Lionel de Rias. Madame FitzGerald writes back entreating her friend to bring M. de Rias unceremoniously along with her. Madame de la Veyle replies that unluckily M. de Rias has nothing but his travelling suit, but finally accepts the twofold invitation, announcing her own arrival for three

o'clock of the afternoon, whereas M. de Rias will come on horseback about six. All these letters are communicated in succession to Mademoiselle Marie by her artful mother, who now flatters herself that her precautions will be perfectly successful.*

"However, towards half-past five of the afternoon, a young lady might have been seen walking alone on a park terrace which overhangs the road from Melun to Fontainebleau. From time to time she arrested her light and rapid steps, seemed to hearken to some distant sound, and bent forward through one of the arcades formed by the thick hedge bordering the terrace to glance along the road. Then she would resume her cadenced walk with the gliding step of a woman who is starting on a waltz.

"Just as she had ventured on renewing one of these furtive glances through a verdant arch, she suddenly threw back her supple form, and murmured some words between her lips, slightly parted by an incipient smile. The elastic agile tread of a horse, which was presumably a thoroughbred, and which could certainly carry no other but a highbred rider, resounded on the hard dry road. The young girl, still smiling, placed herself out of sight, and with a beating heart, secured for herself a little loophole in the thick foliage of the hedge. The rider passed by. She gazed at him with so intense an interest as to hold her breath. M. de Rias appeared to her then in all his quiet elegance, his manly grace, with his proud and delicate features somewhat pallid through emotion.

"When he had disappeared, she heaved a long sigh, pressing one hand on her palpitating bosom; her bright blue eyes were fixed for an instant in a reverie, then, as she cast them towards the ground, she said, half inaudibly, 'My husband!'

"At this word, the blood rushed to her cheeks, she covered her face with her two hands, and remained thus motionless for a few instants, similar to a statue of modesty, after which Mademoiselle Fitzgerald with a brisk step took her way back to the mansion.

"She was awaited there with extreme impatience, for M. de Rias had already entered the courtyard, much to the disappointment of the old Marchioness.

"'But where in the world is Marie?' said she to Madame Fitzgerald, who was at her side in one of the window recesses of the drawing-room. 'Lionel looks very well on horseback. I had arranged matters so that she should see him from the first in all his glory, for first impressions are of supreme importance. . . . Here he is now coming up to us, and this provoking little creature not by! It is a real failure.'

"'My dear Marchioness,' replied Madame Fitzgerald, 'you know that our chief desire, before everything else, was that Marie should conceive no suspicion. Moreover, your godson seems to me just as

* All this fibbing does not cast a shadow of uneasiness over Madame Fitzgerald's conscience. It is considered a necessity of education.

good-looking on foot as on horseback ; we have therefore no cause to lament.'

"When it suited Mademoiselle Marie's pleasure to appear in the family sitting-room a few minutes before dinner, she found M. de Rias already comfortably settled there, in manifest possession of the good graces of Madame FitzGerald and of her uncle the Count Patrice. The young man was immediately introduced to her, and she replied to his profound salutation by a bow that was almost imperceptible, and so inattentive as to seem impertinent. Lionel, somewhat surprised, for his good looks had accustomed him from ladies to more favourable treatment, fell to seeking in his mind what might be the cause of so frigid a reception. By dint of puzzling, he fancied that he had discovered it. Madame de la Veyle had submitted to him her diplomatic correspondence of that morning with Madame FitzGerald, and although he had approved its general tenor, he had judged ill chosen the mention of his morning dress. He argued that Mademoiselle FitzGerald, highly expert in all questions of propriety, had been displeased herself by this detail, and that the idea of a man going about from one house to another without an evening coat in his portmanteau, had naturally enough seemed to her ridiculous.

"This chimera was, as the reader sees, a piece of childishness worthy of a lover. Was Lionel already in love? To say the truth, he had been smitten even before seeing Mademoiselle FitzGerald ; for if the uncertainties of marriage awaken secret fears in men of M. de Rias's years, there is at least amidst those uncertainties a luminous point, a new and certain prospect, which has a potent charm for them. It is the emotion of a kind of love, and, if we may venture to speak thus, a kind of sensual delight, which their past life, however rich it may have been in sensations of this kind, cannot have revealed to them. It is the vision of an untainted spring in which their tired heart and worn-out senses may bathe and recover youthfulness as by the contact of fresh dew. It is the ideal image of this young creature, immaculate as Pygmalion's marble, whose virgin breast reserves its first blushes for their touch.

"Haunted as he had been for some time past by this seductive vision, M. de Rias felt no difficulty in falling in love with Mademoiselle FitzGerald, who seemed to him an agreeable incarnation of his dream. She was indeed very pretty and graceful, supple and undulating, with the air of a somewhat severe nymph, with magnificent blue eyes under brown eyebrows. Lionel's only complaint was that his marble did not gain animation at his touch as suddenly as he had hoped. Mademoiselle Marie's bearing during dinner completed his discomfiture. Had he been the curate of the parish, she could not have seemed less conscious of his presence. Her manner was quiet and listless, she joked at intervals with her cousin Madame de Lorris in a tone of peaceful good humour, and answered Lionel's questions with the politeness of indifference.

"This attitude ended at last by alarming the old Marchioness her-

self, familiar as she was with all the stratagems of her own sex. As she left the dinner table she drew Madame de Lorris aside.

“‘My dear,’ said she, ‘all is going on well ‘on one side. Lionel is evidently under the charm, but the girl makes me uneasy. Do try and find out her impressions—without letting her see your endeavour, of course.’

“A minute afterwards, the two cousins were seen running about and pursuing each other like two school-girls amidst the flower-beds which adorned the court in front of the house. Suddenly Madame de Lorris, approaching breathless one of the open windows, leaned over into the drawing-room, and made a sign to the old Marchioness.

“‘Lay your fears aside,’ said she. . . . ‘She has told me nothing; but I am sure that she has guessed the whole business, and that he pleases her, for she is constantly embracing me.’

“A few weeks later a singular person arrived at the Chateau de Fresnes. It was the Countess Jules de Bruce, an aunt of the late M. FitzGerald. She resided near Cherbourg, and close to the sea-coast, in an old, wild-looking manor, where she spent her time in farming and in works of charity. She never left it save on special family occasions. Her coming, as she used to say, was equivalent to a sacrament; it was a sure sign of marriage, of baptism, or of death.

“The Countess Jules, notwithstanding this youthful appellation, which she had retained throughout the lapse of years, was seventy or more. You may imagine a little old woman of deliberate manners, dressed with scrupulous neatness, but with monastic simplicity. She had been a widow for nearly half a century. It was impossible to guess what kind of man the Count Jules de Bruce might have been in his day. She never spoke of him. When people wondered that she had persisted in so long a widowhood:

“‘I was married five months,’ she would reply; ‘that was quite enough to convince me of the emptiness of such a pastime.’

“Nothing more was known about the Count.

“She arrived on the morning of the day preceding that which had been appointed for the wedding of her grand-niece with Lionel de Rias. Lionel, who had taken up his quarters some time since at his godmother’s house (only a mile or two from Fresnes) in order to pay his court more assiduously, had presented himself that day at the mansion very early. He was therefore immediately presented to the Countess Jules, who, after looking at him with awful fixity, said to him in a sharp tone—

“‘Sir, I am your humble servant. You have a very pretty face. I am pleased with your face. Things are going on finely, fiddle-de-dum—they are going on finely, fiddle-de-dee!’

“After which, she turned her back on him, plunged into an arm-chair, unrolled an enormous piece of knitting, and set herself resolutely to work.

“Madame FitzGerald, however, was assailed by cruel perplexities, which she imparted confidentially to the Countess Jules.

“ ‘My good aunt,’ said she, ‘it is kind of you to have come in the morning; your presence will save me from a great embarrassment. We are expecting some twenty relatives and friends in the afternoon. I have a number of things to prepare, of orders to give, and my two sweethearts to look after into the bargain. It is enough to drive me out of my wits. Thank^o Heaven, you are here to relieve me of my watch. I place unbounded reliance on the delicacy of M. de Rias; but there are certain rules we must observe, you know. When once the wedding is over, as much as you please, . . . but, until then, it would seem to me the height of impropriety that my daughter and my future son-in-law should remain alone together for an instant. Hitherto, I have kept a sharp lookout myself, but for to-day I must intrust them to you; . . . do not lose sight of them a minute whenever I am called away; . . . you give me your word, do you not, dear aunt?’ ”

“ During this appeal, a caustic smile played over the withered features of the Countess Jules; notwithstanding, she expressed by a decided nod that she accepted the duties which were imposed on her.

“ An opportunity to do honour to her pledge was not slow to offer. After breakfast Madame FitzGerald followed her uncle in order to attend to the duties of hospitality, but she did not leave the drawing-room without casting at her aunt an expressive and suppliant glance.

“ The Countess Jules was settled in the embrasure of a window: she had resumed her knitting, and while pursuing her work busily, she shot severe glances at Mademoiselle Marie, who was trying a new partition at the piano, and on M. de Rias, who was turning the leaves for her with a melancholy look. A rapid dialogue in an undertone took place between the young folk.

“ ‘Monsieur,’ said Mademoiselle FitzGerald, without pausing, and casting her words over her shoulder.

“ ‘Mademoiselle.’ *

“ ‘What is the matter? Your face has the expression of a martyr.’

“ ‘That is exactly what I am.’

“ ‘How so?’

“ ‘Do you not see how things are going on?’

“ ‘What things?’

“ ‘We are now watched over by a dragon. . . . Your mother is really incomprehensible.’

“ ‘You know how careful of proprieties she is. . . . Are you not fond of proprieties yourself?’

“ ‘Certainly I am fond of them—especially when they suit me; but in good earnest, your mother—’

“ ‘Come, you are not going to speak ill of my mother.’ ”

* Fancy a German girl addressing her betrothed, on the eve of her wedding-day, as “Mein Herr,” and the gentleman answering, “Mein Fräulein.” The “tu” in France is never used till after marriage, and even then it is not used in public.

“ ‘I worship her ; but honestly, she might be content with having had us at her apron-strings for two whole months, and allow us at least to breathe on the last day. Not at all ; she hands us over to this Cerberus !’

“ ‘Isn’t she amusing, my aunt ?’

“ ‘I find her very far from being amusing.’

“ ‘Take care ; she is not deaf.’

“ ‘The more’s the pity.’

“ ‘Why ?’

“ ‘Because, naturally, I should have a thousand things to say to you.’

“ ‘Say them, then. I will use the forte pedal.’

“ M. de Rias was leaning over towards the ear of his betrothed to whisper one of the thousand things he had to say, when a more direct and sterner gaze on the part of the Countess Jules paralysed him suddenly. At the same time, the old lady laid down her knitting, stuck her knitting-stick into her cap, and spoke as follows :—

“ ‘My children,’ said she, ‘draw near. . . . I have heard experienced people say, and my own short experience has confirmed the saying, that even in the happiest of marriages, the best part is . . . the day before the wedding. I deem it therefore quite absurd not to let you enjoy this day in perfect freedom, and accordingly I use the plenary powers delegated to me by your mother, to unlock your prison gates. The weather is magnificent, go take a walk. Come, children, be off !’

“ Mademoiselle Marie became extremely red.

“ ‘But, aunt,’ she murmured feebly.

“ The old lady, without reply, took her by the hand and pushed her out of the drawing-room by the garden door. Lionel followed, after kissing, as he passed, the hand of this rough-spoken but beneficent old fairy. When once they found themselves in the open air, our two young persons, similar to birds which have been long kept captive, and whose cage is suddenly opened, seemed rather astonished by their freedom. They looked at each other laughingly, as if bewildered by their luck. At last Mademoiselle FitzGerald took Lionel’s proffered arm.

“ As they were walking with a deliberate step towards the nearest alley of the park, a window was thrown open behind them in the upper storey of the house.

“ ‘Your mother !’ exclaimed Lionel merrily ; ‘we are done for.’

“ And, overcoming the young girl’s feeble opposition, he drew her after him in a mad scamper until they were fairly sheltered by the wood.”

We shall not pursue our couple any further ; the contrast between such courtship as this, and courtship as it is customary in England or Germany, is sufficiently apparent. No intimacy ! the accepted suitor is allowed to call every day with a bunch of flowers in his hand, and to take part in the general conversation,

which is chiefly interesting by its recurrence to dress and to the marriage outfit, but in reality he is not allowed as much liberty with his betrothed as he would enjoy with any married woman at a ball after a simple introduction. As for the young lady, it will be understood from the foregoing, that although the really essential terms of the alliance are examined by the parents and by the respective notaries before she has any official notice of the business, still her own assent is not finally dispensed with. The barbarous ages when fathers gave away their daughters just as they might give away a chattel, are no more. We are civilised nowadays, and arrange our little matters mildly. Nay, it is considered extremely desirable that the girl should take a fancy to the favoured client, and that the *mariage de raison* should be at the same time a *mariage d'inclination*. If the suitor is tolerably good-looking and has a good tailor, &c., this consummation may be brought about without much difficulty. Everybody knows that when a vessel of hot water having been saturated with saltpetre (that is to say, having been supplied with as much saltpetre as it can dissolve) is allowed to cool, there comes a moment when some of the saltpetre previously accepted by the water is rejected, and restored in the form of tiny crystals to the solid state. This moment of crystallisation may be retarded if the solution is kept absolutely motionless, but as the temperature sinks, the separation of the saltpetre becomes more and more imminent, until the slightest accidental jar, or the dropping of a tiny piece of glass into the water, is sufficient to determine it. Something similar to this takes place in the minds of young people at the approach of that interesting period which nature has appointed for love and love-making. The rationale of French education consists in so secluding and guarding the solution, that the crystallisation may not take place before the bit of glass selected by the parents is dropped in. An irrational rationale enough, if you please, but it has a semblance of success for the time. The girl's mind has been filled (implicitly and indirectly) with ideas of marriage; her chief preoccupations have been made to hinge on the indulgence of her vanity, and social conventions have established that none but married women shall be permitted to exercise this vanity on a large scale. But at the same time, while her thoughts have been directed to marriage in general, they have not been allowed to settle on any marriage in particular. She ripens—she grows impatient—the solution is ready to crystallise. Yes, she will love her husband—provisionally—until, after the wedding, she begins to know something about him. This seems to the parents all that can be expected, and they would be greatly astonished and greatly indignant, were they told that their daughter is not entering upon life under very favourable auspices.

It is a common saying in France that pure love matches turn out ill. We readily believe it: we should be much surprised to hear the contrary. It is not sufficient to marry for love; the main question is, on what that love is grounded? If it be grounded on esteem, on confidence, on an affinity of aims and aspirations, on the sympathy of character, then indeed there is a guarantee of happiness; but if the sentiment which is dignified by the name of love be simply a sensual desire, springing from the charm of comeliness and youthful grace, why, then let the bridegroom be prepared to be disappointed with his bride as soon as his desire has been satisfied. Nay, he will be disappointed without an iota of consolation, for in the madness of his temporary enthusiasm, he will have neglected to ensure the elementary conditions of a comfortable home. Yet such marriages as these are the only love matches possible in France, where girls are so well guarded by their parents that it is hopeless to learn anything about their character. Better marry for money in that case; the money at least outlives the honeymoon.

IV. Let us pass on to the wedding. Our account of this twofold ceremony (civil and religious) is taken from the charming little volume entitled, "*Monsieur, Madame, et Bébé*;" but our space threatening to fail, we must be content with a few extracts, and refer our readers to the original for the remainder. The following impressions are those of the bride:—

"Undoubtedly, the formalities before the mayor are important in their way; but is it really possible for a delicate-minded person to give them serious consideration? For my part, I accepted this painful duty like everybody else, but I can never think of it without humiliation. On alighting from the carriage, I perceived at my right a muddy staircase; the walls were pasted over with bills of all colours, and in front of one of them a man in a brown jacket, without his hat, with a pen stuck over his ear, and a roll of paper under his arm, was rolling a cigarette between his inky fingers. On my left a door opened, and I saw a low dim basement, in which a dozen drummers of the *Garde Nationale* were smoking black pipes. My first thought on entering these barracks was that I had judged rightly in not putting on my light grey silk. We went upstairs, and found a long, dirty, and ill-lighted corridor, garnished with a number of glass doors, on which I read: '*Funerals, turn the handle*;' '*Expropriations*;' '*Deceases, knock loudly*;' '*Births*;' '*Public salubrity*;' and at last '*Marriages*.' 'Twas here we entered, in company with a boy carrying an inkbottle. The atmosphere was heavy, thick, too warm—nauseous enough to turn you sick. Luckily, a blue-liveried servant, whose aspect resembled that of the drummers downstairs, came and excused himself for not having introduced us at once into the mayor's reception-room—that is to say, the waiting-room for first-class passen-

gers. I hurried into it as you hurry into a cab when it is beginning to rain. The waiting-room had an air of shopkeepers' gentility, which put me in good humour; the clock was of that kind which you may win at a fair, there was a barometer with a dial, a bookcase which had apparently been placed there to conceal a door, and over the bookcase a likeness of our sovereign in plaster-of-Paris. In the midst of the room, a large table covered with green baize, that was soiled by ink in several places. Fancy the waiting-room of a dentist who was formerly a notary. Presently two individuals came in, carrying two registers, in which they began to scribble; they would pause occasionally to ask our names, our surnames, our age, &c.; then they would resume their scribbling, and whisper to each other: 'A semicolon,' 'Fresh paragraph,' 'Between the conjuncts,' &c. When the first of these clerks had finished, he read aloud, through his nose, what he had composed. I didn't understand one syllable of all his rigmarole, except that he repeated my name pretty frequently, as well as the name of my '*conjunct*.' He handed us a pen, and we signed. That was all. Two o'clock struck on the mayor's chimneypiece, and I thought of the dressmaker, who was to come at that hour to give a finishing touch to my bodice.

"'Is it over?' I said to George, who to my great astonishment seemed very pale.

"'Not yet, my dear,' he replied; 'we shall now pass into the marriage hall.'

"That finishing touch to my bodice haunted me. We entered a wide empty hall with ungarnished walls. The Emperor's bust was stuck up at one end over an oak platform; a few benches behind half a dozen chairs, and dustiness spread over the whole. I was in an unfavourable state of mind, I suppose, for I could not help glancing at mamma and at my aunt, who could hardly keep down their merriment at the sight of these empty benches. The gentlemen, on the contrary, were grave, and I could easily see that George was all of a tremble. At last the mayor entered by a little door—a small awkward bit of a man, in a black tail-coat that was too full for him, and that his sash rendered puffy about the shoulders. I daresay he is a very worthy man (he made his fortune by selling iron bedsteads); but how is it possible to conceive that such a puny, awkward, little creature, ill dressed, hesitating in his speech, should pronounce words that are to be for ever binding? Besides, he bore an unfortunate likeness to my piano-tuner. Well, after bowing to us and blowing his nose, much to the relief of his hands, which seemed quite at a loss what to do with themselves, the mayor recited hastily several passages from the code—indicating the number of each paragraph—and I understood confusedly that I was threatened with the constable if I did not blindly obey every order and every caprice of my husband. I was several times on the point of interrupting him to say:

"'Excuse me, sir, this is not very polite language for me to listen to, and you ought to know as well as I that there is not a particle of common sense in it.'

"I refrained, lest I should intimidate the magistrate, who seemed in a great hurry to have done. He added, however, a few words concerning the duties of married people, society, paternity, and so forth; but all these things, which might perhaps have touched me at another time, seemed nothing but grotesque in their association with the dirty barracks and the drummers playing at cards around their stove. I really should have been pained by this meddling of his with the thoughts which were so sacred to me, if the comical side of the performance had not engrossed me so completely.

"'Mr. George ——, you swear that you take Miss —— as your wife,' said the mayor, bending forward.

"My husband bowed, and replied 'Yes,' in a low tone. He has confessed to me since that he has never experienced a deeper emotion than in pronouncing this 'Yes.'

"'Miss Bertha ——,' added the magistrate, turning towards me, 'you swear that you take as your husband,' &c.

"I bowed smilingly, and I thought within myself: Of course I take him—what's the need of asking? I came expressly for the purpose.

"That was all: they pretended I was married.

"Next morning was the great day. I awoke almost before it was light. I opened the sitting-room door, and there was my wedding dress spread out on the sofa, my white veil folded by its side, my garland in a white watered box; nothing was wanting. I swallowed a great glassful of water. I was full of emotion, of expectancy, of happiness, of trembling. I thought neither of my past nor of my future; I was completely taken up by the idea of the ceremony, the sacrament—the most solemn sacrament of all—and also by the idea of the crowd in gala dress assembled expressly to see me pass by.

"At breakfast I could eat nothing, my throat was dry, and I felt twitches of impatience all over my body. I dressed; the hairdresser did his work so well that I could not help saying, I remember, This is a good beginning; this hairdress is a good augury. I prevented Marie, who wanted to lace me tighter than usual. I am aware that white makes you look stouter, and that Marie was not wrong, but I was afraid of its sending the blood to my face. I have always felt a horror of those brides who look as if they had just come from dinner. Religious emotion ought to be too deep to betray itself otherwise than by pallor. A flushed face looks silly in certain circumstances.

"When I was dressed I passed into the drawing-room to get more space and unstiffen my petticoats a little. Papa and George were already there, talking hurriedly:—'The carriages have come?' 'Yes, doubtless.' 'And for the *Salutaris*?' 'Ah, very well; then you will see to everything.' 'And the marriage registration? The ring?' 'Why, I have it, of course. By Jingo! what have I done with my certificate of confession? Oh, I know, I left it in the carriage.'

"We drove away. I felt that everybody was looking at me, and

outside our gates I perceived groups of curious spectators. What I experienced it is impossible to say, but the feeling was delicious.

"At church two gilt arm-chairs had been placed for us in front of all. As we passed up the central aisle, preceded by the beadles, knocking their sticks against the pavement, while the great organ poured forth a triumphal march, thousands of smiling faces saluted us upon our passage, as in a cornfield the ears are bowed before the breeze. My friends, my relatives, my enemies, my acquaintances, made signs of recognition to me, and I could see—for nothing escapes us on these great occasions—that I produced a favourable impression. On reaching my arm-chair, I fell upon my knees with self-contained precipitation (my hair was drawn up tight behind, showing my neck, which is considered one of my good points), and gave thanks unto the Lord. As the organ ceased to peal, I heard my poor mother at my side, bursting into tears. Oh, how well I understand what a mother's heart must feel on such a day! Raising my eyes with modesty to watch the priests advance in solemn procession, I caught a glimpse of George's face. He looked irritated; he stood up straight and stiff, with dilated nostrils and compressed lips. I never quite forgave him for showing so little sympathy, but there is a kind of poetry which men never understand.

"The discourse of the prelate who married us was a masterpiece. He spoke of our two families, '*in which piety and faith are as hereditary as honour.*' You might have heard a pin drop, such was the attention with which the congregation listened to his melodious accents. At a certain passage he turned towards me, and gave me to understand, with charming delicacy, that I had chosen one of the noblest officers of our army. 'Heaven smiles,' said he, 'upon the warrior who devotes to the service of his country a sword consecrated by God's blessing, and who, as he rushes forward to the fray, can lay his hand upon his heart, and shout the noble war-cry, "I believe!"' How nobly this is thought, how nobly 'tis expressed! A slight thrill ran through the congregation. But this was not all. The prelate now addressed himself to George, and with a voice as tender and as unctuous as it had been stirring and enthusiastic before—'Sir, you are about to take as your companion a young girl'—I hardly dare recall the numberless delicate and gracious things which his Grace was kind enough to say of me—'a young girl reared in sanctity by a Christian mother, who has made her partake, if I may so express myself, in all the virtues of her heart, in all the attractions of her mind.'—Mamma was sobbing.—'She will love her husband as she loves her father, that tender father, who from her cradle upwards has cultivated in her those sentiments of disinterestedness and high-mindedness which'—(Papa could not forbear smiling)—'that father whose name is cherished by the poor, and who, in the house of God, has a seat on the bench of the elect.' (Papa is a churchwarden ever since he retired from business.) 'And you, sir, you will respect, oh, I feel assured of this, so much purity and ineffable candour'—(my eyes were growing moist)—'and,

without forgetting the perishable charms of the angel which God delivers into your hands, you will thank Heaven for the qualities, a hundredfold more precious and more lasting, which fill her heart and ornament her mind.' I burst into tears; never had our holy religion seemed more noble, more majestic, more persuasive to me. Ah! how senseless must those people be who forsake their churches, and whose minds are closed to the delicious raptures of a heart contemplating itself in God!

"We stood up; we exchanged the golden ring; and his Grace, with a slow and solemn voice, pronounced some Latin words, which I did not understand, but which affected me deeply nevertheless, for the prelate's white transparent hand seemed to lay a blessing on me. Meanwhile the censer, swung by childish hands, diffused its bluish fumes and sacred fragrance through the air. What a day that was, good heavens! My recollections are confused as to what came afterwards. I was dazzled, transported. I noticed, however, what a fright Louisa was in that bonnet with white roses. It is really singular how little taste some people have.

"The other day, as I was pointing out to George the contrast between such a marriage ceremony as this, and the pitiful formalities run through by the iron bedstead manufacturer, he answered, 'But, my love, you are perhaps not aware that the marriage ceremony at the mairie is performed *gratis*, whereas'— I laid my hand on his lips to prevent his continuing. I felt certain that he was going to blaspheme.

"*Gratis*, indeed, *gratis*? That is precisely what I think improper!"

V. Our heroine is married, but her adventures have not yet begun; and of the novel in three volumes which might be written concerning her, scarcely the first leaves have been turned. We will suppose, if you please, that the match she has made is a good one; she has not been sold to a dissolute old wretch for the sake of a title or a fortune, nor has she been entrapped to pay a gambler's debts; she likes her husband—nay, she is prepared to love him—and he, on the other side, honestly desirous of making his wife happy, looks forward, with the confidence of a man who has neglected no customary precaution, to a long life of domestic comfort and affectionate intimacy. The honeymoon has passed off satisfactorily; the bride has entered upon married life amidst all the excitement of new sights, new dresses, new pleasures, and new adulations; and the bridegroom has been duly enraptured with his new plaything, and duly observant of the attentions and self-sacrifices imposed upon him by his *rôle*. Notice that all this is assuming a great deal, but let it pass, and let us inquire what comes next. How will this couple settle down, and how will each arrange his life so as to suit the other's wants? The husband,

in the first place, is desirous of quiet. He does not indeed refuse to take his wife into society; it is natural, especially at first, that a young creature should be eager to dance, and show her evening dresses; but he performs these duties with the proviso that they be only temporary, and that, after the first year or so, they shall be succeeded by something very different. He did not get married with the notion of going to balls; he went to plenty of balls as a young bachelor, and indeed grew heartily sick of them. His conception of domestic life is that the wife shall stay at home and make the house comfortable. The husband has his business out of doors (nay, some of his pleasures too); he must go to his club, and see Mr. So-and-so, and talk politics; but throughout all this out-of-door activity there must run the comfortable consciousness that his wife is at her post, and that whenever he goes home he shall find her ready and expectant. He looks forward to the evenings in particular; not that he intends much conversation, for people who see each other every day have naturally not much to talk about, and women's topics are not the same as men's, and after dinner he is apt to feel a little drowsy, but he shall like to feel that she is there (a woman's presence has, like a fire, a cosy operation); and when he takes up a book, or perhaps begins to write, he will hear her light step about the room, or glance over at her graceful figure, slightly bent over her sewing, and know that he has company at hand whenever he chooses to make use of it.

Now this is a part which the young French wife is not inclined to play. Her previous life, having been exactly the reverse of that which her husband led as an unmarried man, has engendered in her contrary desires. He has been let loose, she has been pent up. He is rising from the feast of youth, with a stomach rather overloaded by all the dishes he has tasted; she has not yet sat down. She is full of curiosity, of eagerness, of vivacity; she means to be an irreproachable wife, but she means also to amuse herself, and she has no idea of Germanic submission. Stay at home in the evening? Why the evening is just the time when there is every reason to go out. Do tapestry by the fireside? No, thank you; she did plenty of tapestry when she was a young girl, and was overdosed with it. After all, what is the harm of going to parties, and dancing, and dressing, and enjoying one's-self? Has she not always been taught to consider this as the prerogative of married women? Whenever she was denied these amusements as a young girl, was it not with the understanding that she should enjoy them as a woman? Is she to be penned up all her youth with people older than herself? In that case she would have been happier in remaining at her convent. No; her friends are unanimous upon this point; she must not let herself be made a slave of—that would be good neither for her husband nor herself; and

a lady of her station has duties to society—yes, duties! which it would be *ridiculous* to neglect.

So she goes her round of gaieties, insatiable as at her age it is natural to be, and her husband, following her with the cloaks and shawls upon his arm, sees already his vision of domestic happiness grow paler in the distance. He tries to take patience; perhaps he attempts a mild expostulation. Our friend Lionel de Rias takes advantage of his wife's jealousy and tears (occasioned by her surprising him in the midst of a little flirtation which he was carrying on at one of the balls to which he had accompanied her), to expound, in a pretty little speech, the dangers of that social dissipation to which she was so prone:—

“‘You like society,’ he says to her; ‘your life, and consequently my own, is nothing but a perpetual ball. You dance at Paris in the winter, at the seaside in summer, at your country-house in autumn. You see no harm in it, and your conviction honours you; but trust my experience, if people went to parties with the sole object of dancing, nobody would go there after the age of twenty-two; the only crowded balls would be those of schoolboys or of schoolgirls, and reception-rooms in general would be locked up. Unfortunately, society has another kind of attraction: society is in reality an exchange of flirtations, and thus only it can stand. Dancing is generally a pretext and a facility for something else. What men seek in such circles, and what women seek also, is what is called a tender preoccupation—nay, it often happens that an interest of this kind is evoked in you without your seeking it: the result is brought about fatally—it is in the air; for it is inconceivable that a man who does not dance, who does not play at cards, and who is not an idiot, should spend three or four hours of an evening in a drawing-room, without experiencing the unwholesome temptations of idleness and tedium. Thus it may come to pass that, without ceasing to love you, I shall discover myself some of these days on the brink of infidelity without having desired it. As for you, my love, you are still engrossed by the innocent attractions of dress, of rapid motion, of the dance's whirl; but a day will come when these pleasures will seem stale even to yourself, unless they be spiced with a stronger sensation. In a word, shall I tell you to what kind of future we may look forward if we continue in our present way? It may be described in a couple of words: I shall be unfaithful to you; you will cry, you will forgive me. You will then be unfaithful to me; I shall not cry, and I shall not forgive you.’

“‘I will go to no more parties,’ murmured the young wife, wiping away two tears, which were drawn from her less by the idea of the sacrifice which she was making, than by the dry tone of her husband's language.”

But such engagements as these cannot be kept. The young wife, having no resource at home, is insensibly drawn back into

the vortex; the relationship between her husband and herself grows colder; he resumes, in part at least, the bachelor habits which he had laid aside; the wife feels herself aggrieved, neglected—her wedding-dream is at an end, and she plunges more than ever into society, to forget the void which has formed in her affections.

We stated at the outset that our considerations would only apply to the "upper ten thousand," the fashionable class. The reason for this separation is now obvious. In the lower and the middle class, the wife has an interest and an occupation in her husband's business, and if her mere school education is as superficial as that of her high-bred sisters, her practical preparation for life is incomparably superior. The daughter of a tradesman has seen her mother keep the books, inspect the warehouse, or attend the customers: when she marries a man of her own station, she will do the like. She will have an honest ambition, a respectable pre-occupation to keep her steady, and her husband will find in her a reliable companion. It matters not so much that she has not made a love match: she is united to her husband by a community of interests, and out of this, providing the disparity of character be not too great, there may grow up a genuine and durable attachment. The active bustling nature of a Frenchwoman fits her for this kind of union, and she shows to better advantage in it than in any other. Let us once more appeal to M. Graindorge; we cannot call a better witness:—

"An hour later I passed through the Rue des Lombards. Till midnight the young wife remains in a glass box keeping the books; she has a charcoal box at her feet, and fifteen hours at a stretch she does not budge. Molasses, leathers, chinaware, buyers, sellers, clerks—nay, even the housemaid—she has an eye to everything; her orders are precise, her accounts well kept; she is obeyed; she is a good lieutenant, often better than her captain. The man sometimes may be wheedled over; when he has spent his wrath his attention relaxes. If the opponent is insinuating, offers a good dinner, represents himself as a good fellow, straightforward and without malice, the other will probably be on the point of yielding and signing a bad bargain; but his wife makes a sign to him—he understands, he pauses:

"'That is to say . . . No . . . to-morrow. I will talk it over with my wife.' During the night she catechises him, and next morning he is encased in an armour of caution and new arguments.

"Suppose that he does not consult her. She steps out from behind her glass partition:

"'But, my love, you know very well that . . . ' She resumes herewith the discussion on her own account: the battlefield is reconquered by a charge of the light cavalry. She will stand fast for a whole hour; and her shrill voice, her intelligence whetted like a knife, will end by routing her antagonist. Wherever interests are at stake,

words have no hold upon her: her ideas are stuck in her brain like pins in her pincushion. A man's mind is accessible to reasoning; a woman's is not. I know several who have made mere clerks of their husbands—to the great advantage of the business withal: he, in shirt-sleeves, nails up the cases, goes on errands, and drinks a glass of something with good customers—she, commanding, dark-haired, dry, directs the factory, takes the important resolutions, decides that such and such a model is out of fashion and shall be sold off at a loss. She is in the button trade: she has just that kind of brain which is suited to invent the particular button which will set the fashion, or to issue a cheap article.”

Thus the radical cause of so many bad marriages among the upper classes, is the lack of any ground on which husbands and wives may meet and be true partners. The cause of disunion which we described above, namely, the fact that men marry to get out of society, and that women marry to get into it, is only a result; for, honestly, with the education they receive, what else should women marry for? Gustave Droz says somewhere that girls are prepared for marriage as some children are prepared for swimming, by the simple process of being chucked into deep water and left to scramble out as best they can. The simile would be truer still if such children had their arms and legs tied up before they were chucked in. Such education as French girls receive, is not only not a preparation for the wedded state—it is a positive disqualification for it. They are not taught to read, they are not taught to reason; they are launched into life without a single intellectual interest. The whole effort of their early training goes to fill their mind with puerilities and superstitions. As regards God, they are instructed to believe in relics and old bones; as regards man, they are instructed to believe in dress, in mannerisms, and coquetry. Their love of approbation, after being enormously developed, is bottled up and tied down until a husband is found to draw the cork. What else, then, can we look for but an explosion of frivolity? Can we expect that such a provision of coquettishness will be reserved for the husband's exclusive use? He will be tired of it in three months—unless it is tired of him before; and then the pent-up waters will forsake their narrow bed, and overflow the country far and wide.

Never before has the intellectual gap between man and woman been so great in France as it is now. Woman has not only stood still amidst the great onward movement of our century—she has positively retrograded. After having been man's companion throughout his long struggle of emancipation from the tyranny of the Church and the tyranny of the Crown, up to the period of the great Revolution, she has fallen back into childishness and superstition, just as if her capacity for progress, overtaxed, had

been broken and exhausted. We cannot enter here into the causes of this retrogression, but the fact is recognised by all the best observers. Read "Monsieur, Madame, et Bébé," the pretty book from which we quoted above, and see what kind of conversation is considered characteristic of two ladies sitting together over their needlework. If Monsieur loves Madame, his love is that of an adult being for a child: he listens to her prattle while he reads his newspaper, he obeys her caprices because she is pretty: his feeling for her is made up of tenderness, of pity, of curiosity, of sensual desire. Read Augier's, read Dumas' plays, and see whether the men who are represented as understanding women best, ever treat them otherwise than as beings essentially inferior, which must be led and managed for their own good, by those who know what strings to pull. Michelet himself, who has an enthusiastic tenderness for woman, prescribes for her, at least in her first stage of married life, as for an invalid child. Taine complains that in society, conversation (that boasted talent of the French!) is failing—the men, on one hand, being busied with their specialties, and the women, on the other, preoccupied by dress. The two sexes, having nothing to say to each other, are mutually bored unless they flirt. But we never should have done were we to quote all the evidence which we could adduce on this head.

And the children,—some reader may inquire,—may not the children supply that missing bond of interest between the husband and the wife? Undoubtedly they might. But, in the first place, large families are looked upon unfavourably in France, both as a cruelty to the wife, and as an injustice to the first children, whose patrimony is thus diminished; and, in the second place, the children are not brought up at home. When Madame de Rias finds herself to be a mother for the first time, she takes her new duties so seriously that Lionel much congratulates himself upon the change. She declines henceforward all invitations to go out; she receives her friends, reclining on her sofa with an air of languor. In a word, she accepts her new part as a necessary and desired accession to her dignity as a young wife, and enters into it with all the ardour of an actress who in a new character expects to elicit new sympathies and new applause. But when a son and heir is born, Madame FitzGerald intervenes, and proves to Lionel, with those specious arguments to which a man has no reply, that the health, the beauty of her daughter would be endangered by the natural functions of maternity. The child is therefore intrusted to a nurse. Madame de Rias, recovering from her confinement with admirable celerity, returns to society with a sharpened appetite (without on that account neglecting to watch over her baby); and when M. de Rias, disappointed in his hope of a quiet life at home, recurs to the remedy which he had found successful once,

Madame FitzGerald sternly warns him that he is killing her daughter; and Madame de Rias, far from using the same precautions as before, feels herself sufficiently robust to continue her gaieties up to the verge of her confinement, and thus convinces her husband, without altercation or reproaches, that he will gain nothing by his Machiavellic combinations.

We shall not follow the young wife into all the complications which may spring from the disparity between her husband's needs and hers. We have aimed at delineating the preparatory stages which lead to married life, and the general causes which make households what they are, rather than at delineating married life itself. Here, the determining circumstances are too numerous and varied to admit of any very fruitful generalisation. It is evident that, when once started on the road which we have indicated, our poor heroine will have considerable difficulty in guarding herself from serious reproach. The incompatibility of two characters which have no pleasures and no aims in common, will soon engender coldness; that coldness will produce estrangement; and that estrangement will soon amount to a virtual rupture of the conjugal bond. The two spouses will continue to live under the same roof, for appearances must be kept up as long as possible; but each will go his way, with a secret resentment towards the other, and (unless the individual be wholly frivolous) with a void at the heart which cannot legitimately be filled. The children are at school, Madame's parents have returned to their home in the provinces, and Monsieur is rumoured to spend some of his time with a little actress of the Palais Royal. What, under such circumstances, can be expected of the wife? The more she loved her husband once, or the more she fancied that she loved him, the greater is her present danger. What can preserve her? Religion? Her religion consists in devotional practices; there is nothing here to fill the heart: Thirty years hence it will be different; she will go to the confessional every day, and consult her abbé on all the minutiae of her life; he will dine at her table twice a week, and she will prepare for him the dishes he likes best. She will embroider stoles and altar-covers for him; perhaps she will be secretary of the "Société du petit Agneau," or cashier of "Les Dames de la Douleur." At any rate, she will be busy and happy in her bustle. Her salvation is secure; her abbé is her surety for that.* God would be ungrateful indeed, now that she does so much for Him, if He did not overlook the little errors of her youth. Her work suits her to a nicety. She dresses now for church as she dressed for society before; instead of crushing her rivals by her elegance in a ballroom, she triumphs now by collecting more money than they when M. le Curé preaches his charity sermon. Ah! the Catholic clergy understand the instrument they

* "L'abbé me répond de tout," as some French lady said.

play upon; their power has a deep and durable foundation! But all this is of slight avail to our heroine at twenty-five; the time has not yet come. She may indeed resort to devotional practices as a remedy or as a safeguard, but her heart is still too young and fresh to rest content with them. "Out of one hundred young wives," says Balzac, "who resume practices of devotion hitherto neglected, at least seventy prove by this return to God that they have become unfaithful, or are on the point of becoming so." There remains as a preservative the regard for public opinion, and we have seen that this regard is extremely powerful in France. But public opinion on this point is hampered in its operation by several disadvantages. In the first place, being based chiefly on externals, it is more likely to engender the semblance of virtue than virtue itself. "Be prudent; do not compromise yourself, avoid scandal;" such will be its principal injunctions; for the rest, you may do pretty much as you please. And, in truth, what other kind of morality can public opinion be expected to enforce, in a country where so many marriages are obviously and grossly contrary to nature? What kind of fidelity can be expected of a woman who is married at twenty to a millionaire of sixty? Even if she do not transgress the law in point of fact, she will transgress it in spirit, since it is contrary to nature that her affections should fasten upon a man who is so completely an alien to her own stage of development. It will be said that French girls do not, as a rule, marry men of sixty. True, but the mere exception proves fatal. Each infraction of the law of marriage widens the breach, until at last nothing remains of the wall. Men are more consistent in the East; their marriages are just as monstrous, but they shut up their wives.

Moreover, public opinion in France is embarrassed by a flagrant contradiction. While it fain would encourage chastity in women, it ridicules chastity in men. We have already pointed out that Frenchmen marry late, and that at least the ten best years of their youth, the years during which they are most dangerous to society, are spent in celibacy. One reason for this is of a pecuniary nature, and need not be explained; but there exists another reason, believed to be equally important, and far more characteristic of the nation. Rousseau has said, "There must always be some season for licentiousness; it is a bad leaven, which must ferment sooner or later." We shall not discuss his assertion, although we do not believe one word of it; our present purpose is merely to point out that it is credited in France, and that, strangely enough, the inference derived from it is that a young man had better compromise other people's marriages by his licentiousness than compromise his own. We shall conclude this paragraph with a quotation from Balzac,* which the reader will do well to meditate.

* *La Physiologie du Mariage.*

“Suppose a young man of twenty-eight, who has scrupulously kept his purity, to enter the most Jansenistic drawing-room you please, will not the most virtuous woman present congratulate him ironically upon his courage; will not the austere magistrate that ever sat upon a bench wag his head derisively; will not the ladies screen their faces with their fans to hide their smiles? And when the heroic victim leaves the room, what a deluge of mockeries upon his head! There is no greater shame in France than to be cold, abstemious, indifferent to women.”

When we consider all these things, our wonder is, not that so many marriage vows are broken, but that any should be kept!*

VI. There remains for us to notice the position of French husbands with respect to infidelity. And here it must be admitted that the law consecrates some curious anomalies.

We have already pointed out that a vast majority of marriages in France are marriages of interest—that is to say, commercial bargains. This is true, not only of the idle class, but of the working classes; it is true throughout. Does a good salesman wish to set up in business on his own account? he looks for a wife whose dowry will be his working capital. Does a landowner think of improving his estate? he takes a wife who will enable him to drain, or whose acres will dovetail into his own. A lawyer marries in order that his father-in-law may push him in politics or help him on to the bench. An architect marries because his wife's first cousin will get him employment in the city works. A man of fashion marries because his recent losses on the turf would otherwise oblige him to retrench his little comforts. It is a barter, nothing else; so much professional prospects against so much ready cash; a rich old maiden aunt against a seat in council; a coat of arms against three men-servants in livery. The mutual claims are weighed, compared, discussed, by the two notaries in the study, while the suitor in his dress-coat and cream-coloured gloves is paying respectful attention to the young lady in the parlour. Neither party is the other's dupe: the gentleman, when talking to his friends about his matrimonial prospects, will always mention the “solid” advantages first; and the lady, on the other hand, can tell to a centime what her dowry will be, and has often discussed with her friends in the convent, what equivalent may be looked for on the other side. “Last Thursday, at the club,” says Taine, “B— was telling three or four of us of his approaching marriage. ‘A nice-looking girl—respectable—well brought up—good family;

* Stendhal says, the fidelity of women in marriages where there is no love, is probably a thing contrary to nature. See the chapter on marriage in his thoughtful work “*De l'Amour*.”

we shall have 40,000 francs a year between us to begin house-keeping.' We congratulate him.

"He steps out and meets an old comrade of his, Maxime A——, just getting into his carriage in a great hurry, who calls out to him as he drives off, 'I say, old fellow, have you heard that I am going to be married! Four millions, my boy, four millions!'

"B—— comes back to us, and relates the incident with a long face. 'My position is as good as Maxime's. Hang it, I have been over-hasty!'"

Here, then, is one aspect of the marriage institution, and we may add that it is the modern as well as the predominant aspect. Two persons of different sex unite in order to live more comfortably than either could do with his single resources; an act is drawn up, providing in what manner the common fund shall be administered, &c., or, in default of such an act, the law provides its regulations; it is a business partnership, with this particularity, that the children which may be born of it, will constitute for the firm a special kind of liability. The agreement is signed and witnessed in presence of the civil authorities, whose sanction is alone required; and hence we might naturally expect that this agreement should be subject to the common law, and be dissolvable by mutual consent (with due provision for liabilities incurred), or dissolvable by the tribunals for breach of faith on either side, just as in the case of any other partnership.

Two facts, however, contrast strangely with this view; we shall discuss them briefly in succession. In the first place, divorce is unobtainable, whatever be the plea on which it is demanded. On what grounds is it withheld? We confess ourselves unable to understand them, since we can hardly imagine that the commonplaces which are generally recurred to in discussions on this subject, should pass for arguments in the eyes of statesmen and experienced jurists. Thus, it is said that the marriage bond is one of the last bulwarks of morality, and that it is therefore important not to weaken it. But, in that case, why allow married couples to obtain legal separation of their persons and their property? If public morality is subserved by compelling two persons, who inspire each other with hatred and disgust, to remain under the same roof, then the existing law is just as immoral as divorce would be. Nay, more so, for it allows these two persons to separate without recovering their freedom, so that neither, although impelled by nature to contract other ties, can legitimately do so. Is it not evident that such an arrangement, by rendering illegitimate connections more excusable, is immoral in the extreme? We can only look upon it as a vestige of Church influences, for it is utterly inconsistent with the civil nature of the marriage contract. It is but fair to add,

that many of the best thinkers in France have pleaded for a reinstatement of divorce, and that it will probably not be long ere they have numbers on their side. The following extract, from "L'Homme Femme," by Alexandre Dumas, seems to us to be unanswerable; the two cases are founded on fact:—

"A young man meets a young girl, surrounded by a family which public opinion declares to be most honoured and most honourable. The young girl pleases the young man; he solicits her hand, and marries her. The girl is with child since a period of two months, by a lackey. The worthy family, who were aware of this, took legal advantage of the reliance which was placed on their assurances, to burden an honest fellow with this progeniture. The husband applies to the courts of law, who answer, 'We'll draw up a disavowal of paternity, and separate you from this wretched creature.' 'Then I may marry another?' 'No; not unless your wife dies first.' 'And if I want to live with somebody that I can love, and have children that shall bear my name?' 'Impossible.' 'But I have done no wrong.' 'Worse luck for you!' 'It's an abomination!' 'There's no help for it.'

"A young girl, most honourable, meets with a young man, who, as the saying goes, has the best references. The young man is admitted to pay his court, he is accepted, the contract is signed, the marriage concluded. An hour after issuing from church, before the wedding meal is over, the young man steps out, and is seen no more. He has absconded with the dowry, leaving behind him a penniless maiden as his wife. She applies to the law, who answers, 'True, madam, you married a swindler.' 'Well, then, give me back my liberty.' 'No.' 'What must I do?' 'Wait.' 'Wait for what?' 'For his return.' 'And if he does not return?' 'Wait for his death.' 'And if he does not die?' 'Worse luck for you.' 'And if I love another man?' 'You will be dishonoured.' 'And if I have children, for, after all, Nature intended me to be a mother?' 'They will be bastards?' 'It's an abomination, for I am innocent.' 'There's no help for it.'

"But the law might add: 'We have found extenuating circumstances for incendiaries, assassins, parricides; and on certain anniversaries, when they have behaved well for a certain time, we restore them to liberty.'

"'Complete liberty?'

"'Complete.'

"'Oh, indeed!'

"Well, frankly, this husband swindled by a family, this wife robbed and abandoned by a villain, these two victims have said true—'tis an abomination!"

The second point to which we alluded is the fact that a husband is held excusable for killing his wife when he surprises her in infidelity. We may dispense ourselves with quoting evidence to

substantiate this fact, as cases in point are in everybody's memory. The license of human butchery conceded in such circumstances is founded on the social fiction that a husband's honour being inseparably bound up with his wife's virtue, any infraction of that virtue constitutes an outrage on the husband which justifies the blindest resentment on his part. We say "a social fiction," since the notion that one person's honour can be in another person's hands, is as great an absurdity as ever was invented. It is true, indeed, that this absurdity has for its excuse a social utility of the highest order, since, if the wife's fidelity be questioned, the husband may doubt whether his children are his own, and his solicitude for them be turned to coldness or aversion. But a social utility, however great, is not sufficient of itself to get an absurdity believed. The only real justification of the husband's fury in the case alluded to, is a breach of trust. If the husband has trusted in his wife implicitly, if he has esteemed her, if he has believed in her, and if he finds himself betrayed, then indeed a case may be made out for him. But who does not see that in marriages of interest, such as we have described, the plea of breach of trust is utterly preposterous? What kind of trust can there be between two beings who have chosen each other for their money or their influence, whose brief honeymoon, if ever it existed, has been speedily succeeded by indifference and neglect, who hardly appear together save in public, whose affections, whose pleasures, whose principles even lie apart? If the husband plays the part of an Othello here, his indignation merits no excuse, it is the selfish fury of a brute. Even the plea of social utility has only a minimum value, for in France, where marriages are rarely fruitful after the first few years, there is less danger than in any other country, of illegitimate children being introduced into the family.

That husbands, under these circumstances, should be allowed to vent the murderous instincts of their wounded vanity upon unfaithful wives, when they have never respected marriage vows themselves (either their own or those of others), is one proof more how little real justice can be expected for one sex, when legislators, judges, and juries are all taken from the other.

It must be admitted, however, that on this point, as on others, public opinion is progressing, and that marital rights are being curtailed to suit the modern marriage system. It will be understood, of course, that the progress we speak of has reference only to consistency. Being given the reduction of marriage to a commercial transaction, let us at least have the benefits as well as the drawbacks of such an institution, and do away with the mad passions, the wild jealousies, the barbarous acts which belong to other times and to different conditions of existence. Let us be

peaceable, as becomes our condition; let us have our Board of conjugal trade, our Exchange, with its stock of marriageable men and women, our fluctuations in the price of *gens de robe* or *gens d'épée*, of ugly heiresses or of pretty widows, our inventories, our claims for damages, and our dissolutions of partnership; but, for heaven's sake, let us lay aside our daggers! What business have daggers in a counting-house? The French, who are (according to their own report) the most logical nation upon earth, cannot yet be pronounced perfectly consistent in these matters. But, we repeat, they have progressed. When we take up Balzac's "Physiology," and read the rules which he lays down for husbands, we measure the gap which separates his time from ours. It is true that Balzac does not believe in his own system: he exposes it half in earnest, half in jest; but not the less was it the system of his generation, and especially of the generations which had gone before. A husband must not snore, he must not wear a nightcap, he must dissemble his gout or his rheumatism with the firmness of a Red Indian; he must bribe his porter, bribe the lady's-maid if possible; he must arrange loopholes so as to watch the enemy's movements; he must carefully note the position of his furniture; he must make a show of perfect confidence while he is brimful of suspicion. In a word, he must play the part of a hypocrite, a traitor, and a spy every day of his life, without even the slight compensation of feeling that his labours will not be in vain.* *Cui bono?* a modern Frenchman might say if he were philosophically inclined. The treasure which you are guarding has no value when thus guarded. The diamond upon which you set such store is not a diamond, but a dewdrop; close your hand upon it, and it is gone! If your wife is virtuous, your watchfulness is an impertinence; if she is not virtuous, she is not worth your care. Look at me; † what an easy life I lead compared with yours! I married in order to settle down and be respectable. People get married as they get vaccinated; it is an evil, if you please, but an evil which dispenses you from greater evils. Madame Leverdet is of a good family, and the income which she added to my own, enables us to live comfortably, and leaves me free to pursue my scientific studies as I please. I wanted to have a daughter; Madame Leverdet gave me one in the first year of our union. Now, she goes her own way, as I go mine. You say there is an idle report of something wrong between her and M. des Targettes, who comes here every day.

* It is noteworthy that even now-a-days a husband is thought justified in breaking open a letter written by his wife, if he expects by doing so to obtain evidence of her infidelity. See "L'Etrangère," by Alexandre Dumas.

† See "L'Ami des Femmes," by Alexandre Dumas.

Bah! who can escape calumny? M. des Targettes is a pleasant companion; he plays at *besique* with me in the evening, and I should be sorry to lose him. Why, I sent away my cook the other day on his account; he complained that our dinners were becoming worse and worse; and so in truth they were. Old friends are privileged, you know; besides, he is my daughter's godfather. Ah! you sigh, my friend; you say that marriage is the heaviest chain which can be hung about a man? You forget that there are at least two persons to sustain its weight,—two persons, sometimes three!

VII. We cannot tarry to point out all the consequences of the system we have now exposed, but there is one such consequence which is too important to be omitted. In a recent comedy of Alexandre Dumas ("Monsieur Alphonse"), the husband of the piece, discovering that his wife has a daughter born of an illegitimate connection anterior to her marriage (which daughter she has since brought up in secrecy and trembling, but with unwavering solicitude), forgives her with these words, "*Tu es mère, tu es bonne mère, tu es sacrée!*" To unreflecting foreigners, this phrase may seem simply a piece of French flourish; to an observer, on the contrary, it is replete with meaning. In Germanic countries, a husband may judge his wife by her conduct towards himself; in France, he is a fool if he so judges, for nature, in French marriages, has been turned out of doors by civilisation, and the conjugal relation is sterile, artificial, and absurd. By what, then, must he judge her? By her behaviour towards her children, for this is the only natural bond in which he can observe her. If she is a good mother, all may yet be well; she is worthy of respect; her offences are but venial. Rise, then, and be forgiven, poor woman! thou hast erred more through thy misfortune than thy fault. And Frenchwomen are in truth good mothers; they love their children not wisely (they are too ignorant, too badly trained themselves, for that), but they love them well. All French writers concur in exalting maternity, in recognising thankfully and tenderly the devotion of woman to her offspring. "*Tombe aux pieds de ce sexe à qui tu dois ta mère,*" is a verse of Legouv's, which is but the poetical exaggeration of a national sentiment. Alexandre Dumas, who judges women so severely in other respects, declares that it is by the remembrance of his mother that man, for the first time, is brought to believe in the immortality of the soul, since it seems impossible that such love as hers should ever perish. And, conversely, French sons are good sons; more attentive, more respectful towards their mothers, than the generality of sons in other countries. Public opinion is implacable in its condemnation of

unfilial behaviour. In a word, the natural affections, which are repressed and discouraged between husband and wife, seek an outlet, and at least a partial compensation, in other family ties. The bonds of relationship are, we think, stronger in France than they are in England. If a member of the family misbehaves, he is not cut off by the rest, as happens so frequently with us; he is expostulated with, he is punished temporarily, but his name is not struck off from the family books, and his claims as a member are not quashed. In the provinces (we have observed this especially in the South of France), each family forms a kind of clan, into which it is difficult for an outsider to penetrate; the members of the community intermarry, and as the ramifications of relationship are extensive, little need is felt for social intercourse with the external world. Michelet complains that when a young girl marries, and settles in the place where she was born and bred, the husband is gradually pushed away into the background, while the young wife is reabsorbed into her family. We admit that this system opposes a very serious obstacle to that education of the wife by the husband which Michelet has so much at heart, and which, indeed, would be so desirable if only it were feasible. But taking things as they are, is not this reabsorption of the wife into her own circle the best chance of morality and of happiness for her? Ruth's saying to Boaz can only apply to love matches, properly so called; it has no relevancy here.

It were well, indeed, if the other consequences flowing from the mode of marriage we have attempted to portray, were all as innocuous as this. But what will become of the husband when he has surrendered his wife either to her lovers or to her relatives? Will he turn monk at thirty-five? Or will he become a new focus of immorality for the society in which he lives—a corrupter of other men's wives, a consumer in the market of saleable pleasures? The answer cannot be dubious. As a schoolboy of sixteen, the ambition which most tickled his vanity was to be successful with the fair sex. His older comrades boasted before him of their exploits, and fired his breast with a noble emulation. To follow a woman in the streets was already an interesting adventure; to sup with an actress was an achievement worthy of the Capitol. On Sunday, when he issued from the gates of his Lyceum, as dandified and smart as the uniform allows, he would try to affect a conquering air. *Que voulez-vous?* He has no cricket-matches or boat-races to think of, so this is the way in which he asserts his manliness. When he was sent to the university, his father was solicitous, not that his son should abstain from "liaisons," but that all his liaisons should be short. "Amuse yourself, but keep clear of attachments;" such is the paternal injunction. In the old times, when a young man entered society, his mother's hope was

that some woman of fashion might take him in hand to polish his manners and give him his finishing education. Balzac's novels give abundant evidence of this. Now-a-days, such connections are looked upon by both sides as dangerous and unprofitable; they involve too much subjection, too much constancy; the finishing education is bestowed by lower orders in the social hierarchy. At twenty-five it may be considered as completed; the young man is as selfish, as sceptical, as prudent with his money, as a fond parent can wish. Finally, when he is tired of bachelor life, and has exhausted its pleasures, he marries, as we have seen; but time soon begins to hang heavy upon his hands, and in a couple of years he has exhausted marriage too. For what, henceforth, can such a man be fit? Virtuous women, if he could resort to any, would bore him. He must seek the company of courtesans, whose sauciness, whose daring, whose reckless extravagance, are the only spice which stimulates his jaded palate. Thus the vicious circle is completed. The bad seed has borne its fruit; the facile amours of twenty send in their ruinous reckoning at forty; and woman, degraded, despised, ejected from her proper place, takes a terrible revenge for all the evil she has suffered. "Society," says Alexandre Dumas,* is "threatened with destruction; no household is secure from the dissolute invaders; they seat themselves at every board; they are like the locusts of which Moses said, 'They shall fill our houses, the houses of our servants, and of all the Egyptians.' 'No matter, let them come; they can destroy nothing but what is worthy of destruction; they will rid us of the ruins and the rubbish which would hinder a new society from arising out of the old. Their mission is to destroy in the society of our day the element which has proved fatal to all societies gone by, the most pernicious element existing—the idle-handed! When they shall have eaten up inheritance, property will renew itself by labour; when they shall have decomposed our families, better families will constitute themselves through love. They will furnish, together with their victims, the manure needed by the social soil for its mysterious germs. When there is nothing more to prey upon, they will die of inanition, and woman will reappear under a new form."

We must conclude; for, much as there remains to say, our article has already been carried to an unusual and undesirable length. As we glance back over these pages, we feel that any final verdict on our part would be impertinent. Our business, in this case, is to describe and to explain: the condemnation (if condemnation be needed) is contained in the description. A phase of

* See the preface to "*L'Ami des Femmes*." We have considerably abridged the passage in translating.

civilisation which is the result of a national development extending throughout centuries, is not like a child which can be sent supperless to bed when it is naughty. We shall not, therefore, inveigh against the French: let us rather look to ourselves, and learn a lesson from our neighbours' errors. The cardinal error, the prime mover of all the evils we have pointed out, lies in the education of women. We are not speaking merely of the work of governesses and school-teachers; we are speaking of the pressure exercised by society to fix women in one sphere of activity to the exclusion of all others. The popular notion being that women are intended by nature to be wives and mothers, nothing else, and as they must be wives before they are mothers, the whole effort of their training goes to make them *pleasing*, in order that men may be attracted to marry them. Furthermore, as they are to marry very early, it follows naturally that they must please by those attractions which are most powerful in youth, namely, sexual attractions. Hence their attention is concentrated upon their person, their dress, and all the provocations of coquettishness. Their mind remains void; they advance in years without acquiring those qualities, of slower growth, which alone can adorn maturity; and when they have captured a husband, they find themselves utterly unfit for companionship with him. Nay, they are even unfit to nurse their children, since their delicate and unhealthy kind of beauty (the only qualification they possess) would be impaired thereby. Their children, therefore, are taken away; and as the mothers are exonerated by their fortune (we cannot say "good-fortune") from household cares, as they have no intellectual pleasures, nor rational pursuits of any kind, they are thrown back upon the only employment for which they have been fitted, namely, the capturing of husbands. They grow old in flirtation and frivolity; they fall into the hands of a clergy who take advantage of their ignorance and encourage their superstition; the intellectual gap between men and women grows wider and wider; and the mothers, transmitting their habits and their tastes to their daughters, prepare a new generation even worse than the first.

Never was the need that women should be thoroughly instructed, so urgent as it is now. The intellectual advance of man, which has been so rapid since the last century, calls for a corresponding advance in woman, who is destined to be his companion. Sciences are becoming so numerous and complex, the accumulation of facts is so enormous, that the amount of training which must be gone through simply in order to take an interest in and converse upon the great questions of the day, is very considerable. Those persons who imagine that women can be subjected to such training with real profit, without the prospect or the possibility of subsequently using these acquirements otherwise than in their narrow house-

holds, have certainly no adequate conception how much is due to the incentive of ambition, even in the case of men. We should advocate the admission of women to the professions hitherto monopolised by men, were it on no other ground but this. It is not necessary that a majority of women should really enter these professions; the mere fact that the professions are open to them, will raise the level of their general education. Unless this be done, we shall never be entirely safe from the danger which has proved so fatal to France, that our women, sinking gradually below the intellectual level of our men, should one day grow to resemble those "charming yet terrible little carnivora," of which Alexandre Dumas speaks, "for whom men sacrifice their fortunes, their honour, and their lives, and whose sole preoccupation, amid the universal carnage, is to cut their dresses one day after the pattern of umbrellas, next day after the pattern of a bell."

As regards the present state of things in France, we can only say, with M. de Ryons in "L'Ami des Femmes:"—

"I can understand marriage for women—they have no other means of getting their livelihood, and they are dishonoured without it; but for men, and especially for me . . . Never!"

ART. III.—CHARLES KINGSLEY.

Charles Kingsley: His Letters and Memoirs of his Life.
 Edited by his WIFE. London: Henry S. King & Co.
 Fourth Edition. 1877.

FOR some twenty years, which have but lately ended, Charles Kingsley was the most popular clergyman in England. Others have been equally loved, or revered, or notorious, each in his own circle, some in more than one circle, but no man ever appealed to so large numbers, and to so different classes. Dr. Newman, Dr. Martineau, Dean Stanley, and in a far less degree Mr. Haweis or Mr. Stopford Brooke, all represent living forces; Robertson's fame has greatly widened since his death; but none of these names represent at all the sort of influence which Kingsley exerted. He was not a profound or subtle thinker, though he was so eager and so various; he was not a Protestant Pope to his own co-religionists; he did not veil his conclusions even from himself in a cloud of graceful words, but always tried to define sharply what at the moment he believed; he never cast himself on the stream of his eloquence to say haphazard all that passed through his brain, in whatever words

came readiest; he did not become the preacher of culture only, rather than of a gospel to the poor. But he was equally at home in the pulpit of the Queen's Chapel or of the Abbey, and in an obscure church delivering the message of the Church to working men. His large genial nature attracted alike the princes who strove to alleviate the sufferings of his last hours, and the gipsies who strewed, and still strew, flowers on his grave. Now and then in his later years it was said that Kingsley had become a courtier, and forgotten his zeal for reform and for the poor; but the story of his life as given in these volumes is a sufficient refutation if any was needed. We doubt if it was ever really believed, for there was no sign that the large trust which had been given him was ever withdrawn; men of the people were his correspondents and friends to the last.

Yet his personal fascination must have been very great, for it may be admitted there were facts which, till explained by that white light which beats on a dead man's face, seem to militate against his consistency. He ceased to agitate and to appear on Radical platforms; he became a Court Chaplain and a Canon of Westminster; he rewrote that portion of "Alton Locke" which had reflected on the manners of the undergraduates at Cambridge. And although all this may bear a quite satisfactory aspect when rightly understood, there is much also which would have ruined great portions of the popularity of a man less beloved. In the controversy with Dr. Newman he was signally worsted, and all but a few felt he had made a grave mistake, yet he offered no *amende* to the great man whom he had attacked quite without adequate justification. He came forward on a public occasion to justify the deeds of Eyre in Jamaica; he who had been the fierce assailant of the doctrine of everlasting damnation, joined with the rigid Church party in upholding the Athanasian Creed. Yet, as we think, he never lost the love of a friend, or was counted by any who knew him as willingly and consciously unfaithful to the Liberal cause.

We will try to see what this man was; but first a few words are needful concerning the book in which Mrs. Kingsley has enshrined the memories of her husband's life.

The very great demand for it would seem to be an answer to the criticism that it is too long and too sombre; yet we think the book would have been better had Mrs. Kingsley had the courage to sacrifice many a letter beautiful in itself but nearly the duplicate of another which is also given. For Kingsley, like most men of intense and eager nature, was very full of whatever subject most interested him, and he poured it out on all. If he were reading a poem which struck him, it is quoted in many letters; its words are dragged in suitably or not; and his very

eagerness leads him to be diffuse, recurring to the same point to correspondent after correspondent. When a cheap and popular edition is produced, the best, but only the best, of his utterances on each subject should be recorded, and the book would be equally shortened and improved. More than one of Kingsley's friends recognises his joyousness and humour, but little is allowed to appear in the work itself. Mrs. Kingsley shows us her husband overtaxed, out of health, often despondent, full of care; and no doubt there is truth in the picture; but, on the whole, he had a life in which the joys were many, especially to one who had so keen delight in nature and in home, whose children were healthy and happy, and whose wife was all that this book shows her to be. It was perhaps inevitable that somewhat of her own present depression in her loss should overshadow the book; she was, moreover, anxious to show that the poet, novelist, sportsman, was first and before all things a deeply, enthusiastically, passionately religious man; yet none the less do we sometimes crave to have the ring of frank laughter made more audible to us, and catch more of the sunlight which slept on Eversley lawn and sparkled on the waves of Torbay.

Again, we should have been glad if we could somewhat more have seen Kingsley at work on his novels and poems, have heard more of how the former grew, the incidents that suggested them, the places and the characters from which and whom they were drawn, so far as this might have been done without offence. We fancy that Tom Thuruall was known to many who knew the Kingsley family, and the prototype of Sandy Mackaye is unmistakable. We would fain have been told how far these were conscious portraits. One other drawback to the work is that we have too many testimonials. *Laudari a laudatis* is all very well; so also is it well that Kingsley should have been described by his son, his pupil, and one or two old friends. But there are too many letters, which, if they were presented as testimonials to a living man, would at once be eliminated as of no value, and, while dull in themselves, they do not add to our sense of Kingsley's worth. Yet, after all, we have only great thanks for the book Mrs. Kingsley has given us. If in some respects a less tender hand and less adoring heart might have presented what we wanted to know with more artistic skill, none could have so painted her husband as she knew him, and wished us to know him, the believing Christian, the devoted parish priest, the tender husband, the affectionate father, companion, and guide of his children. She has drawn him as many did not know him, and to whom this unveiling of his life has been a very great gain.

We assume that our readers have read, or will read, Kingsley's Life, or as much of it as may appeal to their

interest and curiosity as they turn its pages. We need not recite the few facts of his uneventful life, but will endeavour to estimate his influence on his own and the coming generation, his place in English life and English literature. His work, therefore, must be studied in a threefold character—that of a theologian, novelist, and poet.

We purposely omit politician, for, so far as he considered the subject of politics at all, he did so only through theology, and he had no care for any large and general questions of statesmanship. For a very considerable period, and that the one in which he was interesting himself actively in the condition of the working classes, he took in no daily newspaper, and the "Spectator," then under the editorship of Mr. Rintoul, was his only weekly journal. He seems to have had political instincts, but no political principles, and these instincts drew him in two different directions. First, hereditarily, he was sprung on the one side from a good old county family, and, on the other, from West Indian slaveholders; he had, therefore, much of the feudal lord's feeling combined with the pride of a dominant race. Loyalty ran in his blood, and all the Creole nature sprang to the front when he heard of the rising in Jamaica. The strong bias of Toryism was long counteracted by his intense sympathy with individual suffering. He could and did realise the wants of the poor—chill penury, insufficient wages, a large part of which, in town-work, was swallowed up by middlemen; he could not realise the larger misery which would result from kingly families having the power to rule, and from the Eyres repressing rebellion, themselves unchecked. Therefore, when he saw sorrow, he fought against it with such weapons as he had at hand; it was by an accident that they were those used by Radicals, and that his mental protests against wrong-doing expressed themselves in Radical language. Indeed, when the sufferings of humanity are concerned, what other tongue is there to use than that in which all reformers have spoken? But the action he then took, and the words he spoke, were aside from his proper work, which was that of religious teacher; he was before all things a priest, and, when once the strong excitement was passed which drew him away to become a Christian Socialist, his hereditary tendencies inclined him to a certain lofty but always beneficent rule of the lower orders by the higher. These being his political instincts, he satisfied the contradictory feeling of equality, which had been developed in him, by his deep power of sympathy, by his conception of the great theological kingdom, in which the equality of men before God by no means upset their inequalities in regard to each other.

Kingsley's theology was always interesting, very incoherent
[Vol. CVII. No. CXXII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LI. No. II. 2 B

and illogical, founded on a basis with which reason had little to do, in which tradition and emotion played almost equal parts, but the superstructure was one reared with much common sense. From a creed which logically and severely included them all, he rejected many doctrines which were harsh and cruel. He held, as we have seen, the Athanasian Creed, while rejecting eternal damnation, and used the account of the conquest of Canaan to prove the exceeding love of God. The Canaanitish nations had filled up the measure of their iniquity, and were to be put out of the way; how far more merciful and loving of God to give them into the hands of man than to kill them by the brute forces of nature; how much better to die by massacre than by, for instance, an earthquake, as of Lisbon; and to the slaughterers was a great lesson taught, that they were God's agents, and were not to carry out their own lusts and desires. This is no caricature of a series of papers called "Bible Politics; or, God Justified to the People."

But, however illogical, his preaching and ministrations were an incalculable comfort to many, who by him were encouraged to live manly, pure, self-restrained lives, sustained by that which still is, to the great majority, the only stay. He fostered that Broad Church theology which, utterly inadequate as a resting-ground, has yet been to so many a passage from bondage into freedom; and destitute himself of the critical spirit, he treated the Bible in a free yet reverent manner, which prepared others for the conclusions of modern research. Profoundly penetrated with the conviction that the Bible and science would be found to be at one, with an eager admiration for nature and a love for physical science, he never discouraged or flouted research, but, on the contrary, aided it in every way. His favourite studies were geology and botany, rather in detail than in wide sweeps of knowledge. He sat at the feet of and encouraged others to learn from Darwin; but, intent on the specimens on the lecture table as it were, he did not follow the motions of the teacher's baton pointing far beyond.

In the controversy with Dr. Newman, there can be no doubt that Kingsley strengthened his adversary's hand at the time, but, as a rule, all that he said on the Roman controversy was well and wisely spoken. Some of the most direct and vigorous letters in these volumes are on the Roman question, and as against that side, from the religious Protestant standpoint, they are admirable. To us, perhaps, their arguments may seem to make against more than Rome alone.

Far in excess, however, of the numbers who knew, or through this book will know, Charles Kingsley as a theologian, are those who knew him as a writer of fiction. The time comes to most

people when all but a very few novels of the highest art pall upon them, and we confess that we do not re-read Kingsley with very great delight. Neither do we hear men now talk of his novels as though they were much in the hands of this generation; but there can be no doubt that for a time he was the most popular novelist in England. Few men since Walter Scott have succeeded in England in making historical novels readable. But Kingsley did, and "Hypatia" and "Westward Ho" are not only excellent in plot, with careful character-drawing and exquisite writing, but the local colour is admirably caught and kept. In fact, one of the faults we should be inclined to find with both these works is, that they are too carefully studied—there is a sense of oppression in the laboured minuteness; we long for a daring Shaksperian anachronism, such as "ordnance shot off" in the days of Hamlet, or an honest violation of geography, such as a sea-coast of Bohemia. In these novels Kingsley proved himself to have one great quality of a poet—he saw by his mind the scenes in which his characters were placed. Those who know the climate and aspect of Alexandria and the Desert, and of the tropics, are amazed at the great accuracy of the word-painting. Not "At Last" itself is truer to the scenery of South America than is "Westward Ho," written while the scenes were only those of vision and of hope. But beyond the word-painting—so attractive while fresh, so apt to weary in the re-reading—there was another reason for the great popularity of these books, a reason which time weakens. They were all novels with a purpose, and wholly intelligible only while their subject is before the mind of the audience. We need specify only some of the more remarkable. "Yeast" depicted in a really striking manner the ideas and impulses which were fermenting in the brains of young men thirty years since, but the yeast works in these days under changed conditions and in different matter. The temptations of Lancelot Smith, though they were the same *au fond* as those of men now—since the world and the flesh are always at hand—yet took very different forms. Lancelot's cousin, the ascetic young curate about to go to Rome, and the mystical person at the end, of whose appearance the author himself can only say, "Omnia exeunt in mysterium," would have no influence on the Lancelots of our own day. Each man faces for himself the problems of his own time, and the armour of a former generation is valueless to the warriors of the present. So, too, "Alton Locke" was deeply occupied with the very beginnings of the labour question. Trades' unions, with which we fancy Kingsley never sympathised, were yet to be; the then condition of society is past. So, too, is past the religious frame of mind in which doubts were to be assuaged by Bunsen's form of faith, and for Bunsen we imagine

was intended the glib and kindly Dean who rationalises miracle for Alton Locke. And in "Westward Ho," where the motive for the story was the struggle with Rome, though that struggle is still vigorous, the whole battlefield and one of the combatants have changed. Then Kingsley depicted the conflict between Rome and Protestantism as a religion; now it is between Rome as the representative of religion, and free thought, science, and unbelief. Protestantism as a religion is more dead than Rome herself, and galvanised into less semblance of life. What of vigorous intellect is still left in religious England makes common cause with Rome against all that we represent and uphold. So, too, it will be found, in all the more important works, that whether or not nominally concerned with the past, Kingsley was occupied with a present which has slipped away from us, and is really more removed from us than much which in time is far more distant. The result is, that we doubt the enduring popularity of these books. Just because of their passionate earnestness they grow less intelligible to another generation. Without pretending to compare the two men, it may yet be said that one cause of Scott's lasting fame is, that he was *not* intensely in earnest in regard to the inculcation of direct teaching of any kind, and his characters, in whatever time he placed them, are the ordinary men and women of any period, not those penetrated and singularised by the spirit of the age. It is only the upholstery and millinery that belongs to any special date. He draws the bustle and pageant of an historic time, but does not touch its depths, nor, under a figure, the passions of his own age. The great court of Elizabeth is only the stage for the sorrows of a neglected wife; and, if plots and conspirators are found in "Rob Roy," they are only intended to bring into prominence the charms of Di Vernon, a dark background for a fair maiden, made to worship.

There are charming passages in the novels, but again they are somewhat tedious. Kingsley wanted the power of concentration; he had a vast command of picturesque and forcible language, but no scene he ever wrote is considered stroke by stroke, so as to leave on us the impression of strength in reserve, or of which the actual phrases remain in the memory. Contrast, for instance, the scene in which Amyas Leigh hangs the Spanish American Bishop, with Scott's murder of Porteous, or note how the latter has no single needless word in the wonderful scene between Jeanie Deans and Queen Caroline, and what we mean by Kingsley's luxuriant excess, his wash of colour as contrasted with the sharpness of steel-engraving, will be seen at once. We could have wished, however that Mr. Harrison had included some passages from the novels in his charming volume, "Selections from the Writings of the Rev. C. Kingsley," in which he,

as Mr. Kingsley's curate, and now his son-in-law, perhaps represents the family tendency to place him before us as too exclusively the divine. It is natural, however, that the side should be put forward on which Mr. Kingsley would himself have most desired to be regarded.

Our own impression is that it is as a poet that Mr. Kingsley will leave his mark on the literature of our day, and this although he has not written any large quantity of verse from which posterity may choose. There are, indeed, many writers whose mark on literature has been made by but a few lines. Wolfe will live by the "Burial of Sir John Moore" as long as the language lasts in which it is written. So if Charles Kingsley had written nothing but "The Three Fishers," "The Sands o' Dee," "The Bad Squire," and a few more ballads, he would have been known hereafter as one of our most musical lyricists. His occasional blank verse also, which metre he called "the verse of verses," had remarkable merit. We venture to quote one of his less-known poems, and as he originally wrote it, without a few alterations, which were not improvements:—

"Even as an eagle crying all alone
Above the vineyards through the summer night,
Among the skeletons of robber towers,
Because the ancient eyrie of his race
Is trenched and walled by busy-handed men,
And all his forest chace and woodland wild,
Wherfrom he fed his young with hare and roe,
Are trim with grapes which swell from hour to hour,
And toss their golden tendrils to the sun
For joy at their own riches :—So in time
The great devourers of the earth shall sit,
Idle and impotent, they know not why,
Down staring from their barren heights of pride
On nations grown too wise to slay and slave,
The puppets of the few, while peaceful lore
And fellow-help make glad the heart of earth
With wonders which they fear and hate, as he,
The eagle, hates the vineyard slopes below."

It is interesting to find that this was written on the Rhine on his first tour abroad, in 1851. "How strange," he writes to his wife, "that my favourite psalm about 'the hills of the robbers' should have come the very day I went up the Rhine;" and he speaks again of the Castle of Sonneck as the very *beau idéal* of the robber's nest. Here, no doubt, he saw, as many others have seen, the eagles flying so close above the Rhine steamer that the very flash of the eye and turn of the neck could be seen.

But we are inclined to think that "The Saint's Tragedy" will take increasingly high rank among English dramas, and will, in the years to come, place Kingsley on a lofty pedestal.

Mrs. Kingsley says, with perfect truth and modesty, that the publication of this work in 1848 "made little impression on the literary world in England." But what Bunsen said of it to Max Müller is noteworthy:—"Of Kingsley's dramatic power, I do not hesitate to call these two works, 'The Saint's Tragedy' and 'Hypatia,' by far the most important and perfect of this genial writer. In these more particularly I find the justification of a hope which I beg to be allowed to express—that Kingsley might continue Shakspeare's historical plays. I have for several years made no secret of it, that Kingsley seems to me the genius of our country called to place by the side of that sublime dramatic series from King John to Henry VIII. another series from Edward VI. to the landing of William of Orange. . . . The tragedy of 'Saint Elizabeth' shows that Kingsley can grapple not only with the novel, but with the more severe rules of dramatic art."

With all our hearty admiration for Kingsley's genius, we must say that the notion of his continuing Shakspeare is like Mr. Martin Farquhar Tupper continuing "Christabel;" but no doubt, had he done so, he would have given us something far better than the Froude-Freeman done into blank verse which we know by the names of "Queen Mary" and "Harold." Though "The Saint's Tragedy" is not Shakspeare or Shaksperian, it is a very fine play, and Kingsley has here the great advantage of a subject which is not local nor temporary in interest, but broadly and grandly human. The controversy between asceticism and the frank acceptance of man's nature, restrained only by such rules as experience teaches are best for society, and therefore for the individual, is not the narrow issue between Rome and Protestantism, though once in the world's history it had to be fought out as though it were. In many religions, asceticism has played its dark part; in fact, it is the larger and the more real side of them; the revolt against it is in general a revolt against religion, and in so far as Protestantism retained the dogmas of Catholicism, it retained the root of asceticism; it rebelled against it just so far as it abandoned the dogmas. One of the objects which Kingsley proposed to himself in writing his drama was to cause each Englishman who read it to ask himself, "I, as a Protestant, have been accustomed to assert the purity and dignity of the offices of husband, wife, parent. Have I ever examined the grounds of my own assertion? Do I believe them to be as callings from God, spiritual, sacramental, divine, eternal? *Or am I at heart regarding and using them, like the Papist, merely as Heaven's indulgence to the infirmities of fallen man?*" We should not all put our view of human relations into Kingsley's words, but we may all protest in his spirit against the doctrine contained in the words italicised.

We agree with Baron Bunsen in taking a very high estimate of the dramatic power shown, and of the way in which—first element of dramatic success—Kingsley has caught the spirit of the time in which his scene was laid. For this he deserves especial credit, when we remember that thirty years ago it was very difficult indeed for young men to see the Middle Ages except through the telescope held to their eyes by the Tractarian party, and that one of the most popular books of the day was Kenelm Digby's now forgotten "Broad Stone of Honour." It is of this that Kingsley speaks in his preface: "So rough and common-life a picture of the Middle Ages will be far from acceptable to those who take their notions of that period principally from such exquisite dreams as the fictions of Fouqué and of certain moderns, whose graceful minds, like some enchanted well,

"In whose calm depths the pure and beautiful
Alone are mirrored,"

are, on account of their very sweetness and simplicity, singularly unfitted to convey any true likeness of the coarse and stormy Middle Age." Re-reading this tragedy now, after many years, the old feelings have awakened in us which made Kingsley's name so much to a knot of young University men, none of whom, perhaps, thought with him in their later life, although his influence lifted them in those days above self-indulgence and sloth, and was the motive cause which made them take what part they could in the battle of life. A drama can less than any other literary work be judged by extracts, but we may yet quote a few lines, in which Kingsley puts into the mouth of his heroine the truth for all ages that men and women should do with all their might that which their hand finds to do. One of Elizabeth's ladies says to her, "You live too fast!" and is thus answered:—

"'Too fast!' we live too slow—our gummy blood,
Without fresh purging airs from heaven, would choke,
Slower and slower, till it stopped and froze.
God! fight we not within a curs'd world,
Whose very air teems thick with leagu'd fiends?
Each word we speak has infinite effects,
Each soul we pass must go to heaven or hell—
And this our one chance through eternity,
To drop and die, like dead leaves in the brake,
Or like the meteor stone, though whelmed itself,
Kindle the dry moors into fruitful blaze—
And yet we live too fast!
Be earnest, earnest, earnest, mad if thou wilt;
Do what thou dost as if the stake were heaven,
And that thy last deed ere the judgment-day.
When all's done nothing's done. There's rest above—
Below let work be death, if work be love!"

But if we should be mistaken, and if even "The Saint's Tragedy" does not live among the great literary works of the Victorian age, it is much to have moved the feelings of any time as Kingsley moved those of that in which he lived. For, after all, we build unconsciously the growing structure of which the full perfection is yet further in the distance than its beginnings are in the past—we build like the insects on a coral reef, and few indeed can be distinguished for more than a few moments among that toiling crowd; the stimulus which is given by hearty work lives on when the work itself is buried, and the individuality obscured in the scene of labour and the multitude of toilers. And Kingsley was altogether a stimulating neighbour, co-worker, and friend. His eagerness led him into many situations in which it could only be asked, "Que diable allait il faire dans cette galère?" There was scarce a question on which he would not give an answer to persons who wrote to him as if he had been in possession of the whole counsel of God, and his great fluency enabled him to put words now and then in the place of thought. But when he was assailed, and had right on his side, he could concentrate his forces, and hit, as it were, straight from the shoulder with tremendous effect.

Lord Coleridge reviewed "Yeast" in a flagrantly unfair and bitter article, leaving out a "not," and making Kingsley say the very thing to which he was giving an indignant denial. Kingsley turned on him with the answer of Pascal's Father Valerian in the "Lettres Provinciales," "Mentiris impudentissime," and few who looked into the matter could feel the words too strong. We are glad to see that Mrs. Kingsley reproduces the letter in which he answers his assailant. She lets off a certain Mr. Drew too easily, who having asked Kingsley to preach to working men in his church, and who ought to have known, and in fact must have known, what doctrine the preacher would utter, turned upon him while in the church with a charge of false teaching. But as a rule she is angry for her husband, and she does well to be so in an age when we are all a little too civil in our controversies, and should bear plain speaking with more equanimity than we do.

These controversies, no less than the tributes from friends and the floods of letters, are for signs how much Kingsley inspired his generation; and whether we agree with him or not, the stimulus he gave to it did incalculable good. We, who write this article, were near Eversley last summer, drove past the parsonage, and stood by Charles Kingsley's grave. The picturesque but unwholesome rectory had a sadly changed aspect; the creepers had been stripped from the walls, the lawn looked uncared for, and the garden walks were rough. The church was

undergoing restoration, as it is called—all its individuality destroyed, and fitted for a far more ritual worship than was used in it of old. The rectory pew had vanished. Here it was that, years ago, took place, as we are credibly informed, what is not recorded in these volumes. The then curate of Eversley was a deacon, and could not give the blessing from the pulpit; there was no place at the communion table for the clergyman to sit who was not actually officiating. Therefore, if the curate preached, Kingsley took off his surplice after reading prayers, and sat in his pew. Then, when the sermon was over, he rose where he sat, and gave the blessing to the people in his lay-cut black coat. It was thoroughly unconventional, against all ecclesiastical proprieties, yet he rendered it dignified as well as touching. A generation has arisen to which a parson who dressed like a layman, and was impatient of ceremonial, who liked hunting when he could get it, and fishing always, who held all Church doctrine, yet was tolerant, loving, and tender to the most obstinate heretics, is a very singular phenomenon. Such a type of parson will become more and more rare as the strife between the lay and the clerical mind accentuates itself more and more. But it was a good type while it existed—the examples of it did good service in the world; and though Charles Kingsley was much more than this, he was this also. At Eversley his memory will long be green, and he will live in the hearts of his people and his friends. His biography will take its place among the records of those who have swayed the forces of their time, and when the men of our days are judged by those who can estimate them more calmly than we who are so near, others will be found more deep-thoughted, more logical, more consistent, but none more zealous for what seemed the right, more true-hearted, more lovable, than he who sleeps at Eversley, where on summer afternoons the shadow of the great fir-trees lies across his grave.

ART. IV.—SLAVERY IN AFRICA.

Last Journals of David Livingstone in Central Africa. By HORACE WALLER, F.R.G.S. 1874.

Across Africa. By VERNEY LOVETT CAMERON, C.B., D.C.L., R.N. 1877.

The Lost Continent ; or, Slavery and the Slave Trade in Africa. By JOSEPH COOPER. 1875.

Central Africa : Naked Truths of Naked People. By COLONEL C. CHAILLE LONG, of the Egyptian Staff. 1876.

THE character and intensity of the feeling which now prevails throughout the United Kingdom concerning slavery afford instructive evidence of the rapid and vigorous growth of the sense of justice and benevolence in the British people. It was not always thus. Less than a hundred years ago, many an honest, respectable, God-fearing English gentleman in our distant colonies sat in the midst of his numerous slaves like a king surrounded by obsequious courtiers, his will supreme, his wish law, his chastisements received meekly and without murmuring ; and when, by the labour of these slaves, he had accumulated as much wealth as he desired, he unhesitatingly sold his plantation and his slaves, and retired to his native land, purchased an estate, and lived in ease and splendour. Perhaps he brought back with him to England a favourite slave in the capacity of footman or valet, to astonish the eyes of the country folks by the blackness of his skin and the whiteness of his linen garments, and to tickle their ears with tales of his master's power and wealth. But in those days the air of England brought with it no freedom ; on the contrary, it came to this child of the sunny tropics as a chilly blast of death ; and he commonly survived only a short time, killed not by labour nor by unkindness, but by consumption, yet never uttering a word of murmur or complaint against his owner, nor dreaming of disputing his right to do with him as he pleased, whether to leave him to work on under a burning sun for a new master, or to bring him to a cold inhospitable land to die prematurely of disease. Nor did any idea of wrong-doing ever enter the head of the slave-owner in thus disposing of his property. Bought with his own money, and nourished at his expense, his slaves were as much his to dispose of as he saw fit, as his horse or his dog, and, in truth, they held about the same place in his esteem. Self-interest suggested the necessity of kind and humane treatment, for to have a slave incapacitated for work was a loss to the master only, and the increase of his slaves meant the increase of his property. Probably, as a

rule, slaves were kindly treated, although, of course, base and cruel slaveowners were to be found, and under such, slavery was *worse* than degrading—it was a living death. In all cases, family ties were little regarded, and even the best of masters would not scruple to separate parent and child, or husband and wife, if his interest required it. At the best, it was a barbarous institution, little compatible with Christianity and civilisation, but firmly established through immemorial practice, dating at least from the days of the great hunter Nimrod, and probably from many centuries before his era. It had not yet come into the head of theologians to question the lawfulness of that which was undoubtedly sanctioned by the Bible ; and so far was the worthy slaveholder, in his quiet English retreat, from being looked upon with horror and abhorrence as a monster in human form, a trafficker in human flesh and blood, fattening like a vampyre upon the bleeding corpses of his black brethren, that he was fêted and flattered, looked upon as a great man, visited by noblemen and gentlemen of unblemished reputation and known humanity ; and it is doubtful whether my lord bishop would have felt bound for conscience' sake to refuse the hospitality of a slaveowner who gave splendid dinners and the best wines to be procured for money, and could season his viands with racy tales of life in foreign lands as yet unvisited by bishops, whilst Sambo, standing behind his master's chair, grinned unqualified approval. As to the misery inflicted upon fellow-men in dragging them from their far-off homes and selling them in the open market, no one thought or inquired about these things ; people hardly looked upon the negro as a *man*, certainly would not have acknowledged him as a *brother* ; for was he not a child of Ham the accursed, given into the hands of righteous Japhet in the prophetic words, "Cursed be Canaan ; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren" ? Even the blackness of his skin was adduced as proof positive of his evil origin ; for, although as a descendant from Canaan the negro was clearly of the race of Seth, the sable hue became connected in some minds with the mark traced by the finger of God upon the guilty brow of Cain ; and the first use made of Scripture history when acquired by the negro was to turn the tables upon his oppressors, and to declare that all men were at first black, till Cain became blanched with horror at the crime he had committed.

The first slaves were doubtless captives taken in war ; but men were not long in discovering that it was easy to enslave the weak, and a tribe weakened by internal broils became an easy prey. The Egyptians were not slow to avail themselves of the constant supply afforded by the much divided tribes in the interior of Africa ; and from that day to this, the negro has been the slave of the civilised of the human race.

"It is remarkable," says Dr. Livingstone, "that the power of resistance under calamity, or, as some would say, adaptation for a life of servitude, is peculiar only to certain tribes on the continent of Africa. Climate cannot be made to account for the fact that many would pine in a state of slavery or voluntarily perish. No Krooman can be converted into a slave, and yet he is an inhabitant of the low unhealthy West Coast. Nor can any of the Zulu or Kaffir tribes be reduced to bondage, though all these live in comparatively elevated regions. We have heard it, stated by men familiar with some of the Kaffirs, that a blow given even in play by a European must be returned. A love of liberty is observable in all who have the Zulu blood, as the Makololo, the Watuta, and probably the Masai. But blood does not explain the fact. A beautiful Barotse woman at Naliele, on refusing to marry a man whom she did not like, was, in a pet, given by the headman to some Mambari slave-traders from Benguela. Seeing her fate, she seized one of their spears, and stabbing herself, fell down dead."*

Early ethnologists looked upon the negro as the lowest of mankind, if even worthy of the name of man; but later researches have shown us many inferior races. The Tasmanians, Australians, Bushmen, Hottentots, and Andaman Islanders all rank below the negro, but they have never become slaves, because they are constitutionally too weak to endure the toils and privations of slavery, which with them would mean extirpation. In fact, the very contact with civilised life and its attendant vices has already extirpated one of these races, and is gradually but surely eliminating the remainder; whilst of the negro Livingstone says—

"Neither the diseases nor the ardent spirits which proved so fatal to North American Indians, South Sea Islanders, and Australians, seem capable of annihilating them. Even when subjected to that system so destructive to human life, by which they are torn from their native soil, they spring up irrepressibly and darken half the new continent. They are gifted by nature with physical strength capable of withstanding the sorest privations, and a light-heartedness which, as a sort of compensation, enables them to make the best of the worst situations."†

The negro, then, owes his survival in that state of slavery to which he has been so long subjected, to his splendid animal organism, to his consequent strength of constitution and capacity for labour; and to his docility in enduring the yoke imposed upon him. When, however, we consider that the forced emigration of the negro, which we seem powerless to prevent, has been going on

* Livingstone's "Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries," p. 597.

† "Expedition to the Zambesi," by D. and C. Livingstone.

ever since the days of the Pharaohs, and has always been attended with a loss of life out of all proportion to the number of slaves brought into foreign markets; when we consider the yearly slaughter caused by the tribal wars in the interior, the multitudes slaughtered in cold blood by the caprice of their own chiefs, the numbers slain in every slave-dealer's foray, and the thousands who die in crossing deserts and morasses on the way to the various ports of shipment for foreign shores, we are filled with wonder that a race so persecuted from the earliest times should yet exist in sufficient numbers to tempt the cupidity of the slave-dealer. It would seem almost as though, like the Israelites of old, "the more they were persecuted the more they multiplied and grew;" for we believe that in a state of freedom they gradually but surely decline.

A general impression prevails among Englishmen that when the eloquence of Wilberforce and his supporters, after a prolonged opposition extending over many years, succeeded in inducing Parliament to pass a bill for the abolition of slavery in the British dominions, at a cost to the nation of £20,000,000, and when that abolition was followed up by similar measures in most European countries, by treaties binding these nations to act in concert for the suppression of the slave-trade and the release of negroes newly captured, slavery as an institution ceased to exist, the last stronghold having yielded on the cessation of the late American war. To these sanguine philanthropists the revelations of Livingstone, Cameron, Baker, and other African travellers, must have been a most disagreeable surprise. These all tell us of the continuous deportation of slaves from the East Coast of Africa, under the same circumstances of savage cruelty as formerly roused the indignation of the British public. The efforts of England and her allies would seem to have closed the ports of the West Coast to this nefarious traffic, but all along the eastern shores of the continent it survives, and continues to be carried on with increasing vigour. Captain Sullivan, when questioned upon this subject before the Royal Commission, says distinctly, "I do not think that there is any decline of the slave traffic, although it is not carried on in the same way as formerly;" that is, as Captain Sullivan afterwards explains, it is carried on more by land than formerly, and less by sea. Nevertheless innumerable dhows still convey cargoes of negroes from various points on the Eastern Coast to Arabia, Madagascar, and the little island of Pembe, thence again supplying the slave-markets of Turkey and Persia. The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society give five routes by which slaves are taken from Central Africa—1. Through the Sahara Desert to Tunis and Morocco; 2. down the Nile *via* Khartoum into Egypt; 3. down the Nile, turning off before reaching Khartoum, for the seaports on the Red Sea; 4. direct to

the Zanzibar Coast for Zanzibar, Pemba, &c., where it is said the yearly demand for slaves amounts to from 10,000 to 12,000; and, 5. two routes from Lake Nyassa to the Mozambique Coast for Madagascar and the north, Madagascar alone taking 6000 to 10,000. Sir Samuel Baker says, "Before I suppressed the slave-trade of the White Nile, about 50,000 slaves were brought down from the countries bordering that river every year."* Altogether it is estimated that the slave-trade is now being carried on at a cost of at least 500,000 African lives annually, 70,000 captives reaching the coast, and the remainder either dying or being massacred *en route*; for Dr. Livingstone has calculated that not more than one in five of those captured ever reaches the coast, and on some routes not more than one in nine. Yet Sir Bartle Frere says, "The slavery of the East Coast is, with all its horrors, less barbarous and degrading, and less destructive to human life, than that of the West. Slave life is too often wasted on the East Coast, but the human sacrifices and the wholesale massacres in mere wantonness of superstition, which are such horrible features of the slavery of the West Coast, seem almost unknown on the East."† When, however, we read the accounts by Livingstone and Cameron of the horrible scenes witnessed by them, of slaves abandoned to die of hunger in the desert, of women shot or stabbed because unable or unwilling to keep up with the gang, we are filled with a sickening sense of horror at atrocities which we seem powerless to avenge. "The Ujiji slavers, like the Kilwa and Portuguese, are the vilest of the vile. It is not a trade, but a system of consecutive murders; they go to plunder and kidnap, and every trading trip is nothing but a foray."‡ "Graves and numerous skeletons," says Cameron, "testified to the numbers whose lives had been sacrificed on this trying march; whilst slave clogs and forks still attached to some bleached bones, or lying by their sides, gave only too convincing a proof that the demon of the slave-trade still exerted his influence in this part of Africa."§

When we look around and count over the slave-holding states of the present day, we wonder how they can possibly consume the yearly importation denoted above. "No receiver, no thief," is a common saying; and in the present case, Brazil, Egypt, Turkey, Zanzibar, certain portions of Asia, and Madagascar, represent the receivers of 70,000 slaves annually. Seeing that none of these states are of great commercial importance, the waste of life for the

* "Slavery and the Slave-Trade." "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxx. p. 185.

† "Zanzibar a Commercial Power." "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxxi.

‡ "Last Journals of Dr. Livingstone," vol. ii. p. 11.

§ "Across Africa," p. 256.

supply of these markets does indeed appear appalling. Most of these nations, too, have at least expressed a desire that the slave-trade should cease; nevertheless they continue to draw thus largely upon the life-blood of the unhappy negroes.

The chief agents employed in this traffic are the Arabs and the Portuguese. The Arabs have ever been slave-traders, and their dhows form the chief mode of conveyance by sea from the Eastern Coast. Trading ostensibly for ivory, they ever carried away with them a certain number of slaves.

"Forty years ago," says Sir Bartle Frere, "the Arab demand for slaves was not what it has since become; there was then less money than there is now in Arabia and Egypt, and none but great men could afford negro slaves. The Arabs did little directly to supply the sugar plantations in the East and West Indies and Brazil, which were then the great slave-markets of the world, but some slaves were always to be found in every Arab dhow returning from Africa as sailors and passenger-servants, though not, as in later years, crowded by scores till the boat could hold no more, to be sold in the slave bazaars of Turkey, Persia, and Arabia." *

Of the horrors of the sea-voyage to the poor captives we have spoken in a former paper,† and need not again harrow up the feelings of our readers by a repetition of them. Those who survive the voyage are sold in open market, and it is generally confessed that as slaves in these countries they are not ill-treated. They are chiefly employed as domestic servants, in the harems, &c., but in Egypt they are also employed in agriculture and in working the water-lifts. Sir Samuel Baker represents the Egyptian slave as well conducted and contented. Colonel Long, speaking of slavery in Khartoum, says, "His Highness the Khedive of Egypt had given stringent orders for the suppression of the slave trade; and of late years there had been so great a falling off in consequence, that slavery was to be seen here in a mild character, if indeed it merited at all the name, since a black held in service was free to go, on application to the military authority. The system is there almost patriarchal, and the ignorant savage becomes a member of a household, and is civilised to a certain extent under its influence, while the tenure of his bondage is only nominal."‡ Sir Bartle Frere, also, in treating of this subject, lays stress upon the superior condition of the slave in Egypt, remarking, "There are varying shades of darkness even in the blackest night; and if

* "Zanzibar a Commercial Power." "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxx.

† "The Pacific Islanders' Protection Bill." "Westminster Review," July 1875.

‡ "Central Africa," p. 221. Colonel C. Chaille Long.

the condition of the slave in Egypt is not to be envied by the poorest free-born peasant in Europe, it is beyond doubt far better than that of slaves elsewhere in Africa.* These, too, have not to incur the horrors of the sea-voyage, being brought down the Nile, and they often rise to positions of influence. "I know an instance," says Sir Samuel Baker, "where a slave rose to the high position of pasha and major-general. One of the lieutenant-colonels under my command had originally been a slave, and most of the officers in the Soudan regiments had risen through good conduct from the same low origin." The Khedive of Egypt has, however, made many promises that slavery should cease in his dominions, and in this he is credited with sincerity by Sir Samuel Baker, who, in his late expedition with Egyptian forces, believed himself engaged in a raid upon slave-traders, and that his conquests and annexations would put a stop to the traffic in that direction at least; and he says, "The prosperity of Central Africa and the liberty of her people may date from the Khedive of Egypt's expedition, which first crushed the abomination of the slave-trade of the White Nile."† It is, however, well known that the expedition had no real effect upon the slave-trade, which is as rife as ever in Egypt; and it is said that the Khedive himself continues to be a purchaser of slaves. At all events, Commander Cameron and the Anti-Slavery Society look upon Egypt as the very central point of the traffic; and the former, in his speech before the British Association at Glasgow, expresses himself to this effect—

"The greatest slave-dealer in the world was the Khedive of Egypt, and the condition of the slave in Egypt was worse than in any other part of the world. The railways, canals, and other so-called improvements in Egypt, were carried on by forced labour, and the poor slaves, after their work was finished, were driven back to their homes and severely mulcted in taxes. The condition of the slave-trade in Egypt was in fact such, that there was no use in making a treaty with the Khedive. The only remedy was that the Khedive as a slave-holder should be obliterated."‡

There is evidently some misapprehension here; for, as we know well, a slave can have no property, and therefore could not be taxed, although his master, the unlucky fellah, might be heavily mulcted in money, as well as being compelled to supply slave

* "Zanzibar a Commercial Power." "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxxii. p. 286.

† "Slavery and the Slave-Trade." Sir Samuel White Baker. "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxx. p. 186.

‡ Commander Cameron's speech reported in "The Present Extent of Slavery and the Slave-Trade." By the Rev. Aaron Buzacott, B.A., read at Glasgow, 1876.

labour for the *real* improvements introduced by the Khedive; but the injustice in this case is to the fellaheen and not to the slaves, since they would have to work for their masters if they did not work for the Khedive. The recent appointment of Colonel Gordon as Governor-General of the Soudan is looked upon as a renewed pledge of the Khedive's earnest desire to abolish the slave-trade in his dominions; and a telegram and a more recent letter, ostensibly from Colonel Gordon himself, announce with regard to this appointment, "No one could be invested with greater powers. All financial and other affairs have been placed in his hands. He says it will be his fault now if slavery does not cease, but that, of course, time will be required." * Whether Colonel Gordon will allow himself to be hoodwinked in this matter by the astute ruler of Egypt remains to be proved, but it is perhaps well to believe in the good intentions of a man whom all are agreed in calling an enlightened ruler, desirous of assimilating the institutions of his country to those of Europe; but to this subject we will return later. It is, at all events, noteworthy that those who have had the best means of judging, are unanimous in believing in the Khedive's sincere desire to suppress the slave-trade. †

Whatever may be the condition of the slave in Turkey and Egypt, and the cruelties practised by the Arab dealers in kidnapping and conducting him to his destination, it is agreed on all hands that the most cruel and brutal enemy of the negro is the Portuguese half-caste. All travellers agree that the cruelties committed by Arab slave-drivers are as nothing compared to those of Portuguese subjects. Commander Cameron said at Glasgow, "The Portuguese, or quasi-Portuguese, were far worse in their slave rule even than the Arabs; and he had seen slaves in their possession literally broken down by the weight of manacles and irons with which they were loaded." And in his book "Across Africa," ‡ the same traveller observes, "On the march with Alvez, I was disgusted beyond measure with what I saw of the manner in which the unfortunate slaves were treated; and have no hesitation in asserting that the worst of the Arabs are in this respect angels of light in comparison with the Portuguese and those who travel with them." § Livingstone § also bears similar testimony. He

* See "Times," February 21, 1877. This has since been amply confirmed by a statement made in the House of Commons, March 7.

† On this point Colonel Long says, "Ignorant and unscrupulous writers, anxious for place in the columns of the English press, have endeavoured to call in question the sincerity of the Khedive in his efforts to abolish the slave-trade, an accusation that is as puerile as it is without foundation."—"Central Africa," Colonel C. Chaille Long, p. 312.

‡ "Across Africa," by H. Lovett Cameron, vol. ii. p. 106.

§ "Last Journals of David Livingstone," p. 261.

says, "If one wishes to depict the slave-trade in its most attractive, or rather least objectionable form, he would accompany these gentlemen subjects of the Sultan of Zanzibar. If he would describe the land traffic in its most disgusting phases, he would follow the Kilwa traders along the road to Nyassa, or the Portuguese half-castes from Tetti to the river Shiri."

The Portuguese territories on the East Coast of Africa embrace a large extent of seaboard, from Cape Delgado to Delagoa Bay; and if Portugal were faithful to her treaties, this extent of territory would largely assist the other European powers in their endeavours to put a stop to the export of slaves; but although a law has been passed declaring the abolition of slavery throughout the Portuguese dominions, slavery continues to prevail in full force, not only on Portuguese territory on the East Coast of Africa, but also on the island of St. Thomas on the Western Coast, and, as we have seen above, the Portuguese traders are unenviably notorious for the cruelty with which they carry on the trade; but as the capture and exportation of slaves is a contravention of treaties existing with Great Britain and other great powers, innumerable artifices are resorted to for carrying out this contraband traffic, which is ignored and denied by the Government at Lisbon. Hence we are told that "it is carried on by them in Arab dhows under the Arab flag; and thus, when these vessels are captured, the stigma is cast on the Sultan. Moreover, they have recently adopted the title of 'free negroes' for the slaves, and have established a system of passports in vessels carrying their own flags, in consequence of which detection—or at any rate capture with condemnation—is next to impossible."* That these accusations should give serious annoyance to the Portuguese Government is natural, and we learn that the subject of a remonstrance, to be addressed to the British Government on account of the representations of Cameron and Young, has been discussed in the Portuguese Chamber of Deputies; but, as the "Times" justly remarks, "The special statements about which the whole uproar arose, do not seem to have been even verbally denied. Portuguese patriotism is content with protesting against them, and with bringing forward general counter-statements, which, however creditable in themselves, can do nothing to contradict more precise evidence." The writer of the article above quoted pointed out, "If the slave-trade of Central Africa is carried on very largely by Portuguese merchants, and under the protection of the Portuguese flag, the disgraceful charge can be repudiated, not by language of affected or even of real indignation, not by patriotic reminiscences, not by reference to

* "Evidence of Captain Sullivan in the House of Commons." "Lost Continent," p. 25.

diplomatic compliments, but solely by ceasing to permit any further ground to continue for it." * "As long as they suffer their African possessions to become regular refuges and resorts for the miscreants, of whatever country, who are actively engaged in the slave-trade, it will be to little purpose that the note of indignation is raised aloud at Lisbon, or that testimonies to character are produced which have only too certainly been falsified by facts." †

Very different is the character assigned by common consent to the Sultan of Zanzibar, who, a slaveholder himself, and having in his capital one of the principal slave-markets in the world, has yet set himself loyally to the task, undertaken by treaty, of putting a stop to slave exportation from his dominions; but the only effect produced by this prohibition seems to be an increase in the land traffic, the slaves being sent to the small island of Pemba for shipment to the Egyptian, Turkish, Persian, and, as commonly reported, Afghanistan markets; whilst slavers have been heard to declare that they "thought it a good thing that the sea route was closed, as they saved duty, and the land journey was cheaper." ‡ The truth is, that the canker has eaten so deeply into the heart of Africa that treaties are powerless to eradicate it. Mr. Cooper, in his book "The Lost Continent," gives us a map of Africa showing by a dark shade the present extent of slavery, and by it we find the whole continent blackened, with the exception of the French colony of Algeria on the north, the Cape Colony on the south, the British possessions, including Sierra Leone and Liberia on the west, and a tiny spot, hardly observable, on the east. It is, indeed, a serious but undoubted fact, that if every seaport in Africa could be closed, and every European, Asiatic, and American nation could be induced to give up the importation of slaves, the dark shadow cast over the African continent as indicative of slavery would not be appreciably diminished. Over the whole length and breadth of the continent, slavery is an *institution*. Everywhere in Africa still prevails

"The good old rule, the simple plan,
That he should take who has the power,
And he should keep who can."

We usually look upon the slave-trade as carried on entirely by

* See "Times," 19th February 1877.

† Ibid. A long manifesto upon this subject from the "Jornal Correspondencia de Portugal," may be seen in the "Times" for March 6th, which concludes thus "Only malevolence could confound the Portuguese nation or its Government with some trader, who knowing that he commits a crime, does not in his thirst for gold know how to resist carrying on an infamous commerce prohibited by laws actually in force, and long since condemned by all moral principles."

‡ "The Lost Continent," p. 81.

armed bands of foreigners, prowling about continually to catch and kidnap such unfortunate wretches as may be found peacefully at work and unarmed in remote villages in the interior, and that the muskets of these marauders render them so formidable, that thousands of natives look on paralysed, and suffer about a dozen Arabs or Portuguese to carry off from two hundred to a thousand of their brethren, bound with chains or loaded with the heavy slave-yoke (consisting of a forked log of wood fastened round the neck), without the slightest attempt at resistance or rescue. When, however, we consider the vast amount of thickly-populated territory to be passed through between Central Africa and the sea-coast, and that the natives, if destitute of firearms, possess good spears, bows, and clubs, it is very evident that any organised attempt to rescue kidnapped slaves must result in the slaughter of the handful of marauders and the release of the captives. But the fact is these slave-gangs are *sold* by the chiefs to the slave-dealers, and even when apparently kidnapped, it is generally by the help and connivance of some powerful chief, who would look upon any attempt at rescue as an immediate *casus belli*, resulting in the capture of the offending parties, and a consequent addition to the number of slaves, for it is the constant warfare between the petty tribes of the interior which keeps the slave-market supplied with victims. From the earliest ages of the world, captives taken in war have been looked upon as the lawful property of their captors, to be sold, kept as slaves, or killed at pleasure; and this primitive law, whereby the strong control, and by degrees exterminate, the weak, is taken advantage of by crafty slave-dealers, who, under various pretexts, set chief against chief, knowing that whichever wins they will be the gainers, obtaining thereby the numerous slaves they covet. Livingstone tells us that "in the famines which succeed the slave-dealers' raids, boys and girls are at times to be purchased by the dealer for a few handfuls of maize."*

Sir Samuel Baker relates that "in the country of Uganda, where the natives are exceedingly clever as tailors and furriers, needles are in great request, and a handsome girl may be purchased for thirteen English needles," to be afterwards exchanged in Ungoro for an elephant's tusk, worth £20 or £30.† He also tells us of a chief who, after seeming deeply impressed with Sir Samuel's remarks upon the heinousness of selling human beings, immediately offered to let him have his own son, who, he said, was *always hungry*, for an iron spade. When human life is held thus cheap by the seller, we can hardly be surprised that it is lightly regarded by the buyer, and that Livingstone and Cameron should both be

* "Last Journals of David Livingstone," p. 222.

† "Ismaila," by Sir S. W. Baker, p. 209 *et seq.*

able to sicken us with the horrid details of starving slaves left to perish by the wayside, because too weak to accomplish the journey to the coast, of women butchered in cold blood for the same reason, and of corpses and skeletons everywhere. With African chiefs a raid into a neighbour's territory, too weak to avenge the injury, for the purpose of carrying off men and women to supply the demands of the slave-dealer, is undertaken with the same alacrity with which the borderers of old *lifted* the cattle of their neighbours; and should this source of supply fail, the power of the chiefs is so absolute over their own subjects, that they can sell them as they please, none being found bold enough to resist the decree which delivers them over to captivity or death. "I tried," says Livingstone, "to dissuade Casembe from selling his people as slaves.*" Instances have been known of fathers selling their own children into slavery; Livingstone relates that wives are sometimes thus sold as a punishment for unfaithfulness; and gives one instance in which a man sold *himself*, and made a very good bargain too. Again he says—

"The Manganja chiefs sell their own people, for we met Ajawa and slave-dealers in several highland villages, who had certainly been encouraged to come among them for slaves. The chiefs always seemed ashamed of the traffic, and tried to excuse themselves. 'We do not sell many, and only those who have committed crimes.' As a rule, the regular trade is supplied by the low and criminal classes, and hence the ugliness of slaves. Others are probably sold besides criminals, as on the accusation of witchcraft. Friendless orphans also sometimes disappear suddenly, and no one inquires what has become of them."† "Another channel of supply, fed by victims from all classes, but chiefly from the common people, is frequently opened when one portion of a tribe, urged on by the greed of gain, begins to steal and sell their fellow clansmen. The evil does not stop here. A feud is the consequence. The weaker part of the tribe is driven away, and, wandering about, becomes so thoroughly demoralised as to live by marauding and selling their captives, and even each other, without compunction."‡

In another place we find the same traveller saying of a slave-gang, "We might have released them, but did not know what to do with them. To liberate and leave them would have done but little good, as the people of the surrounding villages would soon have seized them and have sold them again into slavery."§

Towards the south slavery appears to decline. The Kaffir races

* "Last Journals," p. 263.

† "The Zambesi and its Tributaries," by C. and D. Livingstone, p. 128.

‡ Ibid. p. 216.

§ Ibid., p. 125.

do not generally hold slaves, but Livingstone says that the Zulus kill the old and able-bodied men of the tribes with which they are at war, incorporating the women and children into their own tribe, making them equal with their own, and never selling their captives. The Makololo also seem at one time to have been free from the stain of selling their slaves; but both Livingstone and Cameron complain that their footsteps were dogged by slave-dealers, so that every step taken by way of new discovery seems only to add to the traffic in human beings. In his "South Africa," Livingstone says, "One of our visitors appeared in a gaudy dressing-gown of printed calico, others had garments of printed cotton, and of blue, green, and red baize. These had been purchased in exchange for boys from a tribe called Mambari, which is situated near Bhi, and who only began the slave-trade with the Makololo in 1850. They had a number of old Portuguese guns, which Sebituane thought would be most important in any future invasion of Matabele. He offered to buy them with cattle or ivory, but their owners refused everything except boys about fourteen years of age." The desire to possess the guns at last prevailed, and eight were obtained in exchange for as many boys. These were not Makololo children, but captives of the black races they had conquered. "The Makololo afterwards made a foray in conjunction with the Mambari against some tribes to the eastward. The Mambari were to have the captives and the Makololo the cattle. At least two hundred captives were carried off that year. In the course of the raid the Makololo met some Arabs from Zanzibar, who presented them with three English muskets, and received thirty captives in return." *

We might fill many pages with quotations, all showing the innumerable wars and feuds between petty chieftains, frequently fomented by slave-dealers for their own purposes, and always ending in slaughter and the enslaving of innumerable captives, and subsequent sale to the slave-dealer for a gun or a few yards of calico. Neither must we lose sight of the fact that the only mode at present employed for the transport of ivory and other goods from the interior is the slave-gang; hence the trader who has secured a large amount of ivory is almost of necessity obliged to increase the number of his slaves, and when he arrives at the coast, is naturally anxious to dispose of both to the best advantage. We hear constantly of our travellers being detained whilst the traders to whose escort they have committed themselves make up their load of ivory, which is then transferred to the shoulders of slaves, even the children being called upon to bear the smaller tusks; and we cannot help being struck by the fact that travellers

* "South Africa," by David Livingstone, p. 64.

thus owe their safety to the protection afforded them by these slave-dealers, whose guidance they have been forced to accept, whilst loathing the cruelties of which they have thus become unwilling spectators.* But this fact speaks volumes as to the anarchy which reigns in the interior, when a handful of strangers, deeply dyed with native blood, and leading away multitudes into captivity, can thus march from shore to shore and afford protection to British travellers whose chief object is the deliverance of the natives from slavery and the development of the country's resources. The perpetual wars must of necessity breed hatred and distrust, not only of white intruders, but also of the natives amongst each other. Nevertheless it is this disunion among the natives which secures the safety of travellers; whilst facilitating the objects of the trader both in black and white ivory. Some of the more respectable of the traders regret the necessity they are under of employing slave labour for the transport of their merchandise, but under existing circumstances there is confessedly no help for it.

In examining Mr. Cooper's map, we are surprised to find the dark hue representing slavery carried over the Transvaal Republic, whilst a tiny white spot on the Eastern Coast, denoting a free state, seems to indicate a double mistake. But since the affairs of the Transvaal Republic have forced themselves upon the notice of the British public, ugly rumours have been afloat as to the practice of a species of slavery among the Boers, and it would appear that President Burgers himself is unable entirely to deny the truth of the accusation, which, indeed, is by no means new. Dr. Livingstone, in his book upon South Africa, published in 1861, has the following passage:—

“Many of them (the Boers) felt aggrieved by the emancipation of their Hottentot slaves, and determined to remove to distant localities, where they could erect themselves into a republic, and pursue without molestation the ‘proper treatment of the blacks.’ This ‘proper treatment’ has always involved the essential element of slavery—compulsory unpaid labour. The Kaffirs soon found, as they expressed it, ‘That Mosilikatze was cruel to his enemies and kind to those he conquered; but that the Boers destroyed their enemies and made slaves of their friends.’ The tribes, while retaining the semblance of independence, are forced to perform gratuitously all the labours of the fields. ‘We make the people work for us,’ said the Boers, ‘in consideration of allowing them to live in our country.’” †

When Livingstone speaks of the grievance felt by the Boers at the emancipation of their slaves, as the cause which led to the for-

* See Cameron's "Across Africa," vol. ii. p. 322 *et seq.*

† "South Africa," by David Livingstone, p. 23.

mation of the Transvaal Republic, he omits to state the reason of the grievance, which was not so much the emancipation of the slaves as the insufficiency of the grant made by Government as compensation for their release, and the frauds committed in the payment of that compensation. In lieu of money the Boers were offered bills upon the Home Government, which were to them so much waste paper; then agents came round and bought up these bills for less than half their real value, leaving the Boers minus both slaves and money. It is not, therefore, surprising that these industrious people should have little faith in the morality of Governments, and should endeavour to recoup themselves for their losses by enforcing labour from the natives into whose land they had intruded, and whom they found willing to supply them with slaves from hostile tribes in the interior; meanwhile, we must remember that the Boers have been the pioneers of civilisation in the Transvaal, and notwithstanding the tales of cruelty rife with regard to them, they are undoubtedly in general kind to their slaves or servants, the proof of which lies in the fact that the natives are always ready and willing to work for them, often even in preference to English colonists.

The small white spot on the Eastern Coast of the continent has, according to M. Berlioux, a singular and instructive history, which will bear repetition:—

“Ten years ago, the inhabitants of the islands of Sion and Patta, with their chief, Fumo Lotti, surnamed Ziniba or the Lion, who had been proscribed by the Sultan of Zanzibar, quitted their original home, to the number of 13,000, and emigrated to the countries opposite to their islands, in order to find a larger dominion where they might receive all those who were outlawed. The part which they had laid out for themselves, and the first law of this rising state, is to proclaim liberty to all those who cross their frontiers, and to provide a refuge for fugitive slaves. In the basin of the little Ozi, near to Dana, they have built the two strong towns of Vitton and Mogogoni. Ziniba, who is a clever and intelligent chief, in giving liberty to the slaves who take refuge near him, seeks to make energetic men of them, by teaching them at once *the love of labour and respect for the law*. In 1867, more than 10,000 of these miserable beings had fled to him, having escaped from the Arabian possessions, or having left the vessels in which they were engaged as sailors; a great number of them had traversed several hundreds of kilometres to escape from the country of the Somalis. As soon as a fugitive presents himself, the chief of the district obliges him to clear a field and build a hut for himself; afterwards he enrolls him in a company, gives him a musket and ammunition, and each week sends him to mount guard on the coast.”*

* “The-Slave Trade in Africa in 1872,” by Etienne Felix Berlioux, translated by Joseph Cooper, p. 39.

We have italicised two or three words in this history, because we believe that in them lies the secret for the regeneration of Africa. That that vast continent may at present be well named "Lost," no one will dispute who has followed us thus far, and realised to himself the constant internecine wars, the abject terrorism induced among the natives by these wars, the slaving raids which accompany them, and the constant decimation consequent thereupon. We cannot be surprised to read of miles upon miles of country once fertile turned into desert, of villages pillaged and burnt, and thousands of corpses strewing the ground—facts attested by all recent travellers. Livingstone tells us of a hundred miles of depopulated country, some say by slave-wars, others by famine.* Baker, in the north, relates: "Taking advantage of the anarchy of Central Africa, the slave-hunters had an unbounded field for their operations; thousands of slave-hunters from the Soudan, organised as a military force, burnt, pillaged, massacred, and violated at discretion. A country that I had seen in former years teeming with villages and rich in native wealth was rendered desolate. The young girls and boys were carried away into hopeless slavery. The old were massacred, and every abomination was committed in the name of 'God and the Prophet.'" † "By their yearly plunderings," says a correspondent in the "South African Mail" of February 3, 1877, "the Matabele have laid waste a tract of one hundred to two hundred miles; in the country surrounding their own, and where before industrious and agricultural nations kept land well tilled, are now only seen the dismal ruins of burned and plundered villages." Mr. Young, the latest arrival from this troubled scene, repeats the same tale: "The Arabs would come down wanting so many slaves, and surround a village, so that there should be no escape, and after capturing the men, women, and children, they would slaughter the old people upon the spot. He had seen skeletons by the thousand." ‡ The same paper relates the present proceedings of La Bengola, chief of the Matabele: "La Bengola imitates his father, Mosilikatze, in giving two of his regiments secret instructions at a certain time of the year, and his orders are most punctually fulfilled. Where does he send these regiments? Does he send them out hunting? Yes; he sends them out to hunt *human beings*; and this has been going on for many years. The two regiments are ordered to go either to the north, the north-east, east, or south, there to attack the native villages at night, burn them, kill all the old men, women, and babies, and to carry the young women, boys, and cattle with

* "Last Journals," p. 88.

† "Slavery and the Slave-Trade," by Sir Samuel White Baker, vol. xxx.

‡ "South African Mail," February 3, 1877.

them back to the Matabele country. The boys thus stolen are, however, well treated, for we are told that they are brought up as warriors, and that the greater part of the Matabele population now consists of the children thus stolen from other races, who later, in their turn, help to lay waste and desolate their native land. Many of them also remain as slaves to be bought or sold.* The writer of this letter is, however, mistaken in supposing that he is the first to have noticed the horrors perpetrated by the Matabele. Livingstone has certainly reported them, and says, "In the islands, and on the left bank of the Zambesi, all the way from the river Kafue, there is a large population; the right bank is equally fertile, but depopulated, because Mosilikatze does not allow any one to live there who might raise an alarm when he sends out marauders beyond."† With such facts before us, we can fully enter into the mournful feelings which dictated the following words to Cameron: "Passing through the ruins of so many deserted villages, once the homes of happy and contented people, was indescribably saddening. Where now were those who built them and cultivated the surrounding fields? Where? Driven off as slaves, massacred by villains, engaged in a war in which these poor wretches had no interest, or dead of starvation and disease in the jungle. Africa is bleeding out her life-blood at every pore. A rich country, requiring labour only to render it one of the greatest producers in the world, is having its population—already far too scanty for its needs—daily depleted by the slave-trade and internecine war. Should the present state of affairs be allowed to continue, the country will gradually relapse into jungles and wilds, and will become more and more impenetrable to the merchant and traveller."‡ The prospect thus presented is most disheartening—a fertile country desolated and lying waste through the greed and evil passions of man, civilised men descending to the level of ferocious beasts of prey, ravening and battenning upon their fellow-men; whilst the demoralising effects of all this upon the poor uncivilised native may be readily imagined—fields left uncultivated, whilst thousands are starving, the timid flying like hunted deer into the jungle at the approach of a stranger, the warlike prepared with spear or poisoned arrow to strike down the intruder, or, sadder still, hastening to catch the hunted fugitives of their own race to hand them over to slavery, or to death by hunger and starvation on the road; every man's hand against his brother, ready to hold down the fallen, and to entrap the unwary. It is sickening to read perpetually such records as these: "So many slave-

* "South African Mail," February 3, 1877.

† "Zambesi," p. 226.

‡ "Across Africa," vol. i. p. 209.

sticks lie along our path, that I suspect the people hereabout make a practice of liberating what slaves they can find abandoned on the march to sell them again.* “A Lunda slave, for whom I interceded to be freed from the yoke, ran away, and as he is near the Barna, his countrymen, he will be hidden. He told his plan to our guide, and asked him to accompany him back to Tanganika; but he is eager to deliver him up for a reward. All are eager to press each other down in the mire into which they are already sunk.”† “This is the usual course of Suahile trading—it is murder and plunder; and each slave, as he rises in his owner’s favour, is eager to show himself a mighty man of valour by cold-blooded killing of his countrymen; if they can kill a fellow-nigger, their pride boils up.”‡ “A stranger in the market had ten human under-jawbones hung by a string over his shoulder. On inquiry, he professed to have killed and eaten the owners, and showed with his knife how he cut up his victims. When I expressed disgust, he and others laughed.”§

Altogether, as Sir Samuel Baker remarks, in reviewing Livingstone’s last records of the African race, “Throughout these pages the reader will observe that the negro is painted in his true character. Although Livingstone never loses an opportunity of doing justice to the race when praise is due, he produces so many pictures of their brutality and natural love of homicide and savagedom, that the greatest friend of the black must stand aghast.”|| After showing so much of the dark side of the negro, as painted by one of his best friends, it is but fair to add the account given by the same writer of the same people in those parts of the continent into which the slave-trade has not yet penetrated:—“Fortunately I was in a country now where the feet of the slave-trader had not trod. It was a new and virgin land, and of course, as I have always found it in such cases, the natives were really good and hospitable, and for very small portions of cloth my baggage was conveyed from village to village by them.” “None of the people are ferocious without cause.” “The whole of my experience in Central Africa says that the negroes not yet spoilt by contact with the slave-trade are distinguished for friendliness and good sense. In one point they are remarkable—they are honest.”¶ Are we then to attribute all the vices of the negro to the demoralisation caused by the slave-trade? At the first blush it would appear so; but if we search further, we shall find

* “Last Journals of David Livingstone,” p. 65.

† Ibid., p. 23.

‡ Ibid., p. 79.

§ Ibid., p. 127.

|| Sir S. W. Baker on “Last Journals of Dr. Livingstone.” “Macmillan’s Magazine,” vol. xxxi. p. 283.

¶ Livingstone, as quoted in “The Lost Continent,” p. 82.

a deeper cause for the difference. We must not lose sight of the fact that there are *many* races in Africa—that the typical negro, with prognathous jaw and woolly hair, who has been so eagerly sought as a slave in all ages, is quite as distinct from the Kaffir, and from many of the races described by travellers in the interior, as from the diminutive Bushman, the feeble remnant of an older race now almost extinct. Of these higher races Livingstone writes :—

“Nsama’s people are particularly handsome. Many of the men have as beautiful heads as one could find in an assembly of Europeans. All have very fine forms, with small hands and feet. None of the West Coast ugliness, from which most of our ideas of the negroes are derived, is here to be seen. No prognathous jaws nor lark heels offended the sight. My observation deepened the impression, first obtained from the remarks of Winwood Reade, that the typical negro is seen in the ancient Egyptian, and not in the ungainly forms which grow up in the unhealthy swamps of the West Coast. Indeed, it is probable that this upland forest region is the true home of the negro. The women excited the admiration of the Arabs. They have fine, small well-formed features.”*

But we must remember that if this is the negro proper, it is not the negro with whom we have to do in treating of the slave-trade. These higher races may indeed sometimes fall into the hands of slave-traders, but they are not profitable; they perish by the way, some even dying of a broken heart; but of this Livingstone significantly remarks, “This disease attacks only the free who are captured, and never slaves.” The negro slave of the past, as of the present, was the negro of the woolly hair, retreating forehead, thick lip, and prognathous jaw; and it is of these we must treat principally when we speak of the capacity of the negro slave for civilisation, for they undoubtedly have formed the bulk of the slaves who have been taken from the African continent, both in ancient and modern times. People are very apt to class all savages together, and to judge one and all by the same standard. Every one having a black skin is set down as a “nigger,” and we have heard men of excellent sense and superior means of knowledge, argue that the *negro* was industrious because they had never found the *Malays*, among whom they had lived, refuse to work. No one can doubt that nations have special characteristics, which may be traced to the differing races composing them, and the less mixed the nation the stronger will be its characteristics. Now we believe the negro to be correctly sketched by Sir Samuel Baker in these words :—

* “Last Journals of David Livingstone,” p. 245.

“Negroes seldom think of the future ; they cultivate the ground at various seasons, but they limit their crops to their actual wants ; therefore an unexpected bad season reduces them to famine. They grow a variety of cereals, which, with a minimum of labour, yield upon their fertile soil a large return. Nothing would be easier than to double the production, but this would entail the necessity of extra store-room, which means extra labour. Thus with happy indifference the native thinks but lightly of to-morrow. He eats and drinks while his food lasts, and when famine arrives he endeavours to steal from his neighbours. There is an extreme love of independence in most savages, but especially among negroes. When they work in their fields they appear to be industrious, but this hard labour lasts for a short time, to be relieved by a period of idleness. Hunting and fishing are amusements eagerly pursued, but even in such sports a fortunate day is followed by several days of relaxation ; nothing is so distasteful to the negro as regular daily labour ; thus nothing that he possesses is durable. His dwelling is of straw or wattles, his crops suffice for a support from hand to mouth ; and as his forefathers worked only for themselves and not for posterity, so also does the negro of to-day. Thus, without foreign assistance, the negro a thousand years hence will be no better than the negro of to-day, as the negro of to-day is in no superior position to that of his ancestors some thousand years ago.”*

The inferior negro-races certainly possess no great amount of patriotism. In their case we never read of that burning desire for their native land which makes banishment worse than death to some more civilised races. Even in slavery they are content if treated with moderate kindness, and never seek to break their chains unless roused and goaded on by agitators. In truth they care little for freedom except for the power it brings of indulging to the full their love of ease, and many an emancipated slave looks back regretfully to the time when he lived at his master's expense, at the cost of labour which, under an indulgent rule, was not excessive. Hence the constant and unvarying testimony of all who have had opportunities of judging fairly is, that where the masters are kind the slaves are obedient, docile, and happy. Yet put a negro in authority over his fellows, and the brute within him shows itself unmistakably ; the savage instinct which prompts him to hunt down the weak in his native land leads him to persecute those beneath him when power is given into his hands, and the lash is never so unmercifully used as when it is placed in the hands of a negro. That he is not incapable of civilisation has indeed been proved, yet the testimony of Dr. Livingstone would tend to show that education with the negro does not necessarily fit him for

* “Slavery and the Slave-Trade,” by Sir S. White Baker. “Macmillan's Magazine,” vol. xxx.

helping to elevate the race. "Educated free blacks from a distance," says Livingstone, "are to be avoided; they are expensive, and are too much of gentlemen for your work."*

If it should be considered unfair to judge of the negro in his present condition in his native land, ruined and demoralised as it undoubtedly is by the slave-trade, no objection can be raised to an inference drawn from his condition as a free man in our colonies, or in those native free states to which he has been consigned by a freedom-loving people. If we look at the present state of Hayti, Sierra Leone, and Liberia, the attempts of the negro at self-government are not encouraging, these attempts seem generally to end in anarchy, in a burlesque of everything civilised, and constant revolutions. It could, perhaps, hardly be otherwise; we can scarcely expect people downtrodden for ages to develop at once on recovering their freedom a love of order and an aptitude for civilisation, which have been with us the slow growth of many centuries. All impartial writers are agreed in considering the *sudden* emancipation of the negro as a great political blunder; even Wilberforce when he first attacked the principle of slavery did not advocate sudden abolition.

"A man," says Sir Samuel Baker, "who has all his life been compelled to labour will naturally avoid that labour when freedom shall afford him the opportunity. Therefore, the sudden enfranchisement of a vast body of slaves created a ruinous famine of labour, and colonies that had been most prosperous fell into decay. If a value had been fixed upon every negro slave as the price of liberty, and he had been compelled to work with his master at a certain rate per day until he had earned his freedom, the slave would have appreciated the benefit of his industry, he would have become industrious by habit, as he would have gained his reward. At the same time he would have parted, or perhaps have remained, with his master without an imaginary wrong."

One thing seems certain, that before Africa can be opened up to legitimate commerce, the slave-trade, both external and internal, must be abolished. There is reasonable ground for believing that the export trade *must* shortly cease. All the Powers still holding slaves have declared their intention of abolishing the trade and emancipating their slaves, and even should they not be sincere in these expressions, the force of European opinion, backed up now by the voice of United America, will compel them eventually to dispense with forced labour; but, as the most thoughtful writers have impressed upon us, this emancipation must be

* "Last Journals of David Livingstone," p. 210.

† "Slavery and the Slave-Trade," by Sir S. W. Baker. "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxx.

gradual. "Were the slaves suddenly emancipated throughout the Egyptian dominions," says Sir Samuel Baker, "what would be the result? One half would quit the country and return to their old haunts of savagedom. Others would become vagrants; the women would set up drinking and dancing houses, and a general demoralisation would be the result;"* whilst, as he goes on to demonstrate, a sudden emancipation would be ruin to the farmer, whose lands thereby would be thrown out of cultivation. The "Times" correspondent, in a recent article (February 16, 1877), details the measures adopted by the Khedive for the suppression of the slave traffic in the Red Sea by despatching three vessels of the Egyptian navy, under the command of M'Killop Pasha, to board suspected vessels; but, as the same correspondent adds, "No one who knows Egypt and the Levant can hope for any sudden and total suppression of the slave-trade. Domestic slavery is an old institution of this country and all other parts of the Ottoman Empire, and it cannot be uprooted by any single expedition, however well organised. All that can be hoped is that the kidnapping of human beings, the sale of the poor by the rich, and the pillage of children may be checked. It is possible to make the approach to the ordinary markets so difficult that the trade will lose much of its attraction."† If indeed the Khedive is in earnest in his endeavours to suppress the trade, and his evident desire to stand well with the Governments of Europe makes it probable that he is so, a stop will certainly be put to any fresh importations by the Nile route, and in this case we may well be content to let slavery in Egypt die a natural death. Turkey is at present on trial before the world; but whatever may be the solution of the Eastern question, we may safely predict that if the slave-trade be abolished in Egypt, and the sources of supply *via* Egypt and the Red Sea be cut off, then slavery is doomed also in Turkey. If indeed the Sultan desires to infuse fresh vigour into the "sick man," he will of his own free choice abolish a system which has a tendency, in the case of many Eastern monarchs, to reduce them to the state of some of the ants described by Sir John Lubbock, who, having found means to imitate mankind in reducing their brethren to slavery, have become so emasculated thereby as to be unable to live without their slaves, dying absolutely of incapacity to feed and cleanse themselves when deprived of their aid. The wise ruler of Brazil has already commenced a gradual process of emancipation. "All children born after a certain date are free, and slaves are allowed

* "Slavery and the Slave-Trade," by Sir S. W. Baker. "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxx.

† See "Times," February 16, 1877.

to buy their freedom very cheaply."* With the Ameer of Affghanistan we can certainly deal; and if Portugal will *act* as well as *protest*, and purge her African possessions of the deeds she so earnestly repudiates, by calling to account the miscreants who, under the protection of her flag, are guilty of so many crimes, we may safely predict that the foreign slave-trade will soon cease.

The internal trade is, however, much more difficult to reach, and as long as it continues to exist, Africa will still have to be considered a "Lost Continent." Indeed it must of necessity be a very long time before a great continent like Africa, which as yet holds many vast tracts wholly unexplored, where tribes doubtless live as they have lived for thousands of years, warring among themselves, enslaving and probably eating each other, can be brought under the power of civilisation; for we must not forget that Africa is not a country like America, across which a railway may be carried in a few years, but that it abounds in swampy malarious spots, wherein Europeans cannot live; that the most experienced of travellers cannot avoid or repel the effects of these marshes, and that therefore any great engineering works in the interior would have to be carried out by the natives themselves, who are little likely as free agents to undertake anything entailing self-sacrificing labour. When we read of the constant attacks of debilitating fever from which Livingstone and Cameron, as well as all other travellers, so frequently suffered, it would savour of the guilt of murder to send a body of British workmen to endure the same inevitable result of labour beneath a tropical sun in a malaria-laden atmosphere. Colonel Long insists very strongly upon this. He says, "Fifteen hundred miles of marsh and fetid air to the north, and deadly jungles, morasses, and lakes of decayed vegetable matter to the south, form a deadly circle which devotes to a certain fate the white man, that no artifice can surmount." † He speaks also of the disheartening effect of the climate upon Colonel Gordon's expedition on their return to Khartoum, after a march through this long dreary marsh land, and points out its effects even upon his own Arab followers. "I had chosen 450 stalwart men, when at Khartoum, from a battalion of 800 men. They arrived in good health, but they fell ill in great numbers; it was unquestionable they could not stand the climate. Extra rations of tea and sugar and other luxuries were issued to them in vain." ‡ Therefore, those who are the most enthusiastic as to the future of Africa, see plainly that it must be many long years before their golden dreams can be realised. "It is not by

* "Log Letters from the Challenger," p. 43.

† "Central Africa," by Colonel C. Chaillé Long, pp. 237, 35.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 244

talking and writing," says Cameron, "that Africa is to be regenerated, but by action." "But I would impress upon all who approach this question the necessity for not being too sanguine. Many a name must be added to the roll of those who have fallen in the cause of Africa, much patient and enduring labour must be gone through without flinching or repining, before we see Africa truly free and happy."* Neither does this energetic traveller speak hopefully as to the extinction of slavery. He says, "But I am, by no means so certain of the rapid extinction of slavery as a domestic institution. The custom is so deeply engrained in the mind of the African, that I fear we must be content simply to commence the task, leaving its completion to our descendants."† Nevertheless, the recovery and regeneration of this "Lost Continent," and the suppression of the traffic which has so long deluged the land with blood, by the substitution of legitimate commerce, is a design worthy of the attention of European statesmen, and that it will eventually be accomplished cannot be doubted.

At present the commerce of Africa is confined almost exclusively to the export of slaves, ivory, beeswax, palm-oil, and india-rubber, regarding which Cameron says, "The whole trade of tropical Africa is at present dependent on human beings as beasts of burden. Where ivory is cheapest and most plentiful, none of the inhabitants willingly engage themselves as carriers, and traders are obliged to buy slaves to enable them to transport their ivory to a profitable market."‡ Of these exports, ivory cannot be depended upon as a permanent source of wealth, for should the country become opened up to commerce, the wild animals must of necessity grow scarce, if they do not entirely disappear; but in place of ivory, corn of different kinds might be raised in almost incredible quantities, and Africa might become the storehouse of the world. Cotton of various sorts is now raised in considerable quantities, and these might be indefinitely increased. The same may be said of sugar, oil, coffee, tobacco, and various gums and spices, whilst the mineral wealth of the continent is untold. But all these things will avail but little unless the natives can be induced to aid the efforts of Europeans, not only in the cultivation of the soil, but also in the making of roads and providing means of transport. Yet it seems impossible to do anything with a savage or semi-civilised people, without something which would give the master a hold upon the servant, so as to compel him to carry out such work as he undertakes to do; and since our own people work under such conditions, we feel at a loss to know what valid objection

* "Across Africa," p. 338.

† *Ibid.*, p. 338.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 322.

there can be to extending the same principle to uncivilised peoples. The contract system, provided it be fairly carried out both by master and servant, seems, in fact, the only method whereby a race just released from absolute slavery can be brought gradually within the pale of civilisation, and be made useful as labourers, until they are fitted to become perfectly independent.

The abolition of the foreign slave-trade will do but little for the civilisation and permanent improvement of the natives, unless the petty chiefs of the interior can be taught that it is more profitable to employ their subjects in the cultivation of the soil than in kidnapping and selling their neighbours. Even thus, the more powerful chieftains would continue to war with their weaker neighbours, and to make them till their own territory as slaves, unless this be prevented by the establishment of strong governments able to control and overawe the petty chieftains, yet themselves subjected to European influences, if not directly controlled by European governments. There would seem already to exist the nuclei around which such strong African empires might be formed, and through which the whole continent might eventually become civilised. There is, first of all, Egypt on the north, the ruler of which seems to have formed the ambitious project of annexing the whole valley of the Nile, and of restoring the glories of the old kingdom of the Pharaohs, whilst conforming entirely to the necessary improvements of modern civilisation, the chief drawback to this magnificent scheme being the lack of money, causing railways and irrigation works to languish. Perhaps, however, the Khedive will soon learn the Italian proverb, *Chi va piano va sano*—and in the end success may crown his efforts, especially if he will set himself to work in earnest to suppress the slave-trade and to improve the condition of his finances. It is, indeed, to Egypt that Colonel Long looks as the chief factor in the future civilisation of Central Africa. He says, "Egypt holds within her domains in the region of the Upper Nile a hardy population of nomads especially fitted for the exploitation of these countries. Inured to hardships, these Nubian Dongolowa have already entered these countries, and have been the pioneers of every traveller, except Captain Speke and myself. Under a proper régime of discipline, and the selection of good men that I know among them, I regard them as the great future civilising element for the redemption of this country, since the white man and the Arab cannot permanently dwell in its pernicious climate." And again: "I repeat that Egypt alone has within her domain a population especially fit for the perilous service of exploration of these countries, and it is to this element, rather than to costly foreign expeditions, whose sacrifice of life and of money are greatly in disproportion to results obtained, that recourse

must be had by the ruler of Egypt, by the philanthropist, and by the trader. If Providence has ordained that the regeneration of Central Africa is to be wrought by human means, it is thus, and thus only, it ever can be accomplished.*

Then on the East Coast there is the Sultan of Zanzibar, who, as Sir Samuel Baker says, "is too weak to follow the example of the Khedive of Egypt, and annex the country south of the equator to the territory of Uganda; but should an arrangement be made with a greater power, he might with assistance effect this object, and become responsible to his supporter for the good government of his territory and the total suppression of the slave-trade;" and, as the same writer says, although "Oriental governments may not be immaculate, they are far superior to that of petty negro chiefs, whose only aim in life is to war against and to enslave their neighbours." † On the south, our own Cape Colony is rapidly increasing in size and importance. There seems but little doubt that ere long the Transvaal and the Orange Free State will, either by confederation or annexation, become incorporated with the British territories, forming a single compact and wealthy state; and with this absorption, of course, the remnants of slavery yet existing beyond the pale of British law will be stamped out. But the Boers will not submit to British rule; already there are symptoms of preparations for "*trekking*" farther north; farms are thrown up, or offered for sale at ridiculously low prices; and the story of the Transvaal will be enacted over again, land taken from the native, either by assumed right or by some sort of agreement, will be cleared and cultivated, probably by the enforced labour of adverse tribes, but at any rate brought within the bounds of commerce and civilisation by these rough though kindly pioneers, whilst we enter into the cleared, prepared, and forsaken Transvaal, introducing law and order, building cities, and carrying railways far into the interior, thus gradually extending the commerce and aiding the regeneration of Africa. But in all this the native plays an insignificant part. Wherever the Anglo-Saxon race becomes dominant, *there the great mass of natives* are either slowly *exterminated* or are driven farther afield, being unwilling to submit to the restraints of civilisation, whilst *the few* who remain as servants *generally* become attached to their masters, and by degrees acquire the habits of civilised life, although very frequently, even after associating for years with Europeans, the born savage will shake off the bonds of civilisation, retire into the bush among his fellows, and become once more the naked savage. The difficulty, therefore, of con-

* "Central Africa," by Colonel C. Chaillé Long, pp. 313, 314.

† "Last Journals of David Livingstone." Sir S. W. Baker. "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxxi. p. 282.

trolling and civilising the immense masses of African races, some of whom are yet cannibals, may be easily imagined. It seems hopeless to attempt to reach them through the semicivilised of their own race, as typified by the native states of Liberia and Sierra Leone, because the semicivilised negro has a far greater contempt for the uncivilised of his own race than the European has. Winwood Reade has told us of the exclusiveness of the Liberians as to trade, and of the varying interests which prevent the development of the country. "There is a planter interest and a trader interest, and the question of compulsory labour may create disunion between them;" * adding, "The Liberians have no money, immigration is slack, they do not intermarry with the natives, and the population is decreasing. Nothing can save them from perdition except the throwing open of the land, the free admission of European traders and of negro settlers from Sierra Leone, or, in other words, the free admission of capital and labour." † The reports given of Sierra Leone and Lagos would appear to be more favourable, and in 1869 the exports from Lagos are given as exceeding the imports in the following proportion:—Exports, £669,445; imports, £416,869, and the trade is reported to be still increasing; whilst the revenue of the colony in the same year is given at £40,622, and the expenditure at £39,431; and the revenue of Sierra Leone is said to have increased from £59,272 in 1868 to £69,624 in 1869—the chief exportations being palm-kernels, palm-oil, raw cotton, and benni seed. Nevertheless the same book which gives these favourable statistics says truly that the value of these West African colonies must always be very small, owing to the unhealthiness of the climate, the number of Europeans in Sierra Leone being given as 131 Europeans to 41,493 natives. ‡ Whether the leaven of civilisation will ever penetrate through the dark regions of Dahomey, and over the mountains of Kong to the banks of the Niger and the borders of the Great Desert, by means of the British colonies of the coast of Guinea, time alone can show. At present the prospect is not bright in this part of the continent, and the difficulties presented to European colonisation by the climate seem insuperable. Nevertheless European influence and the encouragement of commerce by European capital may do much; but here, as elsewhere, the chief obstacle to the development of the country is the difficulty of finding free labour. Yet the success of Sierra Leone is sufficient to make Mr. Hutchinson and members of the

* "The African Sketch-Book," vol. ii. p. 257.

† *Ibid.*, p. 261.

‡ "The Slave-Trade of East Africa," by Edward Hutchinson, F.R.G.S., a.F.S.

Anti-Slavery Society desire to see a similar colony for liberated slaves established on the East Coast under the following conditions :—

1. The security and freedom of liberated slaves.
2. The maintenance of the able-bodied by their own labour.
3. The improvement in civilisation and education of those not too old to learn.
4. Proximity to their own country as far as possible.
5. That the liberated slaves should be in a position to aid the formation of free self-sustaining communities.
6. That these objects should be secured at no inordinate expense to the English treasury.*

The germ of this free native colony might perhaps be found in the little state of Juba before mentioned, but we doubt whether the enforced labour demanded of liberated slaves by the ruler to which we have previously called attention would not be deemed by the Anti-Slavery Society as savouring too much of slavery to be encouraged. At all events, the Commission of Inquiry appointed by Lord Clarendon ignores this little state (which yet, says M. Berlioux, in 1867, after an existence of only a few years, numbered 45,000 inhabitants), and recommends Zanzibar as the refuge for slaves liberated from Arab dhows. They say—

“Your Lordship will have perceived that, as a means of carrying out our views for the ultimate extinction of the slave traffic in Zanzibar, we rely, in some measure, upon the gradual substitution of free for slave labour, and this object would be greatly promoted by the selection of Zanzibar as the chief depot to the south for the liberated slaves. We have been induced to select this place, not only from its central position in the midst of the slave-trading districts, and the facilities which it therefore affords for the slaves being speedily landed from the cruisers ; but because we understand that there is a great and increasing demand for free labour at that place, and that even children can readily obtain work at good wages, so that no charge for their maintenance is likely to be thrown on the Imperial Government. For these reasons we think that Zanzibar should be selected, not only as the depot for the slaves captured in the south, but that also those captured in the north should ultimately be brought there.” †

It might, however, be worthy of the consideration of our rulers, whether it would not be advisable to take the little state of Juba under our protection, and make that, instead of Zanzibar, the depot for slaves liberated in the north. Whether France and

* See Hutchinson's "Slave-Trade of East Africa."

† Ibid, p. 88.

Portugal will care to enlarge their existing territories, and thus open up more and more of the interior we know not, but there is ample room for such extension, and a rich harvest would eventually be the result. But the one great problem to be solved in any scheme for the regeneration of Africa is undoubtedly *how* to substitute free labour for that slavery which has become the normal state of the negro.

Sir Samuel Baker's conclusions are, that "it is simply necessary to read with attention the journals of the lamented Livingstone to be convinced of the utter impossibility of improving the savage tribes of Central Africa by other means than the strong hand of a paternal Government. Humanitarians of a fanatical school who are not true philanthropists, may object to the blood that must be shed in a war of annexation; that blood is but as a drop in the ocean to the torrents that annually flow in the internecine wars that accompany the slave-trade of Central Africa."* Cameron remarks † to the same effect—"Many people may say that the right of native chiefs to govern their countries must not be interfered with. I doubt whether there is a country in Central Africa where the people would not soon welcome and rally round a settled form of government. The rule of the chiefs over their subjects is capricious and barbarous, and death or mutilation is ordered and carried out at the nod of a drunken despot." ‡

There are, however, grave, if not insuperable objections to a policy of annexation, and in a great measure we must be content to allow civilisation to filter slowly into the interior, through the kingdoms and colonies established around the coasts; but the riches of the interior can never be brought within the domain of legitimate commerce, until roads are constructed and means of transport found, which shall release men from becoming beasts of burthen. The Livingstonia Mission has established a steamboat upon Lake Nyassa, from which great things are hoped; but without roads and a transport service to the coast, a solitary steamboat will be useless; and the great drawback to the establishment of a train of bullock-waggon, in addition to the lack of roads, is the tsetsé-fly, § which in these regions at certain seasons render

* Sir S. Baker on "Last Journals of Dr. Livingstone," "Macmillan's Magazine," vol. xxix.

† "Across Africa," p. 335.

‡ Colonel Long gives several instances of this. On his introduction to M'Tsé, the chieftain of Uganda, who is reckoned by the neighbouring tribes as the greatest monarch in Africa, thirty men were sacrificed in honour of the white man's visit. "This," he adds, "was a custom common to all African potentates—a prerogative that went with the claim to African greatness."—*Central Africa*, by Colonel C. Chaillé Long, p. 107.

§ Colonel Long took his horse through the much-dreaded region of the tsetsé-fly, but does not tell us how he managed to preserve him from the attacks of this redoubtable foe.

cattle of all kinds worse than useless ; and although Bishop Steir reports * that he has taken oxen and a donkey up to a spot between Lindi and Lake Nyassa, yet it is an undoubted fact that the climate is prejudicial, if not fatal, alike to man and beast from more temperate latitudes. Under these circumstances, it is evident that upon the natives themselves must depend the development of the tropical regions of Africa ; and unless they can be induced to undertake the construction of roads, to enter upon drainage and other works necessary for opening up the country to commerce, perhaps also to train elephants to supply the place of horses and bullocks as beasts of burthen, Central Africa will long remain a sealed country to the merchant. Whether any great good in this direction can be effected without a certain amount of compulsion, remains to be seen. But doubtless in this the missionary may do much in inculcating upon these grown children the precept of St. Paul, "If any will not work, neither let him eat." These impressionable Africans are readily *converted*, and look upon their teachers with a reverence akin to the superstitious regard they pay to their own medicine-men. Of the reality of their conversion even their best friends are sceptical. Dr. Livingstone says of the converted, † "Revelation seems to have mingled with their idolatry without any sense of incongruity. But then the negroes are not the first who have retained their own superstitions under the guise of a new religion ; and there can be no doubt that if the missionaries can succeed in winning the superstitious regard of the natives, much good may be effected amongst a people naturally docile and easily led by the feelings of the moment either to good or evil.

With the suppression of the slave-trade a great future may be predicted for Africa, if only a satisfactory method can be devised of developing her rich resources by means of the industry of her own healthy stalwart sons.

* See "Times," March 2, 1877.

† "Last Journals," p. 184.

ART. V.—LORD MACAULAY AS AN HISTORIAN.

Selections from the Writings of Lord Macaulay. Edited, with Occasional Notes, by GEORGE OTTO TREVELYAN, M.P. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1876.

IN our review of Mr. Trevelyan's "Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay,"* we expressed our regret that untoward circumstances prevented our attempting to do the justice which we would have wished to do to Lord Macaulay's *magnum opus*—his "History of England." The publication of this volume of extracts from his writings affords us an opportunity, of which we gladly avail ourselves, to return to the discussion of Lord Macaulay's merits as an historian; and we do so all the more readily because, as is said by a writer now no more, there is at present a prevalent habit amongst "clever young men of pecking at Lord Macaulay." † This is an exceedingly ill-directed exercise of intellectual ability. We will endeavour to aid in the good work of putting an end to it. Many of these critics are as well qualified for their task as a writer in "Blackwood" of whom Macaulay, writing to his sister, says, he "imagines that William III. wrote his letters in English, and takes Cox's translations for the originals. A pretty fellow to set me to rights on points of history!" Such clever young men remind us of nothing so much as jackasses braying over a dead lion. But, as Macaulay himself said, "It is idle to be angry with people of this sort. They do after their kind. One might as well blame a fly for buzzing." ‡

Mr. Lowe once said that "the poetical charm of Lord Macaulay's mind and style have perhaps a little overclouded his reputation as a political philosopher." § So far forth as this is true at all, it is true only of those who afford in their own persons examples of—to use Macaulay's own words—"the slovenly way in which most people are content to think." We may say of Macaulay's "History" what he said of Gibbon's: "It would be strange if, in so large a work, there were nothing open to just remark;" || but the half-thinkers to whom we refer

* "Westminster Review," No. XCIX. (New Series), July 1876.

† "Essays and Reviews," by the late Henry H. Lancaster, advocate, with a preface by the Rev. B. Jowett, Master of Balliol College, Oxford. Edinburgh: Edmonstone & Douglas. 1876. P. 128.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 453.

§ "Speeches and Letters on Reform," p. 41.

|| "Life," vol. ii. p. 284.

“affect to speak of Macaulay in terms like those in which Dumont produced his estimate of Scott as an historian :—

“Mauvais romancier quand il écrit l'histoire,
Habile historien quand il fait des romans.
S'il invente il faut le croire,
S'il raconte méfiez vous en.” *

Because Lord Macaulay is not dull, he must therefore be inaccurate. Because his volume is as amusing as a romance, therefore he was careless in selecting his authorities. Because he conceives vividly and so writes forcibly, and because he sees too clearly to be vague, therefore he is superficial and shallow. Such, we believe, is the logic which supports these three charges which have been made parrot-fashion against Lord Macaulay. With respect to another charge, that of partiality, Mr. Lancaster † points out that there are three kinds of impartiality. There is the impartiality which arises from a sarcastic disregard of the whole matter of which the writer treats. This is the impartiality of Gibbon. There is the impartiality which abuses everybody, which is the impartiality of Mr. Hallam. And there is the impartiality which abuses nobody, which is the impartiality of Sir James Mackintosh, though perhaps his is rather the impartiality of indiscriminate admiration. If to be partial is not to be impartial in one or other or all of these three fashions, then only is Macaulay open to the charge of partiality. We will hereafter return to the sins imputed to Macaulay as an historian. We will premise our remarks by observing that Lord Macaulay's position as an historian differs from that of all former historians, inasmuch as more than twenty years before the publication of the first volumes of his “History” he had given to the world his idea of what a history of England should be and how it should be written, and had criticised, if not every previous historian of England, at least all those of any reputation. He subjected himself, therefore, to be criticised according to the severe rules he had laid down for and applied to others. For although the essay on “History” was not republished by him during his life, it was included in French and American editions of his essays, and was widely known to be his. We believe that he can be tried by his own standard, and not be found wanting. It is not unworthy to be noted amongst the accidents of literature that Lord Macaulay was the third great Whig statesman who began a history of England at the same period—the fall of the Stuarts and the Revolution of

* Vide “Edinburgh Review,” No. 283, January 1874, p. 110.

† Lancaster, “Essays and Reviews,” p. 195.

1688—and died having completed only a small part of his task. His companions in this misfortune were Mr. Fox and Sir James Mackintosh. On the publication of the first two volumes, one now living truly foretold that Macaulay would in this respect resemble his predecessors.

Macaulay in his essay on Mackintosh's "History" thus describes the qualifications of Fox and Mackintosh as historians:—

"The authors belonged to the same political party, and held the same opinions concerning the merits and defects of the English constitution, and concerning most of the prominent characters and events in English history. Both had thought much on the principles of government, yet they were not mere speculators. Both had ransacked the archives of rival kingdoms, and pored on folios which had mouldered for ages in deserted libraries. Yet they were not mere antiquaries. They had one eminent qualification for writing history; they had spoken history, acted history, lived history. The turns of political fortune, the ebb and flow of popular feeling, the hidden mechanism by which parties are moved, all these things were the subject of their constant thought and of their most familiar conversation."

It is obvious that the eminent qualifications for writing history attributed by Macaulay to Fox and Mackintosh were as fully possessed by himself.

Macaulay, referring to Mackintosh's parliamentary speeches and Fox's historical fragment, said, "Sir James Mackintosh spoke essays; Mr. Fox wrote debates, and that a celebrated passage in the fragment "sounds like a powerful reply thundered from the Opposition bench at three o'clock in the morning." It has been said of Macaulay's own speeches that they were "confessedly essayish." From this criticism we dissent, though it comes from one in whose judgment on Parliamentary speaking we generally concur.* If true at all, it is true only of Macaulay's earlier speeches. It is in no degree applicable to those spoken after his return from India.

As Macaulay did not speak "essays," so neither did he write "debates." Yet, again, to quote Mr. Lancaster—"His writings cannot fail to recall the common remark that history is like oratory; . . . the imagination of the orator, a thing quite distinct from the knack of the debater, and which may be manifested in writing as well as in speaking, was his in large measure." † This vein of oratory ran through not only his writings, but through his conversation also.

* The late E. Whitty, author of "The Stranger in Parliament." See the passage quoted in "Life of Macaulay," vol. II. p. 534.

† "Essays and Reviews," pp. 209, 210.

"Any one," says Mr. Trevelyan, "who reads the account of Norwich and Bristol in the third chapter, or the account of Magdalen College in the eighth chapter of the 'History,' may form an idea of Macaulay's merits as a cicerone in an old English provincial capital. To walk with him round the walls of York or through the rows of Chester, to look up at the towers of Lichfield from the spot where Lord Brook received his death wound, or down upon Durham from the brow of the hill behind Neville's Cross; to hear him discourse on Monmouth and Bishop Ken beneath the roof of Longleat Hall, or give the rein to all the fancies and reminiscences, political, personal, and historical, which were conjured up by a drive past Old Sarum to Stonehenge, were privileges which a child could appreciate, but which the most learned of scholars might have envied." *

We have also the testimony to Macaulay's merits as such a guide of one—himself no mean historian, and than whom no one could better appreciate those merits—in an account of a visit paid under Macaulay's guidance to the great Abbey which is itself one of "the manifold glories of this free and famous kingdom." †

"In 1840," writes M. Guizot, "during the leisure of my embassy, I experienced a striking proof of the extent and charm of Macaulay's knowledge. He offered to act as cicerone in a visit to Westminster Abbey. During three or four hours I wandered with him through that monumental gallery of England and her families. I stopped him or he stopped me at every step, at one time in reply to my questions, at another anticipating them; then he explained an allegorical monument, reminded me of a long-forgotten fact, related an anecdote little known, or recited some beautiful passage from the writers or orators whose names we encountered. We paused before the statue of Lord Chatham, standing with his head elevated and his arm advanced as if enforcing a burst of eloquence; before him at his feet was inscribed on a simple stone the name of his son, William Pitt. 'Might one not say,' observed Macaulay, 'that the father rises and there publicly delivers the funeral oration of his son;' and at this thought some of the most beautiful speeches of Lord Chatham thronged on his memory, from which he quoted select passages. The monuments of the great writers, whether in prose or verse, called forth the same abundant display, the same inspiration of memory. Milton and Addison were favourites with him, and he detained me several minutes before their names, gratifying himself by recalling incidents of their lives or passages from their works almost as much as he excited my delight in listening to him. The entire visit filled me with delight and interest. As the illustrious dead of Italy issued from their tombs on the passing of Dante, so did the great celebrities of English history and literature rise up before me at the voice of a worthy representative." ‡

* "Life," vol. ii. p. 214.

† Dean Stanley's "Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey." Dedication to the Queen.

‡ "Embassy to the Court of St. James in 1840," p. 145 *et seq.*

Writing in his diary on 7th December 1849, Macaulay says:—

“I admire no historians much except Herodotus, Thucydides, and Tacitus. Perhaps in his way—a very peculiar way—I might add Fra Paolo. The modern writers who have most of the great qualities of the ancient masters of history are some memoir-writers—St. Simon, for example. There is merit, no doubt, in Hume, Robertson, Voltaire, and Gibbon; yet it is not the thing. I have a conception of history more just, I am confident, than theirs. The execution is another matter, but I hope to improve.”*

It is apparent from the essay on “History” that this estimate of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Tacitus had been formed by Macaulay so far back as the time of its composition. What he admired in Herodotus was “his animation, his simple-hearted tenderness, his wonderful talent for description and dialogue, and the pure sweet flow of his language, which place him at the head of narrators.”† It was characteristic of Macaulay that the first book which he read by way of mental refreshment after the publication of each of the two portions of his “History” published in his lifetime was Herodotus. Thucydides he thought surpassed all his rivals “in the art of producing an effect on the imagination by skilful selection and disposition without indulging in the license of invention.”‡ Of Tacitus he says—

“Of the Latin historians, Tacitus was certainly the greatest; his style, indeed, is not only faulty in itself, but is in some respects peculiarly unfit for historical composition. He carries his love of effect far beyond the limits of moderation. He tells a fine story finely, but cannot tell a plain story plainly. He stimulates till stimulants lose their power. . . . There are passages in the narrative of Tacitus superior to the best which can be quoted from Thucydides,§ but they are not en- chased and relieved with the same skill. They are far more striking when extracted from the body of the work to which they belong than when they occur in their place, and are read in connection with what precedes and follows. In the delineation of character, Tacitus is un- rivalled among historians, and has very few superiors among dramatists and novelists.”||

Again:—

“The talent which is required to write history thus bears a consider-

* “Life,” vol. ii. p. 269. Comp. “Essay on History,” Misc. Works, p. 133, ed. 1871.

† Ibid., p. 133.

‡ Ibid., p. 139.

§ “Nov. 25, ’48.—Read my book while dressing. . . . Home and read Thucydides. I admire him more than ever. He is the great historian. The others one may hope to match: him never.”—*Life*, vol. ii. p. 244. *Vide*, also 245, Con. “Quarterly Review,” No. 283, July 1876, p. 49.

|| “Essay on History,” p. 147.

able affinity to the talent of a great dramatist. . . . In this part of his art Tacitus had certainly neither equal nor second among the ancient historians." *

The characteristics which Macaulay admired in these three old historians are all reproduced in his own works. "Soak your mind in Cicero," was his constant advice to students; † and he had so soaked his mind in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Tacitus, that Herodotus scarcely surpasses him in animation, in his wonderful talent for description, and the pure sweet flow of his language. As Macaulay said of Addison's "Spectators," "It is dangerous to select where there is so much to praise." We will venture, however, to say, that the series of historical scenes which form the first part of Mr. Trevelyan's "Selections," comprising the Battle of Sedgemoor, the Landing of the Prince of Orange, and the Siege of Londonderry, are admirable illustrations of the qualities which Macaulay admired in Herodotus. Macaulay's "sense of his own inferiority to Thucydides" did more to put him out of conceit with himself than all the unfavourable comments which were bestowed on him (sparingly enough it must be allowed) by the newspapers and reviews of the day. ‡ Yet others perhaps may think he closely approached the excellence of Thucydides in the art of producing an effect on the imagination by skilful selection and disposition without indulging in the license of invention. We select an illustration from the 23d chapter of the 'History.'

"On the evening of the 4th of January, a woman—the patriotic journalists and pamphleteers of that time did not fail to note that she was a Dutch woman—who was employed as a laundress at Whitehall, lighted a charcoal fire in her room, and placed some linen round it. The linen caught fire and burned furiously. The tapestry, the bedding, the wainscots were soon in a blaze. The unhappy woman who had done the mischief perished. Soon the flames burst out of the windows. All Westminster, all the Strand, all the river were in commotion. Before midnight, the King's apartments, the Wardrobe, the Treasury, the office of the Privy Council, the office of the Secretary of State, had been destroyed. The two chapels perished together—that ancient chapel where Wolsey had heard mass in the midst of gorgeous copes, golden candlesticks, and jewelled crosses, and that modern edifice which had been erected for the devotions of James, and had been embellished by the pencil of Verrio and the chisel of Gibbons. Meanwhile a great extent of building had been blown up, and it was hoped that, by this expedient, a stop had been put to the conflagration. But early in the morning a new fire broke out of the heaps of combustible matter which the gunpowder had scattered to right and left.

* "On History," ubi supra, p. 148.

† "Life," vol. i. p. 81.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 237.

The guardroom was consumed. No trace was left of that celebrated gallery which had witnessed so many balls and pageants, in which so many maids of honour had listened too easily to the vows and flatteries of gallants, and in which so many bags of gold had changed masters at the hazard-table. During some time men despaired of the Banqueting-house. The flames broke in on the south of that beautiful hall, and were with great difficulty extinguished by the exertions of the Guards, to whom Cutts, mindful of his honourable nickname of the Salamander, set as good an example on this night of terror as he had set in the breach at Namur. Many lives were lost, and many grievous wounds were inflicted by the falling masses of stone and timber before the fire was effectually subdued. When day broke, the heaps of smoking ruins spread from Scotland Yard to the Bowling-green, where the mansion of the Duke of Buccleuch now stands. The Banqueting-house was safe, but the graceful columns and festoons designed by Inigo were so much defaced and blackened that their form could hardly be discerned. There had been time to move the most valuable effects which were movable; unfortunately some of Holbein's finest pictures were painted on the walls, and are, consequently, only known to us by copies and engravings. The books of the Treasury and of the Privy Council were rescued, and are still preserved. The Ministers whose offices had been burnt down were provided with new offices in the neighbourhood. Henry the Eighth had built close to St. James's Park two appendages to the Palace of Whitehall—a cockpit and a tennis-court. The Treasury now occupies the site of the cockpit, the Privy Council Office the site of the tennis-court."*

An unfair and unfriendly critic of Macaulay, on whose attacks and aspersions we shall presently remark, says:—"A peculiar faculty, and one approaching to the dramatic order, belongs also to the successful painter of historical portraits, and belongs also to the true biographer. It is that of representing personality."† The possession of this faculty in the highest degree was, as we have seen, attributed to Tacitus by Macaulay.

The delineation of character did not, to Macaulay's mind, consist in

"Drawing up epigrammatic catalogues of good and bad qualities, and appending to them the names of eminent men. No writer, indeed, has done this more skilfully than Tacitus; but this is not his peculiar glory. All the persons who occupy a large space in his works have an individuality of character which seems to pervade all their words and actions. We know them as if we had lived with them. Claudius, Nero, Otho, both the Agrippinas are masterpieces. But Tiberius is a still higher miracle of art. The historian undertook to make us intimately acquainted with a man singularly dark and inscrutable, with a man whose real disposition long remained swathed up in intricate

* "Selections," p. 276.

† "Quarterly Review," No. 283, July 1876.

folds of factitious virtues, and over whose actions the hypocrisy of his youth and the seclusion of his old age threw a singular mystery. He was to exhibit the specious qualities of the tyrant in a light which might render them transparent, and enable us at once to perceive the covering and the vices by which it was concealed. He was to trace the gradations by which the first magistrate of a republic, a senator mingling freely in debate, a noble associating with his brother nobles, was transformed into an Asiatic Sultan; he was to exhibit a character distinguished by courage, self-command, and profound policy, yet defiled by all

‘Th’ extravagancy
And crazy ribaldry of fancy.’

He was to mark the gradual effect of advancing age and approaching death on this strange compound of strength and weakness; to exhibit the old sovereign of the world sinking into a dotage which, though it rendered his appetites eccentric and his temper savage, never impaired the powers of his stern and penetrating mind; conscious of failing strength, raging with capricious sensuality, yet to the last the keenest of observers, the most artful of dissemblers, and the most terrible of masters. The task was one of extreme difficulty. The execution is almost perfect.*

Again, in the sketch of a history of England such as “a perfect historian” would write, he says:—

“Henry (the Eighth) would be painted with the skill of Tacitus. We should have the change of his character from his profuse and joyous youth to his savage and imperious old age. We should perceive the gradual progress of selfish and tyrannical passions in a mind not naturally insensible or ungenerous; and to the last we should detect some remains of that open and noble temper which endeared him to a people whom he oppressed.” †

We venture to say, that whoever compares this description of the skill of Tacitus in delineating character with the sketch of Peter the Great, or with any one of the nine historical portraits which form the second portion of Mr. Trevelyan’s “Selections,” ‡ will find that in this respect Macaulay, if, as he would himself have said, he is not equal to Tacitus, approaches him very closely. The personalities of Jeffreys and of Johnson are represented by the English writer with a skill little if at all inferior to that of the Roman; but the best of these portraits to our mind is that of Horace Walpole, a part of which, well as it is known, we will here transcribe.

“He was, unless we have formed a very erroneous judgment of his character, the most eccentric, the most artificial, the most fastidious,

* “On History,” p. 148,

† “On History,” p. 158.

‡ “Selections,” pp. 155–241, 279 *et seq.*

the most capricious of men. His mind was a bundle of inconsistent whims and affectations; his features were covered by mask within mask. When the outer disguise of obvious affectation was removed, you were still as far as ever from seeing the real man. He played innumerable parts, and over-acted them all. When he talked misanthropy, he out-Timoned Timon. When he talked philanthropy, he left Howard at an immeasurable distance. He scoffed at courts, and kept a chronicle of their most trifling scandal; at society, and was blown about by its slightest veerings of opinion; at literary fame, and left fair copies of his private letters, with copious notes, to be published after his decease; at rank, and never forgot he was an Honourable; at the practice of entail, and tasked the ingenuity of conveyancers to tie up his villa in the strictest settlement. The conformation of his mind was such, that whatever was little seemed to him great, and whatever was great seemed to him little. Serious business was a trifle to him, and trifles were his serious business. To chat with blue-stockings, to write little copies of complimentary verses on little occasions, to superintend a private press, to preserve from natural decay the perishable topics of Ranelagh and White's, to record divorces and bets, Miss Chudleigh's absurdities, and George Selwyn's good sayings, to decorate a grotesque house with pie-crust battlements, to procure rare engravings and antique chimney-boards, to match odd gauntlets, to lay out a maze of walks within five acres of ground,—these were the grave employments of his long life. From these he turned to politics as an amusement. After the labours of the printshop and the auction-room, he unbent his mind in the House of Commons, and having indulged in the recreation of making laws and voting millions, he returned to more important pursuits—to researches after Queen Mary's comb, Wolsey's red hat, the pipe which Van Tromp smoked during his last sea-fight, and the spur which King William struck into the flank of Sorrel.

“He was, as he has himself told us, fond of faction as an amusement. He loved mischief, but he loved quiet; and he was constantly on the watch for opportunities of gratifying both tastes at once. He sometimes contrived, without showing himself, to disturb the course of Ministerial negotiations, and to spread confusion through the political circles. He does not himself pretend that, on these occasions, he was actuated by public spirit; nor does he appear to have had any private advantage in view. He thought it a good practical joke to set public men together by the ears; and he enjoyed their perplexities, their accusations, and their recriminations as a malicious boy enjoys the embarrassment of a misdirected traveller.

“About politics, in the high sense of the word, he knew nothing and cared nothing. He called himself a Whig. His father's son could scarcely assume another name. It pleased him also to affect a foolish dislike of kings as kings, and a foolish love and admiration of rebels as rebels; and perhaps, while kings were not in danger, and while rebels were not in being, he really believed that he held the doctrines which he professed. To go no further than the letters now

before us, he is perpetually boasting to his friend Mann of his aversion to royalty and to royal persons. He calls the crime of Damien, 'that least bad of murders, the murder of a king.' He hung up in his villa an engraving of the death-warrant of Charles, with the inscription 'Major Charta.' Yet the most superficial knowledge of history might have taught him that the Restoration, and the crimes and follies of the twenty-eight years which followed this restoration, were the effects of this greater charter; nor was there much in the means by which that instrument was obtained that could gratify a judicious lover of liberty. A man must hate kings very bitterly before he can think it desirable that the representatives of the people should be turned out of doors by dragoons in order to get at a king's head. Walpole's Whiggism, however, was of a very harmless kind. He kept it, as he kept the old spears and helmets at Strawberry Hill, merely for show. He would just as soon have thought of taking down the arms of the ancient Templars and Hospitaliers from the walls of his hall, and setting off on a crusade to the Holy Land, as of acting in the spirit of those daring warriors and statesmen, great even in their errors, whose names and seals were affixed to the warrant which he prized so highly. He liked revolution and regicide only when they were a hundred years old. His republicanism, like the courage of a bully or the love of a fribble, was strong and ardent when there was no occasion for it, and subsided when he had an opportunity of bringing it to the proof. As soon as the revolutionary spirit really began to stir in Europe, as soon as the hatred of kings became something more than a sonorous phrase, he was frightened into a fanatical royalist, and became one of the most extravagant alarmists of those wretched times.*

The secret of Macaulay's skill as a delineator of character was the same which made him so skilful an instructor. In his "Life" of his uncle, Mr. Trevelyan, in a passage which well illustrates the remark of the critic to whom we have referred, that "at no small number of points" in that book is to be found "the nearest approach within our knowledge, not to the imitation, but to the reproduction of an inimitable style."†

"There was one department of education in which, as an instructor, he might have challenged comparison with the best. A boy whose classical reading he watched, and in some degree directed, might, indeed, be lazy, but could not be indifferent to his work. The dullest of tyros would have been inspired by the ardour of one whose thoughts were often for weeks together more in Latium and Attica than in Middlesex; who knew the careers and characters of the great men who paced the Forum and declaimed in the Temple of Concord as intimately as those of his own rivals in Parliament and his own colleagues in the Cabinet; to whom Cicero was as real as Peel, and Curio as Stanley; who was as familiar with his Lucian and his Augustan histories as other men of letters are with their Voltaire and their Pepys;

* "Selections," p. 232.

† "Quarterly Review," *ubi supra*, p. 3.

who cried over Homer with emotion, and laughed over Aristophanes ; and could not read the 'De Coronâ' even for the twentieth time without striking his clenched fist at least once a minute on the arms of his easy-chair. As he himself says of Lord Somers, 'he had studied ancient literature like a man,' and he loved it as only a poet could."*

The same deep knowledge and enthusiastic love of his subject, the same power of realising and identifying himself with the men and scenes of old which made him so good a classical instructor, inspired and animated him in writing his "History." Absorbed in that labour of love, "Mr. Gladstone's plan for the consolidation of the National Debt was far less to him than Montague's scheme for restoring the standard of the coinage by calling in the clipped silver, and the abortive Triennial Bill of 1692 was far more to him than the abortive Reform Bill of 1854." He was, to describe him in his own words, "a vehement Ministerialist, of 1698, who thought more about Somers and Montague than Campbell and Lord Palmerston." †

Hence it was that he was able to produce descriptions in the spirit of Herodotus, to affect the imagination by a selection and disposition of materials not unworthy of Thucydides, to delineate character with a skill resembling that of Tacitus. There is another element in his success as a delineator of historical sketches. He had observed and pointed out "the advantage which in rhetoric and poetry the particular has over the general ;" ‡ and in his historical writings he was careful to act on this principle of composition. To quote the words of a writer to whom we referred in our previous paper—

"His [Macaulay's] principle is that a special fact has more hold on the mind than a general reflection. He knows that to give men a clear and vivid idea, they must be brought back to their personal experience. He remarks that, in order to make them realise a storm, the only method is to recall to them some storm which they have themselves seen and heard, with which their memory is still charged, and which still re-echoes through all their senses. He practises in his style the philosophy of Bacon and Locke. With him, as well as with them, the origin of every idea is a sensation ; every complicated argument, every entire conception, has certain particular facts for its only support. It is so for every structure of ideas as well as for a scientific theory." §

The power Macaulay possessed of realising and identifying himself with the men and scenes of whom and of which he wrote, entitle him—on the authority of one of the greatest poets of this century, John Keble—to a high place in that goodly fellowship. Discussing Sir Walter Scott's rank as a poet, and referring not

* "Life," vol. ii. p. 421.

† Ibid., pp. 366, 431.

‡ "Selections," p. 338.

§ "History of English Literature," by H. A. Taine, translated by H. Von Laun, one of the Masters at the Edinburgh Academy, vol. ii. pp.

only to his poems, but to his novels, Keble gives Scott a place amongst those whom he terms primary, as distinguished from secondary poets (*e.g.*, Dryden), because, and here Keble follows the teaching of Aristotle, a primary poet must have not merely the *εὐπρῦια*, the versatility and power of transforming himself into the resemblance of real sentiment, but the more genuine spring of the poetical art which makes the primary poet τὸ *μανικόν*, the enthusiasm, the passionate devotion to some one class of objects or train of thought. Scott, in Keble's judgment, had in the highest degree τὸ *μανικόν*. So equally had Macaulay, and hence, according to the principles of Aristotle and the classification of Keble, both are entitled to rank among the primary poets.*

Beneath most, if not all, the criticisms which have been written on his great work will be found the assumption that Macaulay, having given his idea of what a history of England, written by a "perfect historian," would be, and having subsequently written a history of England himself, gave it to the world as a perfect history. This has led to much of that system of "pecking" at him which Mr. Lancaster condemns. This assumption is wholly without foundation. Macaulay avowed that to be "a really great historian is perhaps the rarest of intellectual distinctions;" that a "perfect historian," such as he attempted to describe in his essay on "History," would indeed be an intellectual prodigy. "In his mind powers scarcely compatible with each other must be tempered into an exquisite harmony. We shall sooner see another Shakespeare or another Homer." † On the completion of the first portion of his "History," he notes in his diary, "I am pretty well satisfied. As compared with excellence, the work is a failure; but as compared with other similar books, I cannot think it so." ‡ And again, on the publication of the second portion, he writes, "I dawdled over my book most of the day, sometimes in good, sometimes in bad spirits about it. On the whole, I think that it must do. The only competition which, as far as I can perceive, it has to dread, is that of the two former volumes. Certainly no history of William's reign is either so trustworthy or so readable." § And later on, "In truth, I do think the fault-finding is generally unreasonable, though the book is no doubt faulty enough. It is well for its reputation that I do not review it as I could review it." || And towards the close of his

414-416; Art. "Macaulay." Single-Speech Hamilton extended the same rule to Parliamentary speaking—*vide* "Parliamentary Logic," p. 69. "Singillatim potius quam generatim atque universé loquitur."—*Cicero*.

* "Occasional Papers and Reviews," by John Keble, M.A., p. 21.

† "On History," pp. 133, 159.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 243; *vide* also p. 232, and "Westminster Review," No. XCIX. p. 28.

§ "Life," vol. ii. p. 384.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 441.

life he says, "I can truly say that I never read again the most popular passages of my own works without painfully feeling how far my execution has fallen short of the standard which is in my own mind."* We have grouped these extracts together in order that our readers may have them in mind when we come to deal with the critic to whom we have alluded. They will then be able to compare his rash and sweeping assertions with the modest, sincere, and candid judgments of Macaulay on his own works—judgments, moreover, the worth of which is enhanced by the consideration that he neither, as we believe, intended or anticipated their publication. We agree with Mr. Lancaster that Macaulay's genius was essentially historical.† He therefore possessed the one indispensable prerequisite for his work. We know from his "Life and Letters" the amount of faithful, earnest labour bestowed on it. We know also the spirit in which it was conceived. When engaged in its composition, he sought to realise the ideal history he had sketched twenty years before. He bore in mind that

"A history which in every particular incident may be true, may on the whole be false. The circumstances which have most influence on the happiness of mankind, the changes of manners and morals, the transition of communities from poverty to wealth, from knowledge to ignorance, from ferocity to humanity, these are for the most part noiseless revolutions. Their progress is rarely indicated by what historians are pleased to call important events. They are not achieved by armies or enacted by senates. They are sanctioned by no treaties; and recorded in no archives. They are carried on in every school, in every church, behind ten thousand counters, at ten thousand firesides. The upper current of society presents no certain criterion by which we can judge of the direction in which the undercurrent flows. We read of defeats and victories; but we know that nations may be miserable amidst victories, and prosper amidst defeats. We read of the fall of wise Ministers, and of the rise of profligate favourites; but we must remember how small a proportion the good effected by a single statesman can bear to the good or evil of a great social system."‡

This was his idea of how history should be written. How far he was successful in attaining his own standard, the following passage from his description of "the currency in the seventeenth century" supplies an illustration:—

"The evils produced by this state of the currency were not such as have generally been thought worthy to occupy a prominent place in history. Yet it may be doubted whether all the misery which had been inflicted on the English nation in a quarter of a century by bad kings, bad Ministers, bad Parliaments, and bad judges, was equal to

* "Life," vol. ii. p. 459.

† "Essays and Reviews," p. 181.

‡ "On History," p. 156.

the misery caused in a single year by bad crowns and bad shillings. The events which furnish the best themes for pathetic and indignant eloquence are not always those which most affect the happiness of the great body of the people. The misgovernment of Charles and James, gross as it had been, had not prevented the common business of life from going steadily and prosperously on. While the honour and independence of the state were sold to a foreign power, while chartered rights were invaded, while fundamental laws were violated, hundreds of thousands of quiet, honest, and industrious families laboured and traded, ate their meals, and laid down to rest in comfort and security. Whether Whigs or Tories, Protestants or Jesuits, were uppermost, the grazier drove his beasts to market, the grocer weighed out his currants, the draper measured out his broadcloth, the hum of buyers and sellers was as loud as ever in the towns, the harvest-home was celebrated as joyously as ever in the hamlets, the cream overflowed the pails of Cheshire, the apple-juice foamed in the presses of Herefordshire, the piles of crockery glowed in the furnaces of the Trent, and the barrows of coal rolled fast along the timber railways of the Tyne. But when the great instrument of exchange became thoroughly deranged, all trade, all industry were smitten as with a palsy. The evil was felt daily, and almost hourly, in almost every place, and almost by every class—in the dairy and on the threshing-floor, by the anvil and by the loom, on the billows of the ocean and in the depths of the mine. Nothing could be purchased without a dispute. Over every counter there was wrangling from morning till night. The workman and his employer had a quarrel as regularly as the Saturday came round. On a fair-day or a market-day the clamours, the reproaches, the taunts, the curses were incessant, and it was well if no booth was overturned and no head broken. No merchant would contract to deliver goods without making some stipulation about the quality of the coin in which he was to be paid. Even men of business were often bewildered by the confusion into which all pecuniary transactions were thrown. The simple and the careless were pillaged without mercy by extortioners, whose demands grew even more rapidly than the money shrank. The price of the necessaries of life, of shoes, of ale, of oatmeal, rose fast. The labourer found that the bit of metal which, when he received it, was called a shilling, would hardly, when he wanted to purchase a pot of beer or a loaf of rye-bread, go as far as sixpence. Where artisans of more than usual intelligence were collected in great numbers, as in the dockyard at Chatham, they were able to make their complaints heard, and to get some redress. But the ignorant and helpless peasant was cruelly ground between one class which would give money only by tale and another which would take it only by weight. Yet his sufferings hardly exceeded those of the unfortunate race of authors. Of the way in which obscure writers were treated we may easily form a judgment from the letters, still extant, of Dryden to his bookseller Tonson. One day Tonson sends forty brass shillings, to say nothing of clipped money; another day he pays a debt with pieces so bad that none of them will go. The great poet sends them all back, and demands in their place guineas

at twenty-nine shillings each. 'I expect, he says in one letter, 'good silver, not such as I have had formerly.' 'If you have any silver that will go,' he says in another letter, 'my wife will be glad of it. I lost thirty shillings or more by the last payment of fifty pounds.' These complaints and demands, which have been preserved from destruction only by the eminence of the writer, are doubtless merely a fair sample of the correspondence which filled the mail-bags of England during several months."*

Macaulay also strove hard, and if not, as he would have been the first to admit, with complete, yet with no small measure of success, to realise the ideal of a "perfect historian."

"In his work the character and spirit of an age is exhibited in miniature. He relates no fact, he attributes no expression to his characters, which is not authenticated by sufficient testimony; but by judicious selection, rejection, and arrangement he gives to truth those attractions which have been usurped by fiction. In his narrative a due subordination is observed. Some transactions are prominent, others retire. But the scale on which he represents them is increased or diminished, not according to the dignity of the persons concerned in them, but according to the degree in which they elucidate the condition of society and the nature of man. He shows us the court, the camp, and the senate—but he shows us also the nation. He considers no anecdote, no peculiarity of manner, no familiar saying, as too insignificant for his notice which is not too insignificant to illustrate the operation of laws, of religion, and of education, and to mark the progress of the human mind. Men will not merely be described, but will be made intimately known to us. The changes of manners will be indicated, not merely by a few general phrases or a few extracts from statistical documents, but by appropriate images presented in every line."†

With this aim and object the passages were composed which will be found in Mr. Trevelyan's "Selections" under the titles "Manners of the Seventeenth Century,"‡ "Travelling in the Seventeenth Century,"§ "The Country Gentleman of the Seventeenth Century,"|| "The Towns of England in the Reign of Charles the Second,"¶ "Civilisation and its Effect on the Mass of the People,"** and "The Highlands of Scotland."†† They are so well known that any lengthy quotation would be superfluous; but we will give a few extracts as illustrations of the manner in which Macaulay sought to fulfil what as an historian he conceived was his duty, viz., "to elucidate the condition of society;" to show his readers "not only the court, the camp, and the senate, but also the nation;" not merely to describe

* "History of England," chap. xxxi, "Selections," p. 418.

† "Selections," p. 157.

‡ Ibid., p. 367.

§ Ibid., p. 374.

|| Ibid., p. 382.

¶ Ibid., p. 388.

** Ibid., p. 399.

†† Ibid., p. 404.

men, "but to make them intimately known to us," and "to indicate changes of manners by appropriate images in every line." We preface our extracts with an observation borrowed from Mr. Lancaster, in which we entirely concur. "Brilliant as are Macaulay's pictures of courts, stirring as are his scenes of battle, it is in describing social ameliorations and parliamentary struggles that his genius has achieved its most signal triumphs." *

In describing the manners of the seventeenth century, Macaulay writes—

"The coffee-house must not be dismissed with a cursory mention. It might indeed at that time have been not improperly called a most important political institution. No Parliament had sat for years. The municipal council of the city had ceased to speak the sense of the citizens, public meetings, harangues, resolutions, and the rest of the modern machinery of agitation, had not yet come into fashion. Nothing resembling the modern newspaper existed. In such circumstances the coffee-houses were the chief organs through which the public opinion of the metropolis vented itself. The first of these establishments had been set up, in the time of the Commonwealth, by a Turkey merchant who had acquired among the Mahometans a taste for their favourite beverage. The convenience of being able to make appointments in any part of the town, and of being able to pass evenings sociably at a very small charge, was so great that the fashion spread fast. Every man of the upper or middle class went daily to his coffee-house to learn the news and to discuss it. Every coffee-house had one or more orators, to whose eloquence the crowd listened with admiration, and who soon became, what the journalists of our time have been called, a fourth estate in the realm. . . . Foreigners remarked that the coffee-house was that which especially distinguished London from all other cities; that the coffee-house was the Londoner's home; and that those who wanted to find a gentleman commonly asked, not whether he lived in Fleet Street or Chancery Lane, but whether he frequented the Grecian or the Rainbow. Nobody was excluded from these places who laid down his penny at the bar, yet every rank and profession, and every shade of religious and political opinion, had its own headquarters. There were houses near St. James's Park where fops congregated, their heads and shoulders covered with black and flaxen wigs, not less ample than those which are now worn by the Chancellor, and by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

"Will's, situated between Covent Garden and Bow Street, was sacred to polite letters. There the talk was about poetical justice and the unities of place and time. There was a faction for Perrault and the moderns, a faction for Boileau and the ancients. One group debated whether 'Paradise Lost' ought not to have been in rhyme. To another an envious poetaster demonstrated that 'Venice Preserved' ought to have been hooted from the stage. Under no roof was a greater variety of figures to be seen. There were Earls in stars and garters, clergymen in cassocks and bands, pert Templars, sheepish lads

* "Essays and Reviews," p. 185.

from the Universities, translators and index-makers in ragged coats of frieze. The great press was to get near the chair where John Dryden sat. In winter that chair was always in the warmest nook by the fire; in summer it stood in the balcony. To bow to the Laureate, and to hear his opinion of Racine's last tragedy or of Bossu's treatise on epic poetry, was thought a privilege. A pinch from his snuff-box was thought an honour sufficient to turn the head of a young enthusiast. There were coffee-houses where the first medical men might be consulted. Dr. John Radcliffe, who in the year 1685 rose to the largest practice in London, came daily, at the hour when the Exchange was full, from his house in Bow Street, then a fashionable part of the capital, to Garraway's, and was to be found surrounded by surgeons and apothecaries at a particular table. There were Puritan coffee-houses, where no oath was heard, and where lank-haired men discussed election and reprobation through their noses; Jew coffee-houses, where dark-eyed money-changers from Venice and from Amsterdam greeted each other; and Popish coffee-houses, where, as good Protestants believed, Jesuits planned, over their cups, another great fire, and cast silver bullets to shoot the King.*

Again, treating of "the imperfect fusion of the different elements of society," the chief cause of which was the extreme difficulty which our ancestors found in passing from place to place, Macaulay does not leave the subject in a few abstract phrases, but, with that characteristic preference for the particular over the general to which we have alluded, proceeds to present a picture to the imagination of his readers.

"It was by the highways that both travellers and goods generally passed from place to place; and those highways appear to have been far worse than might have been expected from the degree of wealth and civilisation which the nation had even then attained. On the best lines of communication the ruts were deep, the descents precipitous, and the way often such as it was hardly possible to distinguish, in the dusk, from the unenclosed heath and fen which lay on both sides. Ralph Thoresby, the antiquary, was in danger of losing his way on the great North Road, between Barnby Moor and Toxford, and actually lost his way between Doncaster and York. Pepys and his wife, travelling in their own coach, lost their way between Newbury and Reading. In the course of the same tour they lost their way near Salisbury, and were in danger of having to pass the night on the Plain. It was only in fine weather that the whole breadth of the road was available for wheeled vehicles. Often the mud lay deep on the right and the left, and only a narrow track of firm ground rose above the quagmire. At such times obstructions and quarrels were frequent, and the path was sometimes blocked up during a long time by carriers, neither of whom would break the way. It happened almost every day that coaches stuck fast until a team of cattle could be procured from some neighbouring farm to tug them out of the slough. But in bad seasons the traveller had

* "History of England," chap. iii., "Selections," p. 370.

to encounter inconveniences still more serious. . . . The great route through Wales to Holyhead was in such a state that in 1685 a viceroy going to Ireland was five hours travelling fourteen miles, from St. Asaph to Conway. Between Conway and Beaumaris he was forced to walk great part of the way, and his lady was carried in a litter. His coach was, with much difficulty, and by the help of many hands, brought after him entire. In general, carriages were taken to pieces at Conway, and borne on the shoulders of stout Welsh peasants to the Menai Straits. In some parts of Kent and Sussex, none but the strongest horses could, in winter, get through the bogs in which at every step they sank deep. The markets were often inaccessible during several months. It is said that the fruits of the earth were sometimes suffered to rot in one place, while in another place, distant only a few miles, the supply fell far short of the demand. The wheeled carriages in this district were generally pulled by oxen. When Prince George of Denmark visited the stately mansion of Petworth in wet weather, he was six hours in going nine miles; and it was necessary that a body of sturdy hinds should be on each side of his coach in order to prop it. Of the carriages which conveyed his retinue, several were upset and injured.

“On the best highways heavy articles were, in the time of Charles the Second, generally conveyed from place to place by stage-waggons. In the straw of these articles nestled a crowd of passengers, who could not afford to travel by coach or on horseback, and who were prevented by infirmity, or by the weight of their luggage, from going on foot. The expense of transmitting heavy goods in this way was enormous; from London to Birmingham the charge was seven pounds a ton; from London to Exeter twelve pounds a ton. This was about fifteenpence a ton for every mile, more by a third than was afterwards charged on turnpike roads, and fifteen times what is now demanded by railway companies. The cost of conveyance amounted to a prohibitory tax on many useful articles. Coal in particular was never seen except in the districts where it was produced, or in the districts to which it could be carried by sea, and was always indeed known in the South of England by the name of sea-coal. On byroads, and generally throughout the country north of York and west of Exeter, goods were carried by long trains of packhorses. These strong and patient beasts, the breed of which is now extinct, were attended by a class of men who would seem to have borne much resemblance to the Spanish muleteers. A traveller of humble condition often found it convenient to perform a journey mounted on a pack-saddle between two baskets, under the care of these hardy guides. The expense of this mode of conveyance was small; but the caravan moved at a foot's-pace, and in winter the cold was often insupportable.”*

We regret we cannot afford space for Macaulay's account of the Protectionist opposition to the introduction of coaches. “We smile (he says) at these things. It is not impossible that

* “History of England,” chap. iii., “Selections,” pp. 374-377.

our descendants, when they read the history of the opposition offered by cupidity and prejudice to the improvements of the nineteenth century, may smile in their turn."

Our next extract we make more especially for the purpose of showing how ill-founded is the criticism that Macaulay's pictures are mere caricatures; that he habitually over-colours, without due admixture of light and shade. It is from the passage in the same third chapter of his "History" in which the "country gentleman of the seventeenth century" are so admirably portrayed.

"From this description (says Macaulay) it might be supposed that the English esquire of the seventeenth century did not materially differ from a rustic miller or alehouse-keeper of our time. There are, however, some important parts of his character still to be noted, which will greatly modify this estimate. Unlettered as he was, and unpolished, he was still, in some most important points, a gentleman. He was a member of a proud and powerful aristocracy, and was distinguished by many both of the good and bad qualities which belong to aristocrats. His family pride was beyond that of a Talbot or a Howard. He knew the genealogies and coats of arms of all his neighbours, and could tell which of them had assumed supporters without any right, and which of them were so unfortunate as to be great-grandsons of aldermen. He was a magistrate, and as such administered gratuitously to those who dwelt around him a rude, patriarchal justice, which, in spite of innumerable blunders, and of occasional acts of tyranny, was yet better than no justice at all. He was an officer of the trainbands; and his military dignity, though it might move the mirth of gallants who had served a campaign in Flanders, raised his character in his own eyes and in the eyes of his neighbours; nor, indeed, was his soldiership justly a subject of derision. In every county there were elderly gentlemen who had seen service which was no child's-play. One had been knighted by Charles the First after the battle of Edgehill. Another still wore a patch over the scar which he had received at Naseby. A third had defended his old house until Fairfax had blown in the door with a petard. The presence of these old cavaliers, with their old swords and holsters, and with their old stories about Goring and Lunsford, gave to the musters of militia an earnest and warlike aspect which would otherwise have been wanting. Even those country gentlemen who were too young to have themselves exchanged blows with the cuirassiers of Parliament had, from childhood, been surrounded by traces of recent war, and fed with stories of the martial exploits of their fathers and uncles. Thus the character of the English esquire of the seventeenth century was compounded of two elements which we seldom or never find united. His ignorance or uncouthness, his low tastes and gross phrases, would, in our time, be considered as indicating a nature and a breeding thoroughly plebeian. Yet he was essentially a patrician, and had, in large measure, both the vices and the virtues which flourish among men set from their birth in high place, and used to respect themselves, and to be respected by others. It is not easy for a generation accustomed to find chival-

rous sentiments only in company with liberal studies and polished manners to image to itself a man with the deportment, the vocabulary, and the accent of a carter, yet punctilious on matters of genealogy and precedence, and ready to risk his life rather than see a stain cast on the honour of his house. It is, however, only by thus joining together things seldom or never found together in our own experience that we can form a just idea of that rustic aristocracy which constituted the main strength of the armies of Charles the First, and which long supported with strange fidelity the interest of his descendants."*

We select from the description of "the towns in England in the reign of Charles the Second" the short extract which follows, for the sake of the illustration it gives of Macaulay's idea that no particulars are beneath "the dignity of history" which show us the actual condition of society.

"As to the comforts and luxuries which were to be found in the interior of the houses of Bath by the fashionable visitors who resorted thither in search of health or amusement, we possess information more complete and minute than can generally be obtained on such subjects. A writer who published an account of that city about sixty years after the Revolution has accurately described the changes which had taken place within his own recollection. He assures us that, in his younger days, the gentlemen who visited the springs slept in rooms hardly as good as the garrets which he lived to see occupied by footmen. The floors of the dining-rooms were uncarpeted, and were coloured brown with a wash made of soot and small-beer, in order to hide the dirt. Not a wainscot was painted—not a hearth or a chimneypiece was of marble. A slab of common freestone, and fire-irons which had cost from three to four shillings, were thought sufficient for any fireplace. The best apartments were hung with coarse woollen stuff, and were furnished with rush-bottom chairs. Readers who take an interest in the progress of civilisation and of the useful arts will be grateful to the humble topographer who has recorded these facts, and will perhaps wish that historians of far higher pretensions had sometimes spared a few pages from military evolutions and political intrigues for the purpose of letting us know how the parlours and bedchambers of our ancestors looked."†

We add one more quotation, as an illustration of Mr. Lancaster's remark, that some of Macaulay's most signal triumphs were achieved in describing social ameliorations. Writing of "civilisation and its effects on the mass of the people," he admits, "that in one respect the progress of civilisation has diminished the physical comforts of a portion of the poorest class." He refers to the enclosure and cultivation of what before the Revolution were thousands of square miles of marsh, forest, and heath.

* "History," chap. iii., "Selections," pp. 385, 386.

† *Ibid.*, p. 398.

He attributes, indeed, more benefit to the poor from the existence of these waste lands than we ourselves, not without opportunity of observation, in a county where there is still much waste land, should be inclined to do; but he contends that against this disadvantage a long list of advantages is to be set off.

"Of the blessings," he continues, "which civilisation and philosophy bring with them, a large proportion is common to all ranks, and would, if withdrawn, be missed as painfully by the labourer as by the peer. The market-place, which the rustic can now reach with his cart in an hour, was, a hundred and sixty years ago, a day's journey from him. The street which now affords to the citizens, during the whole night, a secure, a convenient, and a brilliantly-lighted walk, was, a hundred and sixty years ago, so dark after sunset that he would not have been able to see his hand; so ill paved, that he would have run constant risk of breaking his neck; and so ill watched, that he would have been in imminent danger of being knocked down and plundered of his small earnings. Every bricklayer who falls from a scaffold, every sweeper of a crossing who is run over by a carriage, may now have his wounds dressed and his limbs set with a skill such as, a hundred and sixty years ago, all the wealth of a great lord like Ormond, or of a merchant-prince like Clayton, could not have purchased. Some frightful diseases have been extirpated by science, and some have been banished by the police. The term of human life has been lengthened over the whole kingdom, and especially in the towns. The year 1685 was not accounted sickly, yet in the year 1685 more than one in twenty-three of the inhabitants of the capital died. At present only one inhabitant of the capital in forty dies annually. The difference in salubrity between the London of the nineteenth century and the London of the seventeenth century is very far greater than the difference between London in an ordinary year and London in a year of cholera."*

Still it has been said that, pellucid, brilliant, and forcible as is Macaulay's style, when you pass from the style to the matter of his "History," he is partial, inaccurate, and careless in selecting his authorities. These charges, made by "clever young men" as the successive volumes of the "History" were published, were, on the publication of Mr. Trevelyan's "Life and Letters" of his uncle, revived in a contemporary by a critic to whom we have alluded. The article is, as all such articles should be, anonymous, but it would be idle to affect to doubt that the critic is no less a person than Mr. Gladstone.† Even if the authorship of the article had been less openly proclaimed, we might still say to Mr. Gladstone, in the words which he himself addressed to Macaulay, "In whatever you write, you can hardly hope for the privilege of

* "History," chap. iii., "Selections," pp. 399, 400.

† We read in the "Athenæum" of July 1, 1876: "An article from Mr. Gladstone's pen on Lord Macaulay will appear in the 'Quarterly Review.'"

most anonymous productions—a real concealment.”* We will venture to enter the lists with Mr. Gladstone in defence of Lord Macaulay. Great and sincere as is our admiration for Mr. Gladstone’s vast and diversified powers, he is not the guide whom we should select in matters historical. He is, as Mr. Froude describes him, “the latest and most distinguished exponent of the traditionary and religious philosophy of history,” and in civil and political, and still more ecclesiastical history, such an one is not likely to be either a judicious critic or a safe guide. Moreover, notwithstanding mutual expressions of goodwill,† there was a decided antagonism between Macaulay and Mr. Gladstone. Macaulay, writing of his memorable review of Mr. Gladstone’s “The State in its Relations with the Church,” expressed, not without reason, his fear “that the button, as is too common in controversial fencing, even between friends, had once or twice come off the foil.” On the other hand, Mr. Gladstone, ere he became a disciple of Richard Cobden and an apostle of free trade, opposed the Whig measure for the reduction of the sugar-duties, on the ground of its facilitating the importation of slave-grown sugar, on which pretext the Tories disingenuously sought to catch the votes of the more fanatical members of the Anti-slavery party. In his speech Mr. Gladstone taunted the son of Zachary Macaulay for supporting the measure brought forward by the Government, of which he was a member.‡ Again, Mr. Gladstone’s, we will not say idolatry of, but excessive reverence for, the memory of Sir Robert Peel, is one of his most strongly marked characteristics. In this feeling Macaulay did not share. His criticisms on Peel’s career are among the most powerful passages in his parliamentary speeches, § and his latest judgment on Peel is thus expressed :—

“Lord Stanhope sent me the first volume of the ‘Peel Papers.’ I devoured them. The volume relates entirely to the Catholic question. It contains some interesting details which are new, but it leaves Peel where he was. I always noticed while he was alive, and I observe again in this his posthumous defence, an obstinate determination not to understand what the charge was which I and others brought against him. He always affected to think that we blamed him for his conduct in 1829, and he produced proofs of what we were perfectly ready to

* Letters on Macaulay’s review of Gladstone’s “Church and State.” “Life,” vol. ii. p. 53. † *Vide* the letters, *ubi ante*.

‡ This occurred May 11, 1841, *vide* Hausard of that date. In Vizetelly’s unauthorised edition of Macaulay’s speeches, which, however, is not without its value, Mr. Gladstone’s taunts are given in a note to Macaulay’s speech in reply to Mr. Gladstone. Macaulay’s speech, apparently reprinted (unrevised) from Hausard, is one of his best. *Vide* Vizetelly, vol. i. p. 326. § *e.g.*, the Maynooth speech. *Vide* “Life,” vol. ii. p. 159.

admit—that in 1829 the state would have been in great danger if the Catholic disabilities had not been removed. Now, what we blamed was his conduct in 1825, and still more in 1827. We said, Either you were blind not to foresee what was coming, or you acted culpably in not settling the question when it might have been settled without the disgrace of yielding to agitation and to the fear of insurrection, and you acted most culpably in deserting and persecuting Canning. To this, which was our real point, he does not even allude. He is a debater even in this book.*

Mr. Gladstone accuses Macaulay—and it is a fair specimen of the accuracy and candour of his whole paper—of indulging in a “measure of vindictive feeling” against Peel. He (Macaulay) hardly mentions Peel during his lifetime except “with an extreme severity; and even on the sad occasion of his death, although he speaks kindly of the ‘poor fellow,’ and cries for his death, he does not supply a single touch of appreciation of his great qualities.”† Mr. Gladstone refers to an entry in Macaulay’s journal, written while on his tour to Glencoe and Killiecrankie; and one would not look in a private journal, written on a journey, for a full and well-considered estimate of Peel’s character or career. When the whole entry is read, however, it presents a very different aspect to that given to it by Mr. Gladstone.

“July 3.—As we drove into Glasgow, I saw ‘Death of Sir Robert Peel’ placarded at a newsman’s. I was extremely shocked. Thank God I had shaken hands cordially with the poor fellow, after all our blows given and received.

“July 4.—Poor Peel’s death in the ‘Times.’ I have been more affected by it than I could have believed. It was in the dining-room that he died. I dined with him there, for the first and the last time, about a month ago. If he is buried publicly, I will certainly follow his coffin. Once I little thought that I should have cried at his death.”‡

Moreover, on the previous page, had Mr. Gladstone taken the trouble to refer to it, he would have found two passages from Macaulay’s diary mentioning Peel not only without any “severity,” but with an evident appreciation of his “great qualities.”

“May 9.—To the British Museum. We put Peel into the chair. Very handy he is, to use the vulgar phrase—a capital man of business. We got on fast.

“May 14.—To the Museum. Peel brought his project of a report. I admire the neatness and readiness with which he does such things. It is of a piece with his parliamentary performances. He and I get on wonderfully well together.”§

Again, on the very page of the “Life” to which Mr. Glad-

* “Life,” vol. ii. pp. 455, 456.

† “Quarterly Review,” No. 283, July 1876, p. 23.

‡ “Life,” vol. ii. p. 278.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

stone refers, there is a note containing an extract from Macaulay's speech after his re-election for Edinburgh in 1852, in which reference is made to Peel. The whole passage relating to Peel in this speech reads thus:—

“In Parliament I shall look in vain for virtues which I loved, and for abilities which I admired. . . . There were other men—men with whom I had no political and little personal connection—men to whom I was, during a great part of my public life, honestly opposed, but of whom I cannot now think without grieving that their wisdom, their experience, and the weight of their great names, can never more, in the hour of need, bring help to the nation or the throne. Such were the two eminent men whom I left at the height, the one of civil, the other of military fame—one the oracle of the House of Commons, the other the oracle of the House of Lords.” *

And after referring to Peel as having, “at an immense sacrifice of personal feeling and personal ambition, freed us from an odious monopoly, which could not have existed many years longer without producing fearful internal discords,” he continued—

“I regret them both, but I peculiarly regret him who is associated in my mind with the place to which you have sent me. I shall hardly know the House of Commons without Sir Robert Peel. On the first evening on which I took my seat in that House, more than two-and-twenty years ago, he held the highest position among the Ministers of the Crown who sat there. During all the subsequent years of my parliamentary service, I scarcely remember one important discussion in which he did not bear a part with conspicuous ability. His figure is now before me; all the tones of his voice are in my ears; and the pain with which I think that I shall never hear them again would be embittered by the recollection of some sharp encounters which took place between us, were it not that at the last there was an entire and cordial reconciliation, and that, only a very few days before his death, I had the pleasure of receiving from him marks of kindness and esteem of which I shall always cherish the recollection.”

We have ventured, at the risk, we fear, of wearying our readers, to vindicate Macaulay from the charges of vindictive feeling and a want of appreciation of Peel's great qualities, not only out of regard to his memory, but because we think we have convicted Mr. Gladstone of a degree of inaccuracy on this subject which is of importance when we come to estimate the value of his vague and unsupported aspersions and attacks on Macaulay as an historian. There is, however, a far deeper source of antagonism between Mr. Gladstone and Macaulay than their different estimate of a statesman who was the political leader of the one and the opponent of the other. Mr. Gladstone beyond and above everything is a Churchman, and a Churchman of that particular

* The Duke of Wellington.

school or party which Macaulay regarded with contempt and aversion. "Their (the Puseyite) saints' days," he writes, "affect me as the Puritan Sabbath affected Drunken Barnaby. Their dates of letters, the Eve of St. Bridget, the Octave of St. Swithin, provoke me as I used to be provoked by the first month and the first day of the Quakers." The judgment in the Gorham case he considered "excellent, worthy of D'Aguesseau or Mansfield,"—an opinion not likely to be shared by Mr. Gladstone; and on the only occasion on which, so far as appears, Macaulay had a piece of ecclesiastical patronage in his gift, he wrote to Mr. Ellis: "I do not want a politician, and nothing shall induce me to take a Puseyite."* In fact, the feelings with which Macaulay regarded the Puseyites were akin to those attributed by Dr. Newman to Dr. Arnold, who, he says, avowed that his feelings towards a Roman Catholic were quite different from his feelings towards Dr. Newman himself. "I think the one," he continued, "a fair enemy, the other a treacherous one. The one is a Frenchman in his own uniform, the other is the Frenchman disguised in a red coat. I should, however, honour the first and hang the second."† Between Mr. Gladstone and the holder of these opinions, antagonism, especially on matters relating to ecclesiastical history, is to be expected. In fact, as Mr. Lancaster well pointed out, "From the first Macaulay has been hated by the extremes of all sects; and this, in our opinion, constitutes his best claim upon our confidence."‡ Writing under the influence of this antagonism, Mr. Gladstone has strung together a series of "peckings" at Macaulay, and has brought himself down to the level of a "clever young man," if not to the still lower level of John Wilson Croker. Mr. Gladstone has not confined himself to "pecking" at Macaulay's "History of England," but has included some of the essays in his criticisms—amongst others, those on "Milton" and "Bacon." He accuses Macaulay of being guilty in both those essays of "precipitancy and exaggeration." Macaulay's estimate of Milton is stigmatised as the "worship of a fond idolatry;" but it is plain that Mr. Gladstone's censures on Milton and his admirer, Macaulay, are inspired by a personal dislike of the author of the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine," the Arianism of which is, of course, repulsive to one who, to use his own words, has "completely wrought" those corruptions of primitive Christianity which he calls "the Christian dogma" "into the texture of his mind."§ With regard to Bacon, Mr. Gladstone pronounces Macaulay's "judgments (on Bacon's public life) harsh, and his examinations superficial." But Macaulay does not stand alone in his judgment. We reply to Mr. Gladstone in the

* "Life," vol. ii. pp. 286, 266, 177. † "Lectures to Anglicans," p. 36.

‡ "Essays and Reviews," p. 197.

§ *Vide* "Quarterly Review," No. 283, p. 143.

words of an able writer, "Whence is it hoped to cleanse off the disgrace so identified with Bacon's fame? Is it because the materials for his defence* have been previously overlooked? Is it owing to the discovery of new and sufficient evidence to clear away the stigma which has clung to him for two centuries and a half—a stigma affixed by the unanimous verdict of his peers, and since confirmed by the finding of such special jurors as Hume, Lingard, Hallam, Macaulay, Lord Campbell, and very careful and judicious Mr. Foss? Is there really a case to sustain an appeal, and to warrant a reversal of this authoritative sentence?"*

We must confine ourselves, however, to Mr. Gladstone's strictures on Macaulay's "History."

One great source of the many attacks on its accuracy is the ignorance of those who make them as to the times of which it treats.

"I really do not think," wrote Macaulay himself to Mr. Napier at the outset of his historical labours, "that there is in our literature so great a void as that which I am trying to supply. English history from 1688 to the French Revolution is, even to educated people, almost a *terra incognita*. I will venture to say that it is quite an even chance whether even such a man as Empson or Senior can repeat accurately the names of the Prime Ministers of that time in order."†

On the other hand, Macaulay was deeply versed in the historical literature of the period of which he wrote. What he said of Strype is true of himself, "He had thoroughly imbued himself with the spirit of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." He was equally imbued with the enthusiasm of the period. This enthusiasm might have led him astray, but it was checked and overruled by the "severe legal training which was not the least valuable and enduring reward of his Indian labours."‡

The presumption, therefore, seems to us to be ever in favour of Macaulay and against his critics. "The inaccuracy of the 'History,'" says Mr. Lancaster, "often as it has been asserted, has never been satisfactorily proved."§

Mr. Gladstone, we are sorry to see, revives against Macaulay the assertion that he was shallow in thought. "The serious flaw in Macaulay's mind (he says) was want of depth."|| We do not like to think of Mr. Gladstone as among the class whom Macaulay thus describes—"Many readers give credit for profundity to whatever is obscure, and call all that is perspicuous shallow;"¶ and yet, in our belief, none but such readers can

* "Mornings of the Recess," 1861-64. Reprinted from the "Times," vol. i. p. 180; Art. "Mr. Hepworth Dixon's Defence of Lord Bacon."

† November 5, 1841. "Life," vol. ii. p. 103. ‡ Ibid., p. 75.

§ "Essays and Reviews," pp. 192, 194. || "Quarterly Review," p. 21.

¶ "Life," vol. ii. p. 272.

accuse Macaulay of being rich in expression but poor in thought. Let any one study the passage on "the advantages of the alterations of party government," in the 24th chapter of the "History," and judge if the thoughts there expressed be shallow.* "No passage in all his works (says Mr. Trevelyan, and we cordially assent to his judgment) more clearly illustrates the union of intellectual qualities which formed the real secret of his strength—the combination in one and the same man of literary power, historical learning, and practical familiarity with the conduct of great affairs." †

We could readily multiply our quotations, but we can afford to give only one other. The generation before whose eyes exists the greatest popular delusion which has existed since the days of Joanna Southcote, viz., the persistent belief in the *pseudo* Tichborne and his advocate Kenealy, will not recognise shallowness of thought in this passage:—

"The history of Monmouth would alone suffice to refute the charge of inconstancy which is so frequently thrown on the common people. The common people are sometimes inconstant, for they are human beings. But that they are inconstant as compared with the educated classes, with aristocracies, or with princes, may be confidently denied. . . . The charge which may with justice be brought against the common people is, not that they are inconstant, but that they almost invariably choose their favourite so ill that their constancy is a vice and not a virtue. ‡

We must add, that whatever may be our opinion of the result of the controversy in this Review, referred to in our former article, between Macaulay and a former and venerated editor, Macaulay's papers in it cannot fairly be called shallow.

Mr. Gladstone condemns Macaulay for want of reflection; he was, he says, "always conversing or recollecting, or reading or composing, but reflecting, never." § Every man has his own idiosyncrasies, and can manage his own mind better himself than other men can manage it for him. The remark we have quoted seems to us as unreasonable as if we were to condemn the "woodman of Hawarden" for spending too much time in cutting down trees. Neither is it true, if Mr. Gladstone had carefully read the "Life" he was reviewing, he would have found many such entries as these: "Walked a good deal meditating; I see my line. Home and wrote a little, but thought and prepared more." || The charge of "reflecting never" might with far more reason be made against one of whom it may be truly said that it is rare to open a newspaper without finding a little letter from

* Given in "Selections," p. 291; and *vide* Lord Carlisle's comment thereon, "Life," vol. ii. p. 444.

† *Ibid.*, p. 443.

‡ "History," chap. v., "Selections," p. 26.

§ "Quarterly Review," p. 7.

|| "Life," vol. ii. p. 228.

him to some correspondent, equally obscure and intrusive, expressing crude views on some question, great or little, of the day.

"Macaulay," continues Mr. Gladstone, "unshrinkingly went through an immense mass of inquiry, which even he sometimes felt to be irksome, and which to most men would have been intolerable. He was perpetually picking the grain of corn out of the bushel of chaff."*

Two pages further on we read—"Neither, again, had he patience for the accurate collection of minute particulars of evidence to disentangle an intricate controversy, and by the recovery of the thread to bring out the truth." † We leave Mr. Gladstone to reconcile, if he can, the consistency of the statements that the same man who was perpetually picking the grain of corn out of the bushel of chaff had not "patience for the accurate collection of minute particulars of evidence." We will confine ourselves to showing the inaccuracy of his latter statement by, even at the risk of being tedious, giving a specimen of what Mr. Trevelyan justly describes "as the scrupulous care and the unflagging energy with which Macaulay conducted his investigations."

'On 17th July 1848 he writes to Mr. Ellis:—

"Many thanks for your kindness. Pray let Dr. Hook know, whenever you have an opportunity, how much I am obliged to him. The information which he has procured for me, I am sorry to say, is not such as I can use. But you need not tell him so. I feel convinced that he has made some mistake, for he sends me part of the Leeds burials in 1685; and yet the number is double that of the Manchester burials in the same year. If the ordinary rules of calculation are applied to these data, it will be found that Leeds must in 1685 have contained 16,000 souls or thereabouts. Now, at the beginning of the American War, Leeds contained only 16,000 souls, as appears from Dr. Hook's own letter. Nobody can suppose that there had been no increase between 1685 and 1775. Besides, neither York nor Exeter contained 16,000 inhabitants in 1685, and nobody who knows the state of things at the time can believe that Leeds was then a greater town than York or Exeter. Either some error has been committed, or else there was an extraordinary mortality. In either case, the numbers are useless for my purpose."

Again, on the 27th of the same month, he writes to Mr. Ellis:—

"Many thanks. Wardell ‡ is the man. He gives a much better thing than the list of burials—a list of the houses returned by the hearth-money collectors. It appears that Leeds contained in 1663 just 1400 houses; and observe, all the townships are included. The average number of people to a house in a country town was, according to the best statis-

* "Quarterly Review," p. 8.

† *Ibid.*, p. 10.

‡ The author of "The Municipal History of the Borough of Leeds."

tical writers of the seventeenth century, 4·3. If that estimate be just, Leeds must in 1663 have contained about 6000 souls. As it increased in trade and wealth during the reign of Charles II., we may well suppose that in 1685 the population was near 8000; that is to say, about as much as the population of Manchester. I had expected this result from observing that by the writers of that time Manchester and Leeds are always mentioned as of about the same size. But this evidence proves to demonstration either that there was some mistake about the number of burials, or that the year 1685 was a singularly unhealthy year, from which no inference can be drawn. One person must have died in every third house within twelve months, a rate of mortality quite frightful."

"It must be remembered," adds Mr. Trevelyan, "that these letters represent only a part of the trouble which Macaulay underwent in order to ensure the correctness of five and a half lines of print, viz., *From the returns of the hearth-money it seems certain that the whole population of the borough, an extensive district which contains many hamlets, did not in the reign of Charles II. exceed seven thousand souls. In 1841 there were more than a hundred and fifty thousand.'"*

This is, certainly, picking the grain of corn out of the bushel of chaff, and these letters as certainly disprove Mr. Gladstone's assertion that Macaulay "had not patience for the accurate collection of minute particulars of evidence."

Any one who had carefully read Macaulay's letter to the then editor of the "Edinburgh Review," in which he points out in one article a *catena* of errors, which drew from him the remark, "I do not know that there ever was a greater number of mistakes as to matters of fact in so small a space," would never have brought such an accusation against him.†

In fact, in all things Macaulay undertook he showed accuracy to be the prevailing habit of his mind. Speaking of him as Secretary at War, Mr. Sullivan, then Assistant-Secretary, said, "I never knew him make a blunder in anything he had once got up." Against Mr. Gladstone's assertion that Macaulay "had not patience for the accurate collection of minute particulars," we have Mr. Trevelyan's testimony that

"During his last two years he would often lay aside his book, and busy himself in financial calculations connected with the stock-market, the revenue returns, the Civil Service estimates, and, above all, the clergy list. He would pass one evening in comparing the average duration of the lives of Archbishops, Prime Ministers, and Lord Chancellors; and another in tracing the careers of the first half-dozen men in each successive mathematical tripos, in order to ascertain whether, in the race of the world, the senior wrangler generally contrived to keep ahead of his former competitors." ‡

* "Life," vol. ii. pp. 216-218.

† Ibid., pp. 113, 114.

‡ Ibid., pp. 72, 450.

We next take another sweeping assertion which is equally unfounded, and which is not even attempted to be supported by any proof.

“His collection of particulars was most minute, but he was the master, not the servant, of his subject. When once his rapid eye was struck with some powerful effect, he could not wait to ascertain whether his idea, formed at a first view, really agreed with the ultimate representation of facts.” *

The most serious charges made against Macaulay by Mr. Gladstone are

“First being led away by his imagination; next that, when he was in the wrong, he could not see that he was wrong; lastly, that the echo of himself, which John Stuart Mill found in his wife, was provided for Macaulay in his own literary creations; and what he thought was loyal adhesion to the true and right was only the more close and close embrace of the image he had himself fashioned and adored.” †

“All this, however,” Mr. Gladstone admits, “is not to be taken for granted;” and we shall proceed to examine these assertions a little closely.

“Imagination,” says Mr. Gladstone, “could not alter the date of the battle of Marathon, or the Council of Nice, or the crowning of Pepin, *but it might* seriously or even fundamentally disturb the balance of light and dark in his account of the opinions of Milton or of Laud, or his estimate of the effects of the Protectorate or the Restoration, or of the character and even the adulteries of William.” ‡

No doubt it might. The question is, Has it done so? Take a crucial instance—the character of William, of whom Macaulay has been untruly described as the mere advocate, or rather eulogist, if not worshipper. No one knew better than he that

“A little exaggeration, a little suppression, a judicious use of epithets, a watchful and searching scepticism with respect to the evidence on one side, a convenient credulity with respect to every report or tradition on the other, may easily make a saint of Laud or a tyrant of Henry the Fourth.” §

We regret that we have not space to transfer to our pages from the seventh chapter of the “History” his delineation of William’s character; but let our readers refresh their memory by turning to it as given at pp. 158 to 175 of Mr. Trevelyan’s volume of “Selections,” and ask themselves in what other modern historian, at any rate, can be found a character delineated with so much vividness and power, united to so much impartiality; not the impartiality of Gibbon, or of Hallam, or of Macintosh, but true judicial impartiality. We will make one extract,

* “Quarterly Review,” p. 10.

‡ Ibid., p. 18.

† Ibid., pp. 18, 19, 24.

§ “On History,” p. 153.

because it relates to a specific matter referred to by Mr. Gladstone—"the adulteries of William."

"For a time," says Macaulay, "William was a negligent husband. He was drawn away from his wife by other women, particularly by one of her ladies, Elizabeth Villiers, who, though destitute of personal attractions, and disfigured by a hideous squint, possessed talents which well fitted her to partake his cares. He was indeed ashamed of his errors, and spared no pains to conceal them; but, in spite of all his precautions, Mary well knew that he was not strictly faithful to her."*

The truth is simply told; there is no attempt to explain away an undoubted fact, nor to defend or even excuse what is wholly unjustifiable. We can see here no proof of imagination misleading the judgment, but we do see the disproof of Mr. Gladstone's insinuation.

Mr. Gladstone's second accusation is, that

"When Macaulay was wrong, he could not see that he was wrong." While, as to his "authorship, Macaulay was incessantly labouring to improve, in the substance of what he had written he could neither himself detect his errors, nor could he perceive them when they were pointed out." He was "dissatisfied with the products of his art, because they fell below his ideal, . . . but it is quite plain that all this dissatisfaction had reference to the form, not the matter, of his works." †

We meet this assertion with a direct denial. Macaulay could detect his own errors, and, moreover, correct them. At p. 11 of his paper, Mr. Gladstone makes a quotation from Macaulay's diary ("Life," vol. ii. p. 422), as to a gross impropriety in language pointed out to him by a man he did not like, for which Macaulay expresses his obligation to the man; but this entry is immediately preceded by another:—

"I made some changes in my account of James's declaration of 1692. If my critics had been well informed, they might have worried me about one paragraph on that subject; but it escaped them, and now I have put everything to rights."

Again, on the publication of the second portion of the "History," Macaulay notes in his journal, "I have found one serious mistake in my 'History,' I wonder if any one else will find it out." ‡ Here are two cases of error, not in form only, but in matter, detected, and in the former case corrected, by himself. Yet Mr. Gladstone, though quoting from the page on which the first of these two excerpts is printed, affirms the universal, "Macaulay could not detect his errors." No one can imagine Mr. Gladstone capable of wilful misrepresentation, but then, perforce, we are driven to charge him with gross carelessness.

* "Selections," p. 168.

† "Quarterly Review," p. 19.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 385.

It is equally easy to disprove the assertion that he (Macaulay) could not perceive his errors when they were pointed out.* "Pray tell Adolphus," † writes Macaulay to Mr. Ellis, "how much I am obliged to him for his criticisms, and see that now and then I fell into error. I got into a passion with the Stuarts, and consequently did less damage than I should have done if I had kept my temper." ‡

Mr. Gladstone apparently overlooked this letter also.

Equally unfounded is the assertion that Macaulay's frequent corrections and polishings were bestowed only on the style, and not at all on the matter of his book. Numerous entries disprove it; e.g.—

"January 10, 1851.—Wrote a little, but am out of heart; the events take new shapes. I find that what I have done must be done over again. Yet so much the better. This is the old story. How many times it was so with the first two volumes, and how well it ended at last." §

Again,

"February 6, 1854.—I worked hard at altering the arrangement of the first three chapters of the third volume. What labour it is to make a tolerable book, and how little readers know how much trouble the ordering of parts has cost the writer."

The writer who "paid a second visit to Killiecrankie for the special purpose of walking up the old road which skirts the Garry, in order to verify the received accounts of the time spent by the English army in mounting the pass, which they were to descend at a quicker rate," || and who could spend a cold May morning in searching for the exact spot selected for the execution of the assassination plot, ¶ is not likely to have bestowed all his care and pains in correcting the form while neglecting the substance of his narrative, written, as we know, with the year 2000 in view.

There are, we think, many other inaccuracies in Mr. Gladstone's paper, which, if time and space permitted, we could expose; but we can afford only to notice the assertion, which is, in fact, a mere repetition of that which we have previously considered—*Idem haud visdem verbis*—viz.,

"That the echo of himself which Mr. Mill found in his wife was pro-

* "Quarterly Review," p. 19.

† Mr. Ellis's colleague in the well-known series of Adolphus and Ellis's Reports, afterwards a County Court Judge—a man of most exact mind. Mr. Macaulay had a high opinion of his criticisms. He writes to Mr. Ellis, "I am much obliged to Adolphus for the trouble he has taken. Some of his criticisms [on the MS. "Lays of Ancient Rome"] are quite sound." *Life*, vol. ii. p. 118.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 253.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 219.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 302.

vided for Macaulay in his own literary creations, and what he thought was leyal adhesion to the true and the right was only the more and more close embrace of the image he himself had fashioned and adored." *

In proof of this assertion Mr. Gladstone refers to the Penn controversy, and revives the refuted arguments of Mr. Paget's "New Examen" without adducing any fresh argument or proof in their support. He also refers to Macaulay's interview with the Quakers as proof of the impossibility of convincing Macaulay that he was in error; but he garbles his quotation, it will be seen, by the omission of a by no means unimportant passage.

"February 5, 1849.—Lord Shelburne, Charles Austin, and Milman to breakfast. A pleasant meal. Then the Quakers, five in number. Never was there such a rout. They had absolutely nothing to say. Every charge against Penn came out as clear as any case at the Old Bailey. They had nothing to urge but what was true enough, that he looked worse in my 'History' than he would have looked on a general survey of his whole life. But that is not my fault. *I wrote the history of four years during which he was exposed to great temptations, during which he was the favourite of a bad king, and an active solicitor in a most corrupt court. His character was injured by his associations. Ten years before, or ten years later, he would have made a much better figure. But was I to begin my book ten years earlier or ten years later for William Penn's sake?* The Quakers were extremely civil; so was I. They complimented me on my courtesy and candour." †

The passage in italics, in which Macaulay explains and unanswerably defends his delineation of Penn's character, is omitted by Mr. Gladstone.

We sympathise entirely with an opinion very recently expressed by Mr. Gladstone, "I think it a public duty to protest against the use in any kind of warfare, however poor, of the method of garbled quotation." ‡

"To speak the whole truth concerning Penn," writes Macaulay, "is a task which requires some courage, for he is rather a mythical than an historical person. Rival nations and hostile sects have agreed in canonising him. England is proud of his name. A great Commonwealth beyond Athenians felt for Theseus and the Romans for Quirinus. The respectable the Atlantic regards him with a reverence similar to that which the Society of which he was a member honours him as an apostle."

Macaulay undertook this task, and, of course, drew on him the wrath of all who, from ignorance, sectarian bias, or, on a general survey of the whole of Penn's life, regard him as a bright pattern of Christian virtue.

It will be remembered that Macaulay's most offensive charge

* "Quarterly Review," p. 24.

† "Life," vol. ii. p. 251; comp. "Quarterly Review," p. 36.

‡ Letter to Sir H. Drummond Wolff, M.P., "Times," 26th March 1877.

against Penn was that he was employed by the maids of honour in making a composition with the relations of the maids of Taunton who had been fined by Jeffreys at the Bloody Assize for the part they had taken in Monmouth's insurrection, and whose fines had been given to the maids of honour by James II. After the publication of the first part of Macaulay's "History," it was confidently asserted that although *a* Penn was so employed, it was not William Penn, but one George Penne, who does appear to have been concerned in a negotiation for the ransom of one of Monmouth's followers.

The question turns mainly on the fact whether a letter of Sunderland, the Secretary of State, to "Mr. Penne" was addressed to William or George. Macaulay, in re-editing his "History" in 1857, added a note exhaustively discussing this question. It occupies five closely printed pages, and, therefore, cannot be inserted here; but we recommend our readers to refer to it, as an additional means of testing the accuracy of Mr. Gladstone's assertion "that Macaulay had not patience for the accurate collection of minute particulars of evidence to disentangle an intricate controversy, and by the recovery of the thread bring out the truth." *

"If I thought," wrote Macaulay in 1857, "that I had committed an error, I should, I hope, have the honesty to acknowledge it. But after full consideration, I am satisfied that Sunderland's letter was addressed to William Penn."

He supports this conclusion by a long and carefully elaborated piece of reasoning—as clear as crystal—which closes with these words:—"For these reasons I leave the text, and shall leave it, exactly as it originally stood." †

After all that has been written in defence of Penn and in disparagement of Macaulay, we cannot but agree with Mr. Lancaster, that "the more fully we enter into the depths of the Penn controversy, the more will the trustworthiness of the historian be brought out." ‡

The concluding portion of Mr. Gladstone's paper is devoted to an attempt to prove the inaccuracy of Macaulay's description of the Anglican clergy of the Restoration period. To do this, we suspect, was mainly, if not entirely, the reason why Mr. Gladstone undertook to review Macaulay's "Life." He has performed his task in the manner in which he might

* "Quarterly Review," p. 10.

† "History of England," vol. vii., Edinb. 1857, chap. v. pp. 236-240. We learn from Mr. Lancaster that, in the editions published since Lord Macaulay's death, this note is omitted. We agree with Mr. Lancaster that this is much to be regretted. Probably it thus escaped Mr. Gladstone's attention.

‡ "Essays and Reviews," p. 157.

be expected to treat such a subject. On all ecclesiastical questions it is Mr. Gladstone's misfortune now, as it was thirty-eight years ago, when he published his essay on "Church and State," "that whatever he sees is refracted and distorted by a false medium of passions and prejudices." * He says of Macaulay's description, "We were ourselves at the outset, and we have continued to be, among the sturdiest disbelievers." † This being his state of mind, "we cannot entirely acquit him of that unconscious disingenuousness from which the most upright man, when strongly attached to an opinion, is seldom wholly free." ‡

Macaulay writes in his journal of this celebrated passage in his "History,"—"People may imagine that I infer too much from slight indications; but no one who has not soaked his mind with the transitory literature of the day is really entitled to judge." § This is precisely what Mr. Gladstone has not done, and what, from the structure and habit of his mind, we believe him to be incapable of doing. Writing with a strong desire to put Macaulay in the wrong, he has strung together a series of "peckings,"—for his criticisms are worthy no better name,—on this famous description of the clergy. The authorities by which he attempts to support them are, with scarce one exception, exclusively ecclesiastical, and it is needless to point out that they, as much as Mr. Gladstone, would be tempted to conceal or gloss over the facts which Macaulay narrates.

Mr. Gladstone, moreover, confesses that he has not even attempted to make his refutation at first hand; he has merely compressed into his own pages "the researches" of a Mr. Churchill Babington, "a Fellow of St. John's and Hulsean Lecturer." Of course, Mr. Babington, an ecclesiastic, writing of ecclesiastics, is under the same temptation as Mr. Gladstone's other clerical authorities. We do not even know the title of Mr. Babington's work, which, oddly enough, Mr. Gladstone does not give, but Mr. Gladstone confesses "that only a very few hundred copies were sold or distributed; that it was for its main purpose still-born, is now hardly known in the world of letters, is not found in some of our largest and most useful libraries,|| and if it now and then appears in an old bookshop, confesses by the modesty of its price that it is among the merest waifs and strays of literature." Contrasting the unfortunate fate of Mr. Babington's still-born work, of which he considerably conceals the name, Mr. Gladstone laments that, on the other hand, Macaulay's "History" still "circulates by thousands and tens of thousands

* Macaulay, Essay on Gladstone's "Church and State."

† "Quarterly Review," p. 37.

‡ "Life," vol. ii. p. 224.

§ Macaulay on Gladstone, *ubi supra*.
|| "In the only one where we chanced to have discovered the work it is a presentation copy" (Note by Mr. Gladstone in "Quarterly Review," p. 46).

among flocks of readers, ever new and ever charmed, and has become part of the household stock of every family. Since the time when Père Daniel, the Jesuit, with guns at once so ponderous and so weak, replied inaudibly to the raking and devouring fire of Pascal, there has never been a case of such resistless absolutism in a writer, or such unquestioning and general submission in the reading world.*

Such, no doubt, is the fact. What is its cause? We would reply in language which will commend itself to Mr. Gladstone's respectful attention. It is that of "the Great Father" whom Mr. Gladstone reverently mentions in his paper.† "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*;" which we will paraphrase in Talleyrand's famous sentence, "Everybody is cleverer than anybody." The voice of an overwhelming majority of the reading world, not only of England and America, and wherever else the language of England is spoken and her literature read, but of the twelve nations into whose languages Macaulay's "History" has been translated, has pronounced him to be the great historic authority of the period of which he wrote, and has consigned the modern Père Daniel—in the shape of an Hulsean Lecturer—"to the dust and silence of the upper shelf." It would have been kinder if Mr. Gladstone had allowed him to remain there undisturbed.

Mr. Gladstone asserts that the result of his at second-hand refutation of Macaulay's charges against his clerical clients, is "that they generally and miserably break down. In no instance are they tolerably supported by positive evidence; in many they are absolutely confuted and annihilated. Not, indeed, that he was absolutely and wholly wrong in any point, but that he was wrong in every point by omission and by exaggeration."‡

Mr. Gladstone has ever had "a vast command of a kind of language, grave and majestic, but of vague and uncertain import," and he is now as ever fond of employing it in those parts "of his works which require the utmost perspicuity and precision of which human language is capable; and in this way he deludes first himself and then his reader."§ Many of Macaulay's charges, it seems, are "absolutely confuted and annihilated," but yet he was not "absolutely and wholly wrong in any one point." In "no instance are they tolerably supported by positive evidence," but yet Macaulay "was wrong in every point," but merely "by omission and exaggeration." How a charge can be not wholly and absolutely wrong in any one point, and yet be absolutely confuted and annihilated,—how charges can be not any of

* "Quarterly Review," p. 46.

† "St. Augustine." "The judgment of the whole world standeth sure."

‡ "Quarterly Review," p. 43.

§ Macaulay on Gladstone, *ubi supra*.

them tolerably supported by positive evidence, and yet their only error consist in omission and exaggeration,—are subtleties in metaphysics far above, out of our sight, and the reach of our poor understanding.

Mr. Trevelyan quotes a note of Mr. Buckle's in his "History of Civilisation," in which he says, that "on several subjects I should venture to differ from Mr. Macaulay," but "everything he has said on the contempt into which the clergy fell in the reign of Charles II. is perfectly accurate; and from evidence which I have collected, I know that this very able writer, of whose immense research few people are competent judges, has rather understated the case than overstated it." To this Mr. Gladstone replies in this burst of indignant rhetoric:—

"What shall we say of Mr. Trevelyan's appeal to Buckle? Buckle, forsooth, bears witness that Macaulay has rather understated the case than overstated it. Macaulay, even when least *απειροῦς*, can stand better on the feet that nature gave him than on a crutch like this. Quote, if you choose, publicans on liquor laws, or slave-drivers on the capacities of blacks; cite Martial as a witness to purity, or Bacchus to sobriety; put Danton to conduct a bloodless revolution, or swear in the Gracchi as special constables; but do not set up Mr. Buckle as an arbiter of judicial measure or precision, nor let the fame of anything that is called a religion or a clergy depend upon his nod."

This is passion and prejudice, very (it is needless to say) eloquently expressed; but it merely amounts to this, that Mr. Buckle, a careful student and independent thinker, not, so far as we know, a friend, certainly not a disciple, of Macaulay, as the result of a separate investigation, agreed with Macaulay in his opinion as to the menial condition of the clergy of the Restoration period. To this corroboration of Macaulay, Mr. Gladstone, who, from the first, has been one of the "sturdiest disbelievers" in this opinion, thinks a sufficient answer is given by a rhetorical outpouring, unsupported by a line of proof or a word of argument.

Attacked by High Churchmen on the one side, and by Quakers and a rabble of their allies on the other, Macaulay might have said with the great author of "*The Chronicles of the Canongate*," Jedediah Cleisbotham:—

"Verily I can only say in answer, that I have been cantelous in quoting mine authorities. It is true, indeed, that if I had hearkened with only one ear I might have rehearsed my tale with more acceptance from those who love to hear but half the truth. It is, it may hap, not altogether to the discredit of our kindly nation of Scotland, that we are apt to take an interest, warm, yea partial, in the deeds and sentiments of our forefathers. He whom his adversaries describe as a perjured Prelatist, is desirous that his predecessors should be held moderate in their power, and just in their execution of its privileges,

when truly the unimpassioned peruser of the annals of those times shall deem them sanguinary, violent, and tyrannical. Again, the representatives of the suffering Nonconformists desire that their ancestors, the Cameronians, shall be represented not simply as honest enthusiasts, oppressed for conscience' sake, but persons of fine breeding, and valiant heroes. Truly the historian cannot gratify these predilections. He must needs describe the Cavaliers as proud and high spirited, cruel, remorseless, and vindictive; the suffering party as honourably tenacious of their opinions under persecution; their own tempers being, however, sullen, fierce, and rude; their opinions absurd and extravagant; and their whole course of conduct that of persons whom hellebore would better have suited than prosecutions unto death for high treason. Natheless, while such and so preposterous were the opinions on either side, there were, it cannot be doubted, men of virtue and worth on both, to entitle either party to claim merit for its matryrs.*

We here part with Mr. Gladstone, venturing to express the opinion that this paper will not in any degree add to his literary reputation.

We have too long trespassed on our readers' patience; but before parting with our subject, we would recall to their minds a passage in the writings of one of the greatest living masters of the English language, in which he sets before his readers his ideal of a great author. Dr. Newman, in his "Idea of a University" † discoursing of literature, says:—

"A great author is not one who merely has a *copia verborum*, whether in prose or verse, and can, as it were, turn on at his will any number of splendid phrases and swelling sentences; but he is one who has something to say, and knows how to say it. I do not claim for him, as such, any great depth of thought, or breadth of view, or philosophy or sagacity, or knowledge of human nature, or experience of human life, though these additional gifts he may have, and the more he has of them the greater he is; but I ascribe to him, as his characteristic gift, in a large sense the faculty of expression. He is master of the twofold *Logos*—the thought and the word, distinct but inseparable from each other. He may, if so be, elaborate his compositions, or he may pour out his improvisations, but in either case he has but one aim, which he keeps steadily before him, and is conscientious and single-minded in fulfilling. That aim is to give forth what he has within him; and from his very earnestness it comes to pass that, whatever be the splendour of his diction or the harmony of his periods, he has with him the charm of an incommunicable simplicity; whatever be his subject, high or low, he treats it suitably and for its own sake. If he is a poet, 'Nil molitur inepté.' If he is an orator, then, too, he speaks

* *Vide* Introduction to "The Heart of Midlothian."

† "Idea of a University," p. 291, 2, 3. Edition 1873.

not only 'distincté' and 'splendidé,' but also 'apté.' His page is the lucid mirror of his mind and life.

'Quo fit ut omnis

Votivâ pateat veluti descripta tabellâ.

Vita senis.'

"He writes passionately because he feels keenly; forcibly, because he conceives vividly; he sees too clearly to be vague; he is too serious to be obtuse; he can analyse his subject, and therefore he is rich, he embraces it as a whole and in its parts, and therefore he is consistent; he has a firm hold of it, and therefore he is luminous. When his imagination wells up, it overflows in ornament; when his heart is touched, it thrills along his verse. He always has the right word for the right idea; and never a word too much. If he is brief, it is because few words suffice; when he is lavish of them, still each word has its mark, and aids, not embarrasses, the vigorous march of his elocution."

No words can better describe Macaulay's style than these we have taken from a writer to whose own style they are equally applicable. In thought and feeling not only differing from but repugnant to each other,* in style these two great masters of the faculty of expression agree. Of each of them it may be safely foretold that their works can only perish with the English language.

ART. VI.—THE FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS.

II.

Report of the Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Working of the "Factory and Workshop Acts," with a View to their Consolidation and Amendment, together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index. Vols. I. and II. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1876. Eyre & Spottiswoode.
Progress of the Working Class, 1832-1867. By J. M. LUDLOW and LLOYD JONES. 1867. Alexander Strahan.

IN the last number of this "Review" we offered some criticisms on that remarkable body of laws which, under the above title, has grown up amongst us in recent years, and which is so rapidly

* In Macaulay's journal, 14th October 1850, he writes: "Among other things I read Newman's Lectures, which have just been published. They are ingenious enough, and I daresay cogent to those people who call themselves Anglo-Catholics; but to me they are futile as any Rabbinical tradition. One lecture is evidently directed against me, though not by name; and I am quite willing that the public should judge between us."—*Life*, vol. ii. p. 286. The reference would appear to be to the eighth of the "Lectures to Anglicans," "The Social State of Catholic Countries no Prejudice to the Sanctity of the Church."

being copied by other nations. We endeavoured then, with the utmost brevity, to probe the philosophy and trace the history of the movement, from the first Act of the British Legislature dealing exclusively with the labour of apprentices in mills, to the most recent development of matured opinion upon it contained in the recommendations of the "Report of the Royal Commission on Factories and Workshops," presented to Parliament last year. Since then the Home Secretary has engaged, on the part of the Government, to introduce a measure which it is generally believed will be mainly founded on these recommendations, though also it is said, with some conspicuous differences; and in the interim we propose to return to the subject, and to take this opportunity to supplement our preceding observations.

It will be well, in doing so, to recall the more salient points of the argument then insisted on, before proceeding to supply whatever links in its chain of reasoning may now seem to us, or have seemed to others, to have been wanting. It is so very much to be desired, in our opinion, that what we have called the philosophy of this question should now at length be really understood, and it is so very unlikely that that aspect of it will receive much attention within the walls of Parliament, that probably a reviewer would not render so great a service in merely waiting to discuss the details of the proposed scheme of consolidation and amendment when it appears, as in applying himself to a consideration and a public statement of the principles which should underlie it, if it is to be a really efficient measure, and to have the pretension of anything in the nature of a final settlement. At all events, be this so or not, it does certainly seem to us that any one is but little entitled to express an authoritative opinion on the one, who has not realised, with more or less distinctness, and after more or less of painstaking reflection and research, what is the nature of the other. We wished then to establish:—

1st. That the theory of Government interference with labour had materially altered since it first came to be recognised as an instrument that statesmen were entitled to wield at all for the benefit of the State.

2nd. That notwithstanding this alteration in its avowed sanctions, no formal recognition of any such alteration had ever been made, notwithstanding, again, that statesmen continued to deal with it very freely on the altered basis.

3rd. That the confusion necessarily and naturally resulting, and injuriously affecting all statutes dealing with the subject, had unfortunately been suffered to intrude itself into the report of the recent Royal Commission, whereby many of their best suggestions had assumed a merely empiric character, and no element of finality, and no dominant and pervading principle,

had been found for, or given to, their proposed Consolidated Act.

4th. That this result was to be deplored, inasmuch as it was very important that the sound basis of scientific principle and natural rectitude upon which these benevolent laws were founded should be known to the persons with whose (sometimes nearest) interests they dealt so intimately, and that they should not come to imagine (as they too commonly did) that these interests were made the sport of mere legislative caprice and fitful philanthropy.

We announced what in our opinion constituted an organic principle justifying the protection of certain kinds of labour, that principle which yet remained to be legislatively stated, and we described it, and the necessity for it, thus:—"There are in a free State certain persons, the employers and the employed, and in a competitive-labour market the latter are in need of some counteracting force to oppose to that of unlimited competition among the former. . . . And among men in a free-labour market this counteracting influence to the vast force Competition has been found in the also vast force Combination, and the Government has not found it necessary to interfere for them. But to women and children the labour market is not equally open, and women and children are by the necessities of their position not equally free to combine, and therefore in their behalf the Government has interfered, even though, as we have seen, at first blindly, and only under the pressure of mere events." We further said that "production under another person" was the best definition of the kind of labour which required to be protected. It has been objected to this statement that it is but a bald and undeveloped principle that we have ourselves enunciated, and as open in practice to inconsistencies and incongruities as any other principle, or as no principle at all. We have been rebuked for merely announcing, instead of at the same time illustrating and defending it; the implication being, no doubt, that the task of doing so would be a difficult one; and a remoter implication, in all probability, that these laws are not after all founded on any just and unvarying basis of rectitude, as we have asserted them to be, but on the simple ground of expediency (as if the two were at variance), if not even that they are to be reckoned of as matters with which argument is not concerned, things righteous but unreasonable, acts such as the sensibilities may approve while the sense cannot but disapprove. As it is very important at this crisis in our industrial history that notions so obscure and unsound should be corrected, and as their correction will involve that fuller exposition of our own position which seems to be desired, we propose to discuss both its theoretical and its practical aspects in some detail.

And first of the functions of the State in interfering at all with individual freedom, which seem to be little understood. Mr. Mill has strongly argued ("Essay on Liberty") for the fullest amount of individuality that is compatible with the general good; but neither he nor any thinker of authority has ever argued for absolute individual freedom from all restraints, irrespective of the rights, claims, and interests of others. Such a condition of things can only exist among the most ignorant and barbarous people, whose modes of thought and modes of life would be little removed from those of animals. The first dawn of civilisation and the rise of law are coincident, and probably the highest expression of both is to be found in the well-known Benthamite maxim of "the greatest good for the greatest number." It is not, then, the propriety of Government interference with individual freedom that can ever be a matter of reasonable debate, but of the limits of that interference. Now it is a notorious and pregnant fact, that with the spread of democratic institutions, that is, speaking generally, with the spread of liberty, there is ever manifested a more and more marked tendency to invoke the assistance of the State in spheres of activity upon which, under a despotic constitution, individuals would resent intrusion with considerable vigour. The populace is its own lawgiver, and desires to make trial of its own law. In the classical and medieval republics, we know how fully in theory and how constantly in practice this position was realised, and the earliest efforts of the young French Republic, when several times since the last century it has thrown off the yoke of kings, have almost invariably been in the same direction. In strict conformity with this observation, too, has been the conduct of the British nation in its progress through less rugged paths to freedom. The oligarchy which governed England up to the passing of the first Reform Bill was scarcely deposed from its pre-eminence in the State before a whole host of measures, more or less directly interfering with what is called "the liberty of the subject," and which had been vainly pressed upon the attention of Parliament before, were rapidly passed into law. These measures, admirably classified in the little work by Messrs. Ludlow and Lloyd Jones, whose name we have cited above, as "Protective Acts," "Enabling Acts," and "Measures of General Benefit," have, however, since that time been so continually extending their own limits, and have so constantly been advanced as arguments for supplementing themselves by still further similar enactments, that not a few thoughtful persons are beginning to inquire if the movement has not already proceeded far enough, and some have even been found to instance and oppose the tendency as an inherent weak-

ness of a democratic constitution. Without doubt the movement does need to be jealously watched, and they are in the right who thus earnestly call attention to it. The economic follies into which many of the popular leaders in France were betrayed after successive revolutions had successively established them in power, the economic fallacies which still so extensively prevail there, as well as in the United States, are sufficient evidence that popular instincts (like other instincts) require to be tempered with prudence even when developing in the direction of progress and enlightenment, even when in that of morality and self-restraint. But just as it is a mistake to infer that self-restraint and self-improvement cannot be forwarded by State control—for instance, by the compulsion of education upon the young—so is it a mistake to suppose that it is without the sphere of its duties to adopt this or any other device to procure a result so desirable, and that the endeavour is a necessary encroachment upon freedom's right domain. There is no exclusive sphere for legislation, no absolute good or evil in human institutions, no infallible premonition of truth. The problem for legislators for ever has been—for ever will be—the *balance of good*. Is the end worth the means? Is what is sought to be obtained more permanently valuable to the commonwealth than what must be sacrificed to obtain it? And that the more popular the franchise, the more often should questions affecting the people be discussed and dealt with after this fashion, is but what might be expected, and the greater necessity is there for a rigid and continual analysis of those elements of successful treatment. For the popular tendency in sight of any evil is to fly to the nearest means of succour, and will be in this case to invoke the statute law as the readiest and most potent weapon at hand—a precedent undoubtedly dangerous to the free action of natural laws, and the more so the oftener it is repeated. But, on the other hand, we are to remember that the law can be invoked as well to ensure freedom as to supplant it, and that in nothing is human contrivance more legitimately employed than in combating the cruelties of nature. It is a strange misconception of the function of law to conceive of it as opposed to liberty in the main. The very opposite is the truth. The reign of law is the reign of freedom, and the reign of anarchy or of ignorance is that of tyranny. Thus, in the matter of the Factory Acts, law was appealed to to promote, not to suspend, liberty; and at the bidding of imperious necessity. The compulsion was never on the workers—*i.e.*, the many—not to overwork themselves, but upon the employers of labour not to overwork them. The freedom interfered with was not the individual freedom of doing as one liked with one's self, but as doing as one liked with other

people, or, at all events, of leaving them to be thus dealt with by blind external agents. Such an interference is no wise opposed to, but quite in concord with, Mr. Mill's conception of liberty, which certainly never included the liberty of injuring your fellow-creatures, nor yet of handing them over to a pitiable fate if that fate could be averted. The factory system had sprung up as if by magic in a soil quite unprepared for its reception. It is only by a vigorous mental effort that we can realise now that only one hundred years ago England was still a grain exporting country, and that the general constitution of our society was agricultural. Yet such is the case, and when huge mills began to be planted about the country, filled with strange engines and unknown appliances, and tenanted by hordes of human creatures of both sexes and all ages, imported into them from anywhere for the purpose of serving a blind slavery to these dimly comprehended powers, a feeling of horror took possession of the country, and the public conscience was very deeply stirred. Not without reason. "Gradually the most dreadful results began to exhibit themselves. The absence of education stunted the mind, whilst increasing labour dwarfed and deformed the body, and the short hours of relaxation from toil allowed to the factory worker were commonly spent in the most sensual and degrading pursuits. The educational, moral, and physical condition of England's workers was beginning to be felt as altogether unbearable."* Most naturally, then, the balance of good in the minds of legislators inclined towards putting a period to so grave a state of things, and most evidently they were justified at that time in almost any interference with mere material interests which seemed necessary for the purpose that they had in view.

Accordingly, it was the first Parliament elected on a wider franchise that passed the first really operative Factory Act, and succeeding Parliaments, elected on still wider franchises, have not only passed still wider ones—have not only greatly broadened the basis upon which the whole system rested—but have shifted it from the position of a temporary expedient to that of a permanent institution. A quite different question then arises as to protection on this new basis and for these wider purposes. Is it justified by the same or by equally cogent reasons as formerly?

It may be at once conceded that the Factory Acts have accomplished a large amount of good, that they have fulfilled to a very appreciable extent the objects of their original institution. They have introduced order where chaos previously prevailed, they have greatly shortened the habitual hours of labour, they have rescued many children from oppressive and degrading toil,

they have been the means of spreading instruction amongst those who were formerly utterly devoid of any, they have had a great influence in improving the condition and construction of factories themselves. The factory population will now bear favourable comparison with any other class of operatives, either in appearance, in intelligence, in morality, or in their standards of comfort and contentment, which certainly was not so formerly. But these considerations, instead of being an argument for their continuance, and still less for their extension, are in one very important point of view—at least apparently—an argument tending all the other way. If they were directed at a particular time against a particular evil, and if that evil is now so greatly ameliorated, have they not then fulfilled the purpose of their institution, and what need is there of them any more? More palpable still. Why extend them to industrial processes no wise novel, either in themselves or their environment, such as those were against which they were devised? They were confessedly enacted during a transitional time, when the industry of the country was thrown all into confusion by the changes introduced into the processes and modes of manufacture. That transitional time is past; the new processes and all that relate to them are in the hands of another generation; should not that generation be left to look after its own concerns, and be reasonably expected to know its own interests best? And if the Factory Acts had ever and entirely applied to men, there would be much validity in this argument. It might be shown in support of it how they had reduced their hours of labour by voluntary combination, even below the standard which the Legislature had prescribed; how they had, through their representatives in Parliament, passed an education law which made it incumbent on *every* parent to have his child educated; how the progress of industrial enterprise and intelligence were of themselves a sufficient impulse, without the assistance of any from without, to ensure well-built and well-ordered factories as more profitable in production. It might be said: The law which was passed in a time of great perplexity to bring about precisely these things may now with justice be repealed, because precisely these things may now continue to be brought about without it; because they most assuredly will, whether it exists or not; because they are now, in fact, engrafted on our society, and move parallel with our civilisation. It could have been pointed out how the workman had discovered, and to what purposes he had put, another law outside the control of senates, to protect him in his industry, and to ensure to himself and his belongings, if he chose, fair and decent treatment. "Let legislators content themselves (it might then have been argued with effect) with

striking off every fetter which yet remains to hamper the great power Combination in securing for him his deserts, and let them cease to fear that he will suffer Competition, however unlimited and unscrupulous, to have undivided sway." But this has never in fact occurred. The Legislature has ever resisted with inexorable firmness every attempt to enforce control over the labour of adult men. It has applied itself to the protection of women and children only, and the protection of the former only very recently,* while to the protection of both on an ever-increasing scale. Unless, then, it can be shown that the same protection would have been extended to these without the law that they now receive under the law, the above contention is altogether valueless. But we know that this cannot be shown, for that this is not the case. The long list of prosecutions for overwork and other offences, both against employers and parents, which every half-year adorn the final pages of the Factory Inspectors' reports, sufficiently disproves such a notion. Manufacturers also are themselves the first to confess, that if the Factory Acts were repealed, the evils of the old factory system would again prevail.

So likewise is it valueless, unless it can be shown that there was no necessity to extend them to other industries. For this is the real point. No longer to meet a particular emergency, or to combat a strange and novel aggressor, has the State now come forth to battle, but has taken upon itself duties occupied permanently, and without exception, with the industrial welfare of every woman and every child employed in every kind of handicraft, whatever the condition, surroundings, or requirements of that handicraft may be. The new problem to be encountered, then, is in fact none other than this:—Is the industrial labour of women and children *in itself* a matter that the State is justified in interfering to protect? Not until this problem is honestly and resolutely grappled with is it possible to recognise what is really the matter at stake, or is it likely that it will be adequately dealt with.

In accusing the Legislature elsewhere of having legislated on this altered basis without having recognised the altered grounds of interference, and in accusing the Royal Commissioners of having failed in their report on the Factory Acts to give so important a consideration that prominent place in their proposed amendments that it deserves, we do not mean, on the one hand, to stigmatise the course which legislation has taken, nor, on the other, to charge either the Commissioners or the State with anything so

* The first Factory Act was passed in 1802. Women were not brought under their provisions till 1844.

entirely paltry in a practical sense as a mere logical omission or a mere verbal inaccuracy. On the contrary, as regards the last-mentioned matter, we believe that very serious and unfortunate results are likely to follow the serious confusion that characterises many of their recommendations, should these be adopted, by reason of the absence of the clue thus afforded; and as regards the former, we have already stated our reason for believing that, in the present state of the labour market, some measure of protection for all women, young persons, and children employed in production is requisite. We shall presently contrast more in detail such of our conclusions and proposals which come most into collision with those of the report, with it, and afterwards we shall have to trace the thread of our own conception over the same and similar grounds. In the meanwhile it is necessary to the plan of this article to defend and explain a little more in full those considerations which seem to us to justify the application of protective legislation at all in the cases noted.

There is a party of earnest thinkers, both in this and other countries, whose opinions are entitled to the highest consideration, who are against all interference with adult women's work absolutely, and it is notorious that many working women themselves are of this party. It is no wonder that such persons, especially such as last named, look with dissatisfaction and even with indignation upon these continual encroachments of the State upon what they conceive to be their privileges and rights, the more so as no proof of the necessity for them, no explanation of the preponderating utility of such measures, is ever vouchsafed them, as they have themselves no voices in the framing of them, and as they may be sometimes in individual cases—real sufferers by them. It is very important then to point out how it comes about that these obstacles placed in their way of production are really so placed for their ultimate good, to save them in the aggregate from greater evils; to disclose why they are thus heavily weighted on one side, as it were, on account of the excessive burden that is cast upon them on the other, in order that, between the two—to continue the illustration—some sort of stable equilibrium may be attained. If they better understood on which side it was that the burden was the greater, if they realised from which weight it was first necessary to struggle to free themselves, if they would obtain the liberty that they speak of, they would also know the advantage to them of supporting this one in the interim, and come to understand how that in disencumbering themselves of the other, they would infallibly relieve themselves of both. They would perceive that it is not the Factory Acts that have trespassed on their rights, but the Factory Acts that have been called in to contend with other

trespassers; that it is not these Acts that have invaded their privileges, but these that have sought to compensate them for such as they had not.

Discarding all further metaphor, let us then inquire more at large what justification has the State for interfering with the labour of women and children, and not with that of men? The case of children does not admit of much argument. Children, by reason of their helplessness and immaturity, must evidently be protected by some one until they are of an age to take care of themselves. Of course the proper persons to protect them are their parents, but in the absence of parents and relatives, their charge devolves upon the State. But, unfortunately, experience shows that children must not only look to the State for protection when their parents desert them, or when they die off in their infancy, but have also, in only too many cases, to look to the State for protection from their parents, when these treat them cruelly. And, perhaps, the cruellest treatment that a parent can inflict upon his child is precisely such treatment as was over and over again brought to light and described in the reports of the Children's Employment Commission, where the utmost precautions were taken to debase and degrade them physically, morally, and intellectually, by setting them to early infantile labour that was beyond their strength, by submitting them to the vilest and most contaminating influences amongst their seniors, and by excluding all the while any possibility of the slightest ray of knowledge penetrating to their understandings and intelligences. Such too was the cruelty practised upon apprentices in mills, so graphically described by the elder Sir Robert Peel, when, at an anterior date, and to his lasting honour, he brought that subject under the notice of Parliament; and certainly it does seem that if the State is ever entitled to stand *in loco parentis* to a child, it is in such circumstances as these. It is a function surely of Governments to protect the weak and innocent from the strong and criminal among her citizens; the parental obligation is surely an obligation towards virtue, not towards vice, and the State is entitled to claim from all her citizens the faithful fulfilment of all obligations that are legitimate. And the reason that this need of protecting the young from the cruelty or rapacity of their elders was not so strongly felt before in our history and by our sentiments of social propriety, was not only on account of the introduction of the factory system, and the terrible train of evils that it at first brought with it, but on account of other circumstances, some more or less connected, and others in no way connected, with it. Labour had never assumed so associated a character before, and had not therefore ever been viewed so much in the gross. Doubtless abuses nearly as great,

or as great, had prevailed while labour in isolation was still the custom, and cruelties as grievous had been practised under the old system of cottage industries as under the new factory system; but these, from the very circumstance of their isolation, had escaped notice, and the need of interference was not therefore felt in the same way as it necessarily was when many cases were accumulated together and open to the gaze of all. Again, the country had not yet, in its morality, quite emancipated itself from feudal notions, which were very favourable to parental authority, and was only in its jurisprudence very slowly wrenching itself away from absolute servitude to the Roman law, which distinctly taught it. Lastly, free trade in commodities came to sweep away all monopolies and guild privileges, and other contrivances for restricting the free action of Competition; and in the free action of Competition applied to human labour the most terrible evils, as we have seen, were generated. The inexorable law of Competition acting with absolute freedom is, that "the weakest must go to the wall;" and unless the State was prepared to see its weakest members of all, but also its rising generation of productive labourers, crushed and bruised out of the semblance of civilised humanity, it was incumbent on it to interfere. The factory system first drew public attention to the necessity of protecting the interests of children engaged in productive industry, and the particular phase of the necessity thus displayed was the first legislated upon; but the way having once been found out, almost by haphazard as it were, was quickly followed up to far other conclusions—to those, even, upon the consideration of which we are now more immediately employed. Now, almost precisely the same set of considerations that are thus seen to justify the State in protecting the labour of children will be found, on examination, to have at present an equal validity in the case of the industrial labour of women. The female sex is both by custom and by law subject to the dominion of the male sex, and therefore subject to possible (alas! but too possible) abuse of power, and in need of consequent protection. It by no means follows, of course, that this power need be always detrimentally exerted, either in the one case or the other, but large numbers of women have only too sad an experience of how often, how unreasonably, and how injuriously it is so utilised. There are many (nay, most) trades' unions that will not admit female members, nor suffer female apprentices to an handicraft to be taken. We may, for instance, recall the case of the letterpress printers, with whom Miss Faithfull maintained so vigorous a struggle in her ultimately successful effort against every opposition which the most cruel despotism or cowardly ingenuity could suggest to introduce female labour into that trade. More recent

cases will be in the memory of all interested in these matters ; as, for instance, the strike of the carpet-weavers at Kidderminster against female competition. Nor is the public yet likely to have forgotten the case of the lady medical students at Edinburgh, whom the University arbitrarily excluded from the rewards for which it had yet admitted them to compete, after they had fulfilled every requirement prescribed by its own code for the obtaining them. This last instance is not, of course, an instance of industrial labour, but it may serve as an illustration of that heavy weight of which we have spoken, with which the female sex is weighted when it has to engage in the race for life with men. Women, too, not less than children, are only but slowly emerging from the influences which feudalism and a blind worship of Roman jurisprudence had for long years enwrapped them in—from the theory of “property,” in short, in which they were included. A husband who kicks his wife’s brains out with his clogs, or who leaves his children to starve while he gets drunk at the neighbouring public-house, is still found to plead that he should be allowed “to do what he likes with *his own* ;” and the brutal and barbarous laws of brute and barbarian ages are yet found firmly rooted in the affections and the apprehensions of the worst type of the British workman, and even of some persons with higher pretensions. But this similitude comes to be most clear of all when we observe the similar action of the power of Competition on the one as on the other. In the case of men’s labour, the law runs its natural course, and supply and demand easily adjust their positions in the labour market. But in the case of women, as of children, they are subject not only to this law as well, but to its operation in a greatly restricted sphere ; therefore not only to all the evils of Competition, which undoubtedly exist alongside of so much that is good, but to these evils principally, if not solely. For the prizes in the lottery being denied to them by other laws, and by usages existing outside the purely economic sphere, the sifting of the market is ever for them a sifting downwards, and all the disadvantages without the advantages of the process fall to their share. Thus, not only are all the evils of Competition, without its compensatory advantages, incident to their position, but these evils are exaggerated exactly in the ratio that their sphere of employment is contracted. Accordingly, we should expect that the least agreeable and worst-remunerated occupations would fall to women, and this is precisely what we find. We should expect that, with perfectly free trade in labour, they would ultimately be ground down to the basest and most degrading toil, to a competition even with the labour of brute animals—

and this too has occurred.* So also will this ever infallibly occur except when society steps in, and, whether by a Factory Act or a chivalrous social usage (and as yet our society yields us but little hope from the latter alternative), comes to their rescue. From these considerations also we infer, then, that that portion of the population to which law and custom denies the right of employing itself as it thinks best is fairly entitled to some compensatory benefit on the other side (so long as that law and custom lasts), and therefore that, while women remain industrially in the position of children in the labour market, they should, like children, receive the protection of the State.

It will not fail to have been observed, no doubt, that throughout this exposition of the claims of women for protection, their case has invariably been stated hypothetically. It is, in fact, a hypothetical case. If the present social and political position of women is their ultimate one, and if our present industrial system is likely to be permanent, then the protection of their labour is a permanent necessity, for the reasons that have been advanced, and because the State has other interests to look after than only the production of wealth. But we have no reason for supposing that either of these hypotheses are likely to be realised in fact. There is nothing that has been more variable in all countries and all ages than the social and political position of women, and our present industrial system is as yet but the growth of a single century. What may be reserved for us in either of these respects, it is absolutely impossible to foresee, or to what new developments our society is so rapidly hastening. If women, for instance, ever succeeded in obtaining that political emancipation for which some of them are now so earnestly striving, can it be doubted that one of their earliest acts would be to claim equality with man in the labour market—the unfettered privilege of selecting their own careers? Whether this is a claim that they might not afterwards forego, when they experienced the full consequences that its concession brought with it, it is not for us to inquire here; but we are strongly of opinion that they would make trial of the experience, at all events. In such circumstances, the obligation of the State to protect their industry would of course be void. The obligation to protect little children would still remain. It is conceivable, however, that about the same time some radical change might be made in the conditions of industrial progress; that the labour of young children would no longer be in demand, or that some social, moral—or perhaps religious—custom, brought to bear upon their parents, would take the place of law, and forbid their employment in

* In mines and collieries, for instance, previous to legislation.

competitive industry. In that case there would no longer be any need of a Factory Act either for children or women. The children, however, would be equally, or perhaps more, under protection, while the women would not; and this is the difference between the two cases. The necessity of children being under the protection of some one is a necessity of their life; it is not so with women. Therefore we have throughout been careful to speak of the need of protective labour laws for them as a need existing only so long as the free competition of the labour market is denied—so long only as they “remain industrially in the position of children.” There are other possible eventualities as well. It is conceivable that this continual recourse to law to back us out in all our good intentions, which has of late been so exceedingly popular, may in time bring its own cure in the way most to be desired; that having built our house, we shall be able to find a home in it without keeping all the masons and carpenters continually in attendance. In a very hopeful mood we may look forward to a time when “Protective Acts, Enabling Acts, and Measures of General Benefit,” will all have borne their fruit, and when society will ensure, by the compulsion of public opinion, what it is now fain to achieve through the medium of positive institution. If this prospect is ever realised, the present will then appear in the light of a transition period, when the rough-and-ready weapons of legal enactment were applied to the crisis while the more delicate ones of public sentiment and conscience were but still in the stage of preparation. It may never be realised, but towards such an end is all this effort directed, and it is well to keep the goal in view. It is conceivable, again, that the issue may be other than this. A strong reaction may be in store for us against these political swaddling clothes with which legislators are ever encumbering more and more the limbs of the nation, and the upshot of such a reaction would be likely to manifest itself in a considerable convulsion, such as we have had experience of elsewhere when the circumstances have been similar. This, at all events, we hope may be averted. Or there is yet another eventuality, the most likely to occur, and the most in harmony with the national character. It is that of a gradual progress, through other and contrary tendencies, to the mutual destruction of the offensive elements of both. Such a tendency is even now being developed among women in the efforts that they are making to combine and to form trade unions like men. Should this effort be successful, and it is a hopeful enterprise in many ways, there would not any longer, of course, be the same need of offering them protection in their work, for they would then be in a position to protect themselves. They would then have the defensive weapons of

one natural law to oppose to the offensive weapons of another natural law, and the makeshift of a human law might be dispensed with. In the meanwhile, however, and perhaps all the more that it may only be necessary for a time, is it important that so deteriorating an agency as unlimited competition in industrial production should be warded off from them. It is imperative in their own interests, and in the general interest most desirable; it is common justice as well as common humanity.

Proceeding now to a consideration more in detail of those points upon which we differed from the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners, and to a fuller examination of the value and tendency of our previous criticisms, it will be necessary to quote, however briefly, from their report, that the matter of the discussion may be fairly set before our readers. The Commissioners had very early in this published statement of their views taken an opportunity of announcing what limits they had set themselves in their labours, and upon what principles their inquiry had been conducted. "In general we have endeavoured," they say, "to limit our inquiry to topics which demanded special attention, either for the settling of doubts and difficulties as to the law, or for the removing of invidious anomalies, or for the remedying of particular hardships, or for the prevention of abuses, whether hitherto overlooked or of recent growth in the wide field of handicraft labour and industrial occupation" (par. 3). In "two departments only," it seems, had they felt themselves compelled "to diverge into a somewhat wider field;" namely, "in the question of the extension of the Factory Acts to occupations not hitherto included in their operation," and "in the consideration of legislative provision for the attendance of children at school" (*id.*). They resent the idea that "merely for the sake of uniformity," they would make any recommendations "of any further substantive alterations in the law," and they resent it on the ground that in such a course they would not be "following in the path approved by those who have traversed this field before us" (par. 45). Elsewhere in the same paragraph they had already said, emphasising this view of their duty, "Our task would have been shorter if we could have devised a single set of regulations, such as might be recommended for application to all trades alike. This could not be done, however, without offending against that legislative principle which has hitherto been followed with such excellent results in the framing of our Factory and Workshop Acts. Only to meet proved abuses and to rectify particular evils has interference been thought justifiable" (*id.*). Against this conception of their potential usefulness we ventured to protest. We argued

that they might have done better work even than they have done if they had used the opportunity thus confided to them, not for following the path which others had traversed at all, and which path had confessedly led to those very complications and contradictions which they were now set to rectify, but by taking an independent one, which would not lead to the like in future, by seeking, securing, and enunciating a fundamental basis for legislative effort, whereon an administrative edifice might be at length erected with some appearance of proportion and with some prospect of stability. In a special manner we objected to their definition of a factory as being a place where protected persons were employed, for we showed that such a definition was illogical and impracticable. Surely it is because people work, and may be liable to overwork, that they need protection; it is not because they need protection that they work. Moreover, how is such a law to be administered? How is it to be known beforehand where protected people do work? Is it by instinct? Is it by some spiritual or supernatural agency? The dilemma which their definition gives rise to is none other than this:—A place is not open to inspection unless protected persons work there. Query—how can it be known without inspection whether they work there or not? Is an inspector to proceed, perhaps; upon guesswork? But if he does so, and enters a place believing it to be a factory, and then finds that it is not one by reason of no persons legally requiring protection being employed, is he not liable to be indicted for a trespass? Surely, too, there will be many places that now will employ protected persons for a while (in “season trades,” for instance), and again will not; and are they to be factories and non-factories with every change of hands? Such a system would give quite unexampled opportunities for quite endless evasions of the law; and where evasions are practised there will hardships most assuredly follow in their train. And this difficulty became still more complicated in practice, we said, in the light of some of their other recommendations. Thus, if three women worked in a room together, exclusive of inmates, these, they proposed, should be protected persons; but if one of them worked in another room, none should then be protected persons at all (par. 21). An acute employer, it seemed to us, would only then have to shift his hands about to escape the compulsion of the law altogether; nay, he would only have to do so when an inspector visited, and might he not then, too, refuse him admission as well? But a further evil of their proposals on this head which escaped us then may now be noted. It is proposed that domestic employment shall include “the case of employers carrying on business in their dwelling-houses and employing none but inmates,” and that for these

“special relaxations” shall be allowed (par. 21). Now it is precisely in such employments as these that the gravest evils of all notoriously prevail. It is here that the “sweating” system is in full operation—a system, that is, of Competition pushed to its extreme issue, and of work done under circumstances the most undesirable and insanitary of any.* We do not quite gather from the report what the “special relaxations” are that are here to be allowed; but if they are such as to favour production of this kind at the expense of production under the far healthier and happier auspices of the regular workshop system, they certainly do not meet with our approval. A result of the enacting of such recommendations as these would be, that a woman might work for a “sweater” up to and beyond the margin of human endurance, if she but worked alone or in company with only one other, and the law would be impotent to prevent it; and, in other words, that production on a small scale

* The terrible extent to which this system prevails, and the deplorable consequences that result from it, are well described in the report of some proceedings at a meeting of trade societies in Manchester, which (some-what curtailed) we extract from a number of *The Manchester Courier* of a few weeks ago:—

“*Sweating in the Tailoring Trade: Startling Disclosures.*—The Secretary of the National Association of Tailors introduced the subject of ‘sweating,’ and home-working in the tailoring trade, a system which he said prevailed most extensively in Manchester, Sheffield, Liverpool, London, and other large and industrial centres. The ‘sweater’ accepted work from the master tailor at prices much below the ordinary and proper rate of payment, and took it home with him to his squalid and wretched home, which was often the haunt of fever and disease, where he made it up, and where he often employed a number of hands, who, of course, received less for their work than the man who employed them. Not only did that system affect those who were engaged in it, but the public generally, because it was the medium whereby contagious diseases were conveyed to them. He gave a history of the movement against this system in the trade, and illustrated the evils of it by referring to the death of the daughter of Sir Robert Peel, the cause of which was traced to the making-up of a garment for her by a ‘sweater’ in whose house the fever existed. He said it ought to be incumbent on the employers to find healthy workshops for their men, which would be the only safeguard for the public, and where a large number of men were employed, the Workshop Regulation Act should be put in force. Any home that was turned into a workshop should be registered the same as lodging-houses were at the present day. †

“The President of the Manchester Branch of the Tailors’ Association said that the Manchester Branch considered the ‘sweating’ system so dangerous that they had appointed a committee to go round and make investigations as to the dens of disease and death where so many thousands of garments were made. Nearly all the ‘sweating’ which was done in Manchester was done in ill-ventilated, loathsome places, beneath warehouses. The committee of investigation visited places in Cheetham Hill, Red Bank, Rochdale Road, Ancoats, and Vernon Street. In the latter street the very air seemed to be impregnated by disease, and the committee

would be benefited at the expense of production on a large scale, and at the inevitable expense, too, of those whom factory laws are supposed to be promulgated to protect. We proposed instead the being employed at all "in production under another" to be the test, and that the definition of a factory should thus simply come to be—that of any place where industrial production is carried on under another or other persons.

Let us see, then, how this definition would answer in practice, and especially with reference to some other matters of detail upon which we find ourselves at issue with the Royal Commissioners. To this point our argument has at length come. It will be necessary to view it with something like scientific precision in the first place, for its scope and significance may otherwise be very easily missed. Its primary advantages would be its universality, its precision, its equity, and its consistency. Under it we should not expect to find any of

really felt they were incurring danger to their own lives by going into such a place. The very appearance of those who presented themselves at the doors to answer inquiries indicated that disease was rampant in the place. In many cases they could not gain access to the interior of the houses. He went to one house and asked the gentleman who answered the door how many he had in his employ, and he replied himself, his son, and wife. He was asked whether he had a machine, and the reply was in the affirmative, and that it was worked by his son. The poor lad seemed to be in the last stage of consumption, and his face showed that he was marked for an early tomb. Let them remember that that lad had to take the different sections of the garment in his hand and bring his head closely down to them, breathing a part of his own consumption into them, and as they were pieced together by the process of pressing, &c., the whole garment became entirely permeated with the particles of disease which the lad in his respiration threw out. In another case the committee found a man in a house making a garment. The house was in the most filthy state, and of the four or five children, not one was decently clad or fairly washed, and not one had a shoe on. The wife was in the same neglected condition. It was apparent to the committee that scarcely one-sixth of the work executed in this city was done in healthy and respectable places. And how was this produced? It was the result of the awful spirit of Competition. Men could not do the two things. They could not work for little money and provide cleanly and respectable places in which to carry on their employment. The committee could scarcely have conceived the state of things had they not gone round and visited those dens and soughs, he might call them, where clothes were made. It made them shudder, and they came to the conclusion that in future any man who ordered a garment from his tailor ought to make it a condition that it should be made upon the premises, in properly ventilated workshops, and workshops in a thoroughly sanitary condition. That should be the course adopted until legislation could be brought to bear upon the question.

"The Secretary of the Tailors' National Association remarked that there were about three thousand tailors working in Manchester. Only one thousand were employed in the workshops, so that the rest must be working at their own houses."

those confusions and contradictions which have for so long been a source of astonishment and irritation to persons engaged in industry ; and even if others should display themselves, we do not believe that they would be characterised by anything like such objectionable features. In it the particular class of persons to be protected is precisely specified ; it includes all members of that class ; is independent of any variable conditions in their number, or in the nature of their employments, or of other casual circumstances : it is exclusive, comprehensible, and concise. It appears, then, to have all the requisites of a good definition. But why is it appropriate only to production, and what does this include ? Why not also to distribution ? Why not also, to take a particular case, to domestic service ? These are the questions which we may here expect to meet us. Certainly we should have considered the matter very superficially if we had not considered these simple aspects of it, and were we not prepared to defend our proposal in difficulties so elementary. Let us take, then, the case of distribution first ; and, in doing so, it will be proper to recall what is the economical conception of production. It is the conferring utility on some portion of matter which, in its pre-existent state, it did not possess ; the fitting it for some useful or desirable end ; the giving it a value. In this only it begins—in this only it consists. But neither does it cease until all of this is accomplished, and that is what now concerns us most. To little good is the utility conferred if it remains embodied in an inaccessible product, nor would it then be a true utility at all. In the language of economists, production only ultimately ends in consumption : in other words, not until the finished product is placed in the hands of the consumer can its “ production ” be said to have ceased. Thus distribution is not merely a correlative of production, but it is a part of it, and distributors are producers in the true and scientific sense.* As such we regarded them in our previous article, wherein mainly upon this ground in reality we objected to the Commissioners excluding the labour of retail from their scheme of legislation. Mainly upon this ground, but not upon this ground only, for we also showed, from their own pages, that the hardships endured in the retail trade are not only often as great, but are often far greater, than any prevalent at all among the operative class, as might indeed have been expected. The answer, then to the question why distributors should not be protected as well as producers, simply is, that dis-

* “ Principles of Political Economy,” by John Stuart Mill, book I., chap. ii., par. 6. People’s edition.

tribution is properly included in production, and that, under our definition, they would be so protected.

It is different when we come to consider the case of domestic servants. The contract which a servant enters into with his master is not alone a contract to produce or convey a commodity, or any number of commodities, to him, but to "attend upon," to "wait upon," to serve him in a great variety of ways. The utility which he embodies is the utility of obedience, of attendance, of assistance; or, if a commodity can be said to have been the subject of exchange throughout, then that commodity is the person's own natural and proper self. Now the relations of human beings to one another, as we have before insisted (and as cannot, in view of some modern notions, be insisted upon too often), is not wholly exhausted in their economic relation: this is but one of many. Mere material products are only susceptible of such a relation, and must ever exchange according to fixed and definite laws, the only disturbing influences which can be introduced to give a direction to those laws being just the disturbing influences of human sympathies and predilections. But in the relations of man to man, and even of man to material nature, the science of political economy has only sway in so far as these relations are comprehended in the subject of the science, which is the production and exchange of wealth. That this is not the object of domestic service is evident; nor are the other sanctions which we instanced to justify protection in the matter of production valid here. The competition about servants is rather among masters who shall procure them, than among servants who shall obtain situations. The tendency of law and usage is not towards deteriorating, but towards improving their condition; and the intrusion of unregulated male labour upon this particular sphere of female usefulness is so slight as to be scarcely perceptible, and is, moreover, subject to a tax which is, in fact, protection in another form. It is true that Mr. Nassau Senior argues with much ingenuity that a cook is a productive labourer, and that "a servant who carries coals from the cellar to the drawing-room performs precisely the same operation as the miner who raises them from the bottom of the pit to its mouth."* This is true so far as it goes. The cook imparts a utility to the animal flesh which it did not before possess by rendering it fit for human food; the servant who brings up the coal performs the last act in its production by putting it in a position to be consumed.

* "Political Economy," by Nassau William Senior, Esq. 1850. (Griffin & Co.) Originally contributed as an article to the "Encyclopædia Metropolitana," but happily reprinted separately for more general use. An excellent treatise.

And if the cook is a cook and nothing more—in a cookshop, for instance—there would be much to be said in favour of extending the Factory Acts to such an occupation, and we shall allude to the matter again. Biscuit factories and bakehouses, for instance, are recommended by the Royal Commissioners to be brought under inspection, and we think rightly so. But if the cook be a servant, then that is what is most essential in her economic position, and she is no longer in the same category as a labourer; she is neither theoretically nor practically so. Again, the servant-man, like the collier, may carry up the coals, but let us observe particularly that that is all that the collier does. The servant-man has many other offices to perform; the carrying the coals is only incidental to his position as a servant—it is intrinsic to the collier. The collier receives his remuneration for producing the coal at the pit's mouth out of the commodity when sold; the servant receives his remuneration in wages for general services rendered. What is alone constant in both cases is the coal, which Mr. Senior fixed his exclusive attention upon, but the services about it are not only very different in degree but quite different in kind. The essential point of divergence between them and all labour of production and that of domestic service is this, that the one is engaged about inanimate material objects and the other about sentient fellow-creatures. The utility of the one is eventually embodied in a material product; that of the other in an immaterial and incommensurable one.

The labour of domestic service is, in fact, like the other labour of producers of immaterial products—artists, authors, sovereigns, statesmen, clergymen, lawyers, and the like—who are all servants in their kind; it is very important, but not important in production. As it would be absurd to propose a Factory Act for the one class of persons, so does it seem quite inappropriate to the other. Perhaps it is still more like the labour of soldiers, who may cook or carry coals, or even build bridges and other useful works, but who assuredly are not fit subjects for a Factory Act. An important parallel between these two cases may also here be noticed. A workman is paid for the quantity of work absolutely done at any given time and place; the more the work, the higher the pay; the lower the wage, the less the work. A servant or a soldier is paid for potential work. His wage is to remunerate him not only for what he has to do, but what he may have to do. In periods of idleness he will receive precisely the same as in periods of great activity, and the wage will measure the balance of effort, the mean between the two extremes. The greater the demand for his services, too, the more bound is he to afford them, which is by no means the case with the workman, the amount of effort demanded from whom is ever varying with

the amount of pay. And some sort of difference of this last kind, too, seems also to be observable between the labour of agriculture and the labour of manufacture. The production direct from land is a production which differs very materially from production when once the commodity has been raised from the soil. The labour of a miller, for instance, is not bound by the same conditions as the labour of him who grows the corn. The latter is dependent for the fruition of his efforts upon influences over which he has no control: a bad season may terribly reduce his crop notwithstanding his utmost industry, and a very bad one will probably annihilate it altogether. But if the miller does not get the corn he wants for grinding in one place, he will get it in another, and even if he has to go a very great distance, and pay more for it, the loss need not necessarily be his, as he will probably throw it upon the consumer in the shape of an enhanced price. Again, the laws of the increase of production from manufacture and from agriculture are not only dissimilar but contrary. The well-known law of agricultural industry is, that increase of labour procures in the long-run an ever-decreasing proportionate return; and of manufacturing industry, that its products may be indefinitely increased by employing themselves as a means of further production. Given unlimited capital and unlimited labour, and manufacturing industry may go on indefinitely; but unlimited capital and unlimited labour will not force from the soil more than a limited return, and that subject to a proportionate decrease the longer the experiment is tried. The economical conditions of the one thus differ very much from the economical conditions of the other, and accordingly their labour requirements are not the same, and they cannot advantageously be treated under the same code of labour-regulating laws. This the Commissioners have recognised, though upon different grounds; and it is scarcely necessary to point out how far their conclusion and our own is justified by practice. The labour of the fields is naturally and necessarily of an intermittent character, which is precisely what the labour of the factory is not; and while some sort of provision should doubtless be made for both, the same sort of provision assuredly could not be made without developing as much of scientific incongruity as of practical inconvenience.

In more general terms, we might say that all occupations concerned about production require to be protected, while those concerned about consumption do not; and as there are two distinct modes of production, so should there be two distinct kinds of protective legislation. So long as labour is employed about material products, either in their production or distribution, it is a fit subject for legislative care; when it is employed about im-

material products or about mere consumption, it is not. As for immaterial products, they still less than agricultural products can be produced in proportion to the amount of capital and labour expended on the effort: they are not, in fact, so produced at all, and are commodities which exist altogether outside the scope of the economic sphere. Consumption, again, is, accurately speaking, the destruction of the qualities which production has conferred on matter, and the one is the necessary opposite of the other. It is only as consumers that the producers of immaterial products have any economic being, and servants accordingly, whether we consider them as mere assistants in consumption, or as producers of immaterial products, are thus equally without our definition. There are, however, several somewhat similar occupations which it is difficult to assign with certainty to either category. The labour of "barmaids," for instance, which was more than once brought under the notice of the Royal Commission: is it such an one as is, in our point of view, entitled to protection? It has been stated, though we do not remember that any evidence was given on the point, that this is an occupation in which great hardships occur, those employed being subjected to overwork and other unwholesome influences. On the face of it, the latter part of this statement does not seem probable, unless the unwholesome influences referred to be of such a kind as Factory Acts are not concerned about. It is to the interest of the proprietors of "bars" that their sanitary condition and surroundings should be such as to attract visitors, not to repel them. With respect to overwork, however, it is quite possible that very long hours may often be worked in this trade; and allowing this, the question comes how such a case would be dealt with on our principle of classification; would barmaids be regarded as producers or consumers? We have already said that all distributors engaged in placing the finished product in the hands of the consumer should be regarded as engaged in production, and at first sight, without doubt, all persons serving behind bars or counters, and engaged in retailing refreshments, would appear to answer to this description not less than others engaged in retailing any other commodity. But without going into any more technicalities of detail, of which our readers have doubtless already had quite enough, it should be sufficient to note that the refreshment trade has long been recognised as standing on a quite different footing from all other trades, and that special laws have already been enacted for it. However much one might desire, then, to see it on the same footing as other retail trades, it actually is not now on that footing, and the same considerations would not therefore be quite applicable to

it. It is worthy of reflection, too, if the very act of distributing refreshment with a view to immediate consumption is not a stage rather in consumption itself than in production, if it does not partake more of the nature of domestic service than of retail, and if the waiter at your friend's dinner-table who fills your glass with wine might not just as reasonably be said to be engaged in production in performing for you that office. It is otherwise, however, when you purchase and take away the commodity with you: a wine-merchant and his assistants, or a butcher or a baker with his, have certainly assisted in the production of the article so far as the purchaser is concerned, and may hence be justly viewed as assisting in the production generally. This difference, so explained, also recalls that between the cook in service and the cook in the cookshop previously noted. The confectioner or cook of the cookshop, in so far as that very attractive personage approximates towards a mere retailer of refreshments, is not a fit subject for protective legislation, and is already provided for under other restrictive laws of quite another character, as we have seen. In so far, however, as he develops a tendency towards the labours of the baker, and the producer as well as the retailer of provisions, does his labour come naturally within the scope of the other set of laws, and he then is so. (In so far, it may be added, as it approximates to neither of these, does it remain the labour of the domestic servant: the assister in consumption, not in production.) These distinctions are no doubt somewhat fine, but not more likely to give rise to any practical inconvenience for that reason. There must be always such nice distinctions to be provided for in any properly elaborated scheme, and our desire is not to shirk any difficulty. This particular one, too, would in practice really arrange itself of its own accord; for whatever places of the class described were not refreshment houses, and already provided for by the laws to which they are subject, would come as a matter of course to the factories and to be provided for under the Factory Acts. And thus whoever served in the one class of establishments should not, while whoever served in the other class should, be considered to be employed in production, and amenable to the regulations of protected trades. In the matter of "Wandering Occupations," again—hawkers, street performers, newsboys, errand boys, &c.—as we do not see our way to connecting them with production, so should we not consider them either to be within the area of our definition. On this point at least we are at one with the Commissioners, as also in the exception they make in favour of persons carrying about goods in process of manufacture from place to place. It is curious, however, to note how completely they missed the significance of this last exception, as, indeed, we pointed out in our

previous article.* Instinctively they seem, to have felt that persons so employed were on a different level from those others whom we have instanced, but they quite failed to perceive why—namely, that these were employed in assisting forward production, while those were not. They talk about “definite premises,” and other immaterial and inapplicable accidents of the position, but they quite failed to grasp the economical basis of truth underlying their keen perceptions of justice and utility. With respect, finally, to laundry employment, which is the only other we can think of that is likely to present any difficulty, it is not likely to do so to any one who has mastered the meaning of the word Production, upon which so much depends. This we have already seen to be the conferring upon any portion of matter a utility which it did not before possess—the production not of a thing itself, but of a fitness in a thing; and the labour of a laundress is just such an one. The person that cuts out the garment, and so renders it fit for human use, and the person that washes, or starches, or irons the garment, and so renders it fit for human use, perform for all purposes of production an exactly similar office.

Thus have we gone through, so well as our recollections serve us, the chief points upon which we were previously at issue with the recommendations of the Royal Commission for the purpose of showing the applicability of our principle of arrangement to the matter in debate. Summed up, in brief, our argument has taken the following course:—The State is entitled to interfere for the protection of its subjects in every case where grave evils threaten them from any cause, the only qualification being that the interference shall not develop greater evils than those it sets itself to remove. It was, therefore, justified in interfering to protect the labour of children when, at the introduction of the factory system, the new conditions of industrial production were found to exercise a highly baneful influence upon them. The event has proved that no evils correspondingly great have been developed by the interference. It was afterwards also justified in interfering to protect them on account of their comparatively helpless position in face of the universal system of competitive labour which dominates our industry, and which it had itself encouraged by adopting the doctrine of free trade in commodities. For the same reason it is justified in interfering to protect women, so long as they occupy a position analogous to children in the labour market. The result of the vast mass of evidence which has, at various times, been taken since the earlier Factory Acts goes to show, in both instances, that no evils at all com-

* “The Westminster Review,” January 1877, p. 48.

mensurate to the great evils of unlimited competition in a limited sphere, have followed on this interference with their freedom of work. All *a priori* reasoning tends to the same conclusion. But while instinctively acting thus correctly, and particularly urged thereto, it would seem, by the popular element lately imported into it, the Government has failed to comprehend and omitted to announce the changed sanctions for its successive protective enactments, with the result of introducing indecision and confusion into these well-meant efforts. And this indecision and confusion will be sure to continue to prevail in all similar legislative attempts until they are based upon one consistent principle, and Factory (or whatever the place be called where persons needing protection are at work) be properly and comprehensively defined. The best definition would be—Any place where productive industry is carried on under another or other persons. Distribution, being a branch of production, is included in this definition. Domestic service and any industry resulting only in immaterial products, or engaged more about consumption than production, is not. Agriculture, being a mode of production essentially differing from manufacture, should be legislated for on a different basis. The refreshment trade is already so provided for.

Whether this principle be acknowledged or unacknowledged, whether realised or not, we believe it to be the true principle upon which all factory legislation should proceed, and upon which in the main it has proceeded, however blindly. There is an unexampled opportunity now for giving it authoritative currency, for fixing it as a fundamental basis for all future action in that direction. Parliament is about to be called upon to give its adhesion to a measure which for good or evil must enormously affect, not only the industry of the country, but the prospective well-being of the entire mass of the country's working classes. It is easy to suggest, in the light of the reflections which we have made, what the principal points of such a measure should be; it is more difficult to conjecture what they will be. We shall briefly indicate our views. It should commence by repealing absolutely all previous Factory Acts, and shovelling them for ever into the limbo of oblivion; or, if the Act of 1874 must necessarily be spared, as being the last born and of such tender years, and for fear of wounding the susceptibilities of its parents now in power,—with that exception only. This is the prime necessity. The process of patching and adding that has for so long gone on, of taking out here a slice and slipping in there a piece, of explaining away this clause and subtracting so much and no more of that section, of laying down rigid rules in the body of the bill and carefully upsetting them in the Schedules, should at length cease, now

when the subject of legislation is the whole productive power of the nation. Its watchword should be—"Simplification, not uniformity." That is to say, the whole body of statute should be consolidated into one comprehensible whole, drawn upon broad and well-marked lines, but leaving within these lines the greatest possible freedom of separate action and arrangement. This is the second requisite of success. Every branch of production does not proceed by the same modes, every productive labourer does not inherit the same habits, and "no strictly drawn Act of Parliament can ever satisfactorily provide for the innumerable various conditions of innumerable various industries" (Appendix A., page 16, Evidence of Mr. Cooke Taylor). The Act should accordingly lay down as few positive rules as possible, while its negative rules, its prohibitions, should be comprehensive and inexorable. If it be determined, for instance, that ten and a half hours' labour in any one day is enough for women, children, and young persons employed in productive industry of any kind, let that be the allowance then in any one day—that much and no more. Let no overwork then be worked for any purpose, but least of all, surely, because "trade is good" and "we must fulfil our orders," and for such-like reasons, for these are altogether away from the spirit and the intentions of the law. It is an extraordinary plea for indulgence to overwork people that it is manifestly to your advantage to do so. Precisely against such occasions and such motives as these are Factory Acts devised. If there were no "times of great pressure" they would probably be needless; and to assert that the great exertions of these may be balanced by periods of proportionate idleness is palpably absurd. Nor is the possible inconvenience to the consumer which might thus result an argument of any weight. It is not the consumer at all, but the producer, that we are concerned to protect, and the former is certainly better able to suffer the inconvenience than the latter is the injury which by hypothesis working over the stated hours must produce. Let the ten and a half hours (*i.e.*, twelve hours, with one and a half out for meals) be taken at whatever time suits best the condition of the workers and the condition of their industry, subject of course to the approval of the factory inspector of the district, whose duty it will be to make himself acquainted with both, and liable in all cases of disagreement to an appeal to the Home Department. Once the inspector is made cognisant of the different hours, different trades, and different workshops' work, it is very little more trouble for him to keep a record of this than to keep a record of their names, which we suppose it is now customary to do, and to time his visits accordingly. The recommendations of the Royal Commission on this department of their inquiry, though most carefully

and patiently elaborated, are not satisfactory. They have the defect of so many other of their recommendations—a want of vigour—of the desire, in fact, which we have already had occasion to condemn, not to “offend against that legislative principle which has hitherto been followed with such excellent results,” &c.,—the most apparent of these results being the necessity of their own appointment to remedy the incomparable confusion that had supervened on it. They propose that “relaxations of the law” should be granted to particular trades or classes of trades at large, and not to individual employers on application, “such trades to be specified in the law,” the Secretary of State having power to add to them. Then follow long lists of these trades, to which differing relaxations, to the number we think of about thirty, are to be allowed as a commencement. To our uninstructed mind, almost every conceivable trade outside the textile trades (already otherwise provided for) seem to be thus included in the list, and we pause at length to inquire—If these are the trades which need relaxation, where are they that do not?—if these are the relaxations variously needed, will any one be good enough to show us a trade that is under the regular rule? Those original rules seem indeed to have completely vanished in the process of application, and to remind us most of the Irishman’s gun under repair, which required to refurnish it a new “lock, stock, and barrel.” Why not pursue the much more simple plan? Forbid more than a certain amount of work to be done, but let it be done at the most suitable time; insist on the hours of meals being allowed, but let them be given when and how suit the customs of the trade and the habits of the people best, more care being taken, however, than there is now, that they are not allowed to be taken in unhealthy places. In some places, such as dyeworks, for instance, it should be altogether forbidden to remain for meals, as in several other classes of factories we believe it is; but the right person to decide on the fitness and unfitness of any place is the inspector at his visits, not a body of gentlemen sitting in council at St. Stephen’s. On the other hand, nothing would be more unnecessary and ill-judged than to extend to dye and print works (and doubtless many others) that provision of the Factory Act of 1874 which makes it incumbent not to exceed a four and a half hours’ interval between each meal. On the face of it, it is an extraordinary assumption that persons require a meal every four and a half hours throughout the day to ensure the preservation of their health, the fact being that a very large number of people go six, eight, and even nine and ten hours between breakfast and dinner without food, and suffer no ill effects (though we do not, certainly, recommend any such long abstinence). But in print and

dye works there is a specific reason against it. There are in these, processes to be performed which require over four and a half hours to complete, and which cannot be left without losing all the value of the whole labour. In such cases, any such strict regulation of details is inapplicable and tyrannical. The framers of the Workshop Act, which, notwithstanding its many failures and absurdities, was conceived in a wide spirit and has done a great deal of good, so clearly saw this necessity, that an almost improper latitude is allowed by it. Persons may work any period of ten and a half hours between 5 A.M. and 9 P.M., and so long as they have a proper interval for meals, they may take them when they think best. With a refinement of ingenuity, however, for making their work worthless, which almost approaches the sublime, our legislators omitted to make it compulsory that a statement of the hours chosen should be hung up in the workshops, whereas in the factory, where they can only be such as we have said, this provision is rigidly enforced. A fusion of the two extreme systems, and an elimination of the folly pointed out, might be easily made to result in a very workable mean applicable to all classes of works.

We will now advert to the sanitary recommendations of the Royal Commissioners. These peculiarly relate to the position and duties of the certifying surgeons, a subject of considerable importance, but which is so certain to command its full share of attention in the debates, that we do not feel compelled to do more than to touch very briefly upon its most practical aspect. There is a very large number of those gentlemen, and they, for the most part, perform their duties in a manner that commands general approval: the success of the Factory Acts being in a considerable measure due to the exertions of the best among them. They perform those duties, too, at the expense of the manufacturer, not at the expense of the State. If, then, the manufacturers are willing to pay without demur for the medical services thus rendered, who has any right to complain? Again, it may be asked, why should the scope of their duties be reduced just at the time that the scope of factory legislation is being so much extended, unless those duties are worthless, which it is acknowledged that they are not? Still more, why abbreviated in such a manner as to render them practically useless, if they are to be retained? The Royal Commissioners recommend that a child or young person, having once obtained a surgical certificate of fitness for work, should be entitled to work upon that, no matter how often its place of employment has changed; but a child may be fit to work at one sort of occupation, and yet not fit to work at another; or may be fit at one time of its youth and not at another. Clearly, he should either be examined at each

separate place or not at all. The O'Connor Don seems to us to deal far more logically with the question in recommending the total abolition of the office. We do not go with the O'Connor Don, but we consider that retention in a mutilated shape is inexcusable and illogical, and, in fact, the worst expedient of all. Upon the other principle on which the O'Connor Don is at issue with his colleagues, we are more in sympathy with him. He very strongly argues that a woman working for her own livelihood, and not under the control of any master, should work as she thinks best. (See separate report of O'Connor Don, vol. i.) Such a woman does not fulfil our definition of being engaged in production under another person; she is simply engaged in production for her own purposes, and within her own control. To interfere with such production as this by State ordinance, appears to our minds to be pushing protective legislation much too far, for it is, in fact, nothing less than introducing it into family life, which should not be tolerated.

It almost seems to us as if we had now, either in this article or in the preceding one, touched upon the principal points of interest in the Commissioners' report, excluding those only dealing with the education question, and peculiarly seeking out those where our own views seemed most to diverge from theirs. It is partly because we so thoroughly concur in their education policy that we have not found it necessary to go into that, and partly because education is fast passing out of the control of Factory Acts, or any other power less stringent than the resolute desire of the people to have their children taught. Had we more time and more space at our command, it might have been interesting, however, to exhibit the difficulties in the administration of the law which the concurrent and contrary jurisdiction of three such forces as the Factory Acts, the Education Act of 1876, and the byelaws of School Boards are now producing; and the spectacle we should have been able to present might have been an amusing if not an edifying one. But it is a poor ambition to cavil at every difficulty that arises in the path of a good cause. Doubtless the present expedients are raw and rough enough, but the end is good; and if they bring us any nearer to it, they will have served their purpose, and will have helped to bridge over a vast gulf of ignorance which once looked quite impassable. Moreover, if they are raw and rough, what then? By such rough-and-ready expedients have we in the old time struggled forward to the attainment of the great and free constitution which we enjoy; by such-like have we fought our way to liberty, in the truest sense—the liberty of thought and speech, which is alone worth having; by such may we in time to come fight our way forward to the culture and refinement which is as yet so far

off from but too many of us; through such at length may we possibly arrive at that time which earlier in these pages we have shadowed forth, when the practice of morality will no more need to be impressed upon us by the compulsion of law, and "the quality of mercy," that "droppeth like the gentle dew from heaven," no longer require to be "strained" through the material mechanism of Factory Acts or any other legislative enactments whatever.

ART. VII.—RUSSIA.

Russia. By D. MACKENZIE WALLACE, M.A., Member of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society. London: Cassells, Petter, & Galpin. 1877.

Savage and Civilised Russia. By W. R. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1877.

Russian Wars with Turkey. By Major FRANK S. RUSSELL, 14th Hussars. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

NO country presents more interesting and important questions for study, and, if possible, for answer, than Russia. Not only are there imminent political questions which affect the nations of Europe and Asia, and which affect our own national interests in a peculiar way, connected with that great empire, but there are innumerable social and economical problems which may be well considered in the light of an intimate knowledge of the development and condition of the mixed race which spreads its vast proportions over all the Russias. But notwithstanding the importance of a careful study and intimate knowledge of that formidable power and its unwieldy resources,—notwithstanding the not altogether unjustifiable fear with which the designs of Russia are regarded, and the terrible consequences of a misinterpretation of the signs of these perilous times, the information which is possessed by most people with reference to Russia and her policy is by no means either accurate or ample. True, quite recently a considerable effort has been made to supply this want of information, and men well qualified for the task have contributed to dissipate the ignorance which, considering the magnitude of the interests involved and the greatness of the country in question, is scarcely less remarkable than deplorable. But even now the knowledge we possess concerning Russia is not altogether adequate or satisfactory. It resembles rather the information which is secured by "cram" with a view to examination,

than the knowledge which is acquired by careful experience and confirmed by long familiarity, and which is available for the conduct of life. There is a haste about our acquisition which is inimical to clearness of conception and method of arrangement, and many of the views which are expressed, and the conclusions which are entertained, with reference to Russia and her somewhat tortuous policy, are characterised by features which show that they have been adopted for the emergency.

Some of the works from which we draw our information seem to have been forced into print a little prematurely; and even Mr. Wallace's work, in order that it might take the tide of present affairs at the proper point, and be floated to the fortune of a fifth or sixth edition, has been offered to the public without the grave disquisitions upon the rural commune, systems of agriculture, history of the emancipation, the economic condition of the peasantry, the financial system, public instruction, and the like, which he meant to make a part of his work; and we cannot find any reference to the military organisation of Russia in his pages.*

Still, notwithstanding the nature of the materials which have been supplied to us, we think that sufficient has been said and written to enable us to form some correct conclusions as to Russia, and we propose to offer these for the consideration of the reader. Our duty here is limited to summing up the evidence which has been given; but the duty of the witnesses, who have come to the bar of public opinion, and testified to facts and hazarded inferences, is a much graver and more difficult one to perform. That we may rightly weigh that evidence and these inferences, it is necessary that we should appreciate the gravity of that duty and the many circumstances which contribute to the difficulty of its performance.

The problems that we are dealing with in relation to Russia are not matters of archaic report, but of living current history; and of all history, current history is the most difficult to write. To make the past, present; to bring the distant near; to approximate the sympathies of living men with races which have been dead for centuries, is, no doubt, a difficult matter; and he who can faithfully accomplish this—who can show us a nation's real life in its true colours, unstained or strained by blots and contortions which are incident to the medium of the character of the

* The best information as to army organisation and administration which can be given—for it is difficult to get any accurate information about it, so strict are the Russian press regulations and so corrupt and negligent are many of the officials—will be found in some articles recently published in the "Times," and reprinted, pp. 207, 224, in Major Russell's work on "Russian Wars with Turkey."

most honest historians, does a truly great work. But such a writer has one thing greatly in his favour. In speaking to us, he speaks to our reason and our calm sympathies; we are not "hand and glove" with those old heroes,—we have no common blame or merit with those long-dead villains or saints, and we can look at them and their actions with clear eyes and unbiassed understandings. But the writer of contemporary history has to make that which is near to us, that which is dear to us or hated by us, sufficiently remote from our urgent sentiments to allow us to survey it with fairness and justice. That is not easy. True, the historian of to-day may have a more intimate knowledge of his times than the writer of the history of a bygone age can have of the subject of his study, but his intimate knowledge is intermixed with prejudices; and even if he can transcend these in himself, he has to speak to men with intense loves and hates, intense beliefs and convictions, which are often irrational and wrong,—men who are in some part the subject of his vivisections—men who have, or believe they have, like opportunities of knowledge with himself, and who have strong sympathies and interests which may gainsay the best reason. But, besides that difficulty, which every writer of the history of his own time must be prepared to encounter, he has other problems presented to him which he will scarcely find easy of solution. In all writing, the duty of the author is to say that which is primarily significant, and to leave unsaid that which is only significant in a secondary sense or insignificant. In the choice of these significant circumstances the merit of real authorship lies. To discern in relation to any matter what is essential and what is unessential is by no means easy. But the writer must learn to do this, for, however prolix he may be, he can only give hints after all. A man without genius or without special knowledge will not unfrequently dwell upon unessential elements in his description, and neglect the real important features by which the thing described can be recognised. Inferior writers load their labouring pages with unnecessary details, and at the end of their cumbrous verbosity the reader attains no clear conceptions from their diffuse efforts; while an artist will with a few strong light words represent the whole gist of the affair, however complicated, with a vividness and reality which conjures the actual place or time before the eyes. But there is a preliminary power which is necessary to this excellent literature, and that is the power of selecting that which is, and the rejection of that which is not, significant. Now, however well-gifted an author may be in this respect, he may undertake to write about events and circumstances in connection with which the exercise of this discretion is almost impossible. In dealing with com-

pleted transactions and past events, the appreciation of the significant is not difficult. There is a sifting process in the centuries, and the insignificant is lost sight of, while the huge essential features can be surveyed correctly in their relative proportions. It is possible that a critic in Homer's days might be in doubt as to the relative merits of the "Iliad" and some feeble efforts of a rural poetaster; but now Homer comes alone from his age. But in dealing with the vital conditions and developing circumstances of our own time, we are not assisted by this natural selection of oblivion and tradition, and it is well-nigh impossible to determine the nature of acts and events which are only in the doing or happening, and which are properly to be estimated only by their results. We may judge with some accuracy of the height of hills if we see them as a range on the horizon, but who can tell the relative soaring proportions of their bulky forms if he is sunk in the shade of one of their deep valleys? What chemist would predicate the result of an experiment from the first or second observation of a long process of intermediate results? And yet it is a not less difficult duty which the writer of contemporary history undertakes, and the results of his labours, however ingenious, however conscientious, must be taken in connection with a memory of the inevitable drawbacks to a perfect performance or an adequate accomplishment of the high design.

It seemed to us necessary to make these remarks, in order that the true value of Mr. Wallace's book might be appreciated. He himself is conscious that his estimate of the effects of recent changes—as, for instance, the emancipation of the serfs—may be premature. Indeed, his "Russia" belongs to that class of works which we have been describing, but, at the same time, it possesses many merits of which works of that class are usually devoid. He did not, like some writers whose careless works have passed before the careless eyes of circulating-library readers in these last few years, pay a short summer holiday visit to Russia, see some things, and pretend to have seen a great deal more, and write a flashy book full of mistakes and epigrams. Mr. Wallace's book is peculiarly calm and judicious. He speaks always with *caré*, often from much painstaking study, and invariably from excellent opportunities of the best information. He has been wise in preparing himself to write a great work by a long residence in the country, and by familiarising himself with its institutions. But he was well prepared to profit by his exceptional opportunities before he went to Russia. He is evidently a man of culture in the best sense—a man with wide experience, not only of books but of men; and he has, besides his experience, good observant eyes and a clear thoughtful head. With these

advantages it was to be expected that he would produce an admirable book about Russia, and that expectation has been fully realised. His book is a most valuable contribution to our knowledge of Russia, and we can praise his clear and candid performance without stint. It is the best book we have read about that great country. Many aspects of Russian life, many important problems of Russian sociology, many questions of international policy and of social polity, are dealt with in these volumes by a most careful and capable observer and by an impartial and judicious writer. Mr. Wallace is master of a lucid style of English prose, and we cannot wonder that his book has already passed through two editions. But even taking this view of the merits of Mr. Wallace's performance, we would guard ourselves against a too implicit acceptance of his book as an authentic history of Russia at the present time, by the considerations as to the value of contemporary history which we have already submitted to the reader, and by the remembrance of the fact that "even a judge is an advocate after all." Even Mr. Wallace admits, as we have said, that it may be too early to speak accurately and with authority as to the results of the emancipation of the serfs (vol. ii. pp. 311, 345), and he expresses his views as to the rural communes and their future with ample diffidence; and so fair does he always try to be, that we feel certain he would admit that he has some prejudices in favour of Russia—which was his home for six years—and that he may, possibly have failed, with all his efforts, to eliminate these from his pages or to transcend them in his judgments. We shall have occasion to point out how, in one respect, his views of Russia are scarcely warranted by the evidence which was before him; but here we will content ourselves with these preliminary remarks.

That Russia, altogether apart from any view which we may take of her present policy, is a peculiarly interesting country, is undoubted. Its history is in many respects curious and full of romance; and even the events which have occurred in Russia within the last few years are of the utmost importance to the student of national institutions and social science. It is a country which belongs geographically and ethnologically as much to Asia as to Europe; and while its conquests stretch its autocratic rule more and more over the former continent, its curious eclectic tendencies seem to assimilate it more and more to Western nations. Russia, which has many of the characteristics of an Oriental power, has always had the ambition to rival the civilisation, the commerce, the literature, and even, to some extent, the institutions, of the countries of Western Europe. One peculiarity of Russia as a country may be noted here, and that

is its want of originative power. It has developed or invented nothing,—it has borrowed or imitated everything. In this Russia resembles the Asiatic world in its recent phases. That world seems to have passed its vigorous youth, in which it originated and invented. China has been standing still for a thousand years. At one time it surpassed all nations in its advancement. It was there that printing was invented; it was there that gunpowder was first made; it was there that the suspension-bridge was first constructed. But before it had learned how to use its great discoveries, a blight seems to have fallen upon the race, and it has stood still ever since. It has used the printing for the decoration of teachests, the gunpowder for fireworks; but even now the Chinese show marvellous powers of literal imitation, and their excellent qualities in this respect are making them useful labourers in America, where they undersell the workers with whiter skins. The Russians have some resemblance to the Chinese in this respect, but they have not the satisfaction of feeling, as the Chinese have, that they once were a people possessing genius, that they once were pioneers of science. They are singularly deficient in all these respects. They have always gone to school to the West. They have always had a sort of reputation for acquiring languages, and they show a capacity for appropriating ideas—that is all. Peter the Great left Russia to learn what Russia ought to be. He modelled his army on Western principles; and Alexander II. has modelled his courts upon those of England or France. But it is the same throughout. Their best writers are imitators of the more gifted authors of Western Europe. This is what they say of themselves:—“Imitators, skilful imitators, we have produced in abundance; but where is there a man of original genius? What is our famous poet Zhukófski? A translator! What is Pushkin? A chosen pupil of the Romantic school! What is Sérmountof? A feeble imitator of Byron! What is Gógol?” (Wallace, vol. i. p. 394, and see “Savage and Civilised Russia,” p. 151). Well, Gógol, according to Mr. Wallace,* is an imitator of Dickens (ii. p. 140). Indeed, the Russians are great only as followers.

But there are other characteristics of Russia which must not be lost sight of. It has not produced discoverers any more than inventors. The map of the world owes little to Russia, while it owes much to such small countries as Portugal and Holland;

* Geigoróvitch, the writer of tales descriptive of rural life in Russia, has also written under the influence of Dickens, and, like most imitators, has been more successful in producing the tricks and affectations of the original than in reproducing the genuine characteristics of the author (Wallace, i. p. 109).

while the contributions of England, and Austria, and America have also been large. Yet, while it has not discovered new lands, its ambition to acquire new lands has been boundless. If it has not emigrated in ships, it has emigrated in armies. Its ambitions have led it in all directions. Take one illustration. Since 1709 it has made war eight times upon Turkey. On each occasion it was the aggressor, and the result of most of these wars was an addition to its territory ("Russian Wars with Turkey," p. 6). Here are some words which were written in 1854, but which are worthy of being read in 1877 :—

"A reference to the map will show that Russia has advanced her frontier in every direction ; and even the Caspian Sea, which appeared to present an impediment to her progress, she has turned to advantage by appropriating it to herself. It will be seen that the plains of Tartary have excited her cupidity, while the civilised states of Europe and Asia have been dismembered to augment her dominions. It will be seen that the acquisitions she has made from Sweden are greater than what remains of that ancient kingdom ; that her acquisitions from Poland are as large as the whole Austrian Empire ; that the territory she has wrested from Turkey in Europe is equal to the dominions of Prussia exclusive of the Rhenish provinces ; and that her acquisitions from Turkey in Asia are equal in extent to all the smaller states of Germany, the Rhenish provinces of Prussia, Belgium, and Holland taken together ; that the country she has conquered from Persia is about the size of England ; that her acquisitions in Tartary have an area equal to Turkey in Europe, Greece, Italy, and Spain, and that the territory she has acquired within the last sixty-four years (since 1772) is greater in extent and importance than the whole empire she had in Europe before that time. . . . In sixty-four years she has advanced her frontier eight hundred and fifty miles towards Vienna, Berlin, Dresden, Munich, and Paris ; she has approached four hundred and fifty miles nearer to Constantinople ; she has possessed herself of the capital of Poland, and has advanced to within four miles of the capital of Sweden, from which, when Peter the First mounted the throne, her frontier was distant three hundred miles."—*Quoted in "Russian Wars with Turkey,"* pp. 7, 8.

But here the quotation becomes inapplicable to the present circumstances, for it goes on to speak of the distance Russia had advanced towards Persia and India, and the further advances in that direction since these sentences were written, which are fully in the memory of all, make the assertions all the stronger than they were in 1854. But passing in the meantime from this aspect of Russian eclecticism, we may point out that Russia possesses a purely autocratic government, which stoops to a police-spy system (Wallace, i. p. 317), and that yet within the last few years serfage has been swept away by the Emperor, and the

rural commune, an undoubted democratic institution, has been recognised by law. While Russian society is curiously imitative of that of Western nations, and has been content to take its fashions, its manners, and even its language, from Paris and Versailles for more than a century, it has not secured from the autocratic power the concession of a constitution or any share of the power which is so despotically wielded by the Emperor. But although Russia has not imitated Western Europe in that respect, she has in many others. We pointed out that the courts—which are arranged in two systems, one the Justice of Peace courts, and the other the regular tribunals, the decisions of the appeal court belonging to either of these departments being liable to revision by the Senate or supreme court of revision—had been modelled upon the courts of France and England; but beyond that, trial by jury has been introduced, and a certain amount of local self-government, besides that which exists in the rural commune, has been given to the provincial assemblies (*Zemstvo*), but unlike such concessions in Western countries, these have been unaccompanied by any limitations of the autocratic power. There is a striking difference between the West and the East in that respect. Here the force comes from below. There is an immense amount of human energy always being generated by the people, and to utilise that—as we do the heat that passes from the engine-fire—we require certain machinery which will give it vent in the direction of useful labour instead of harmful explosion. Here reforms come from the people and are forced upon the Government; there the Czar is the motive power of all changes. The people are inert and recipient, not suggestive of reforms; vital modifications are forced upon the people by the supreme power. Russia seems to be moved by a spring. The great reform of 1861, the emancipation of the serfs, was not called for by the people; the merchant class was entirely apathetic, and the nobles were for the most part averse to the momentous change. Yet against all this national friction the Emperor carried his point and imposed freedom upon the peasantry.

But not only is Russia interesting in relation to points of contrast with Western civilisation: there are also curious and important contrasts to be found within her own wide domains. Her peasantry are apparently in the theological stage of development; their faith is curiously implicit; they worship God and their icons, and pray to the former to mix Himself in many affairs of daily life, and not to believe a neighbour if he should speak ill of him. They have much faith in certain forms of words, but their religion has not taught them temperance or sobriety. The nobles, on the other hand, seem to be in the metaphysical stage of development. All political and social questions are dealt with upon funda-

mental and philosophical principles. When a practical question is proposed, they are dissatisfied with an answer drawn from experience and expediency, but "look before and after." "As soon as they begin to examine any simple matter with a view to legislation, it at once becomes a 'question,' and flies up into the region of political and social science" (Wallace, i. p. 215). Their views of the "mir" or village community are characteristic in this respect. To them it is not merely a convenient and temporary form of very local self-government, but it is a "panacea for nearly all social evils" (Wallace, ii. p. 373). It will for ever prevent the formation of a Proletariat; it is the social element which will defy all the disintegrating tendencies which are at work in Western Europe, tendencies which will sooner or later lead to the dismemberment of countries like England, France, and Germany. Mr. Wallace points out that many persons in Russia believe that the nations of the West are on the highroad to political and social anarchy. The populations in these countries have increased, the small landowners have been expropriated by the large landowners, and the result has been the production of "the masses"—masses of unattached human beings, who have no property in the country, no interest in existing institutions. These men wrench small livelihoods out of hard-handed circumstances, either by the slavery of agricultural labour in the country, or by the worse slavery of artisan labour in the towns. Hitherto, it is argued, owing to free trade and the natural advantages of England in the competition of the world, she has been able to feed her hungry Proletariat; but whenever the industrial and commercial supremacy of England is at an end—and that time is not now distant—it will be impossible for her to feed those hungry masses. Already she has to be supplied with food from other lands for her overgrown population; but she must pay for the grain she wants by her manufactures. When nobody wants her manufactures, having as good of their own, how will she buy off revolution? Now the Russians think that the commune will for ever prevent the occurrence of such stringent wants in their country, that in the commune they have a perfect system of preventive medicine for all social and political evils, and that the fate which is fast hastening to destroy the nations of the West will be averted from Russia by this ancient democratic institution. But there is, at least, a probability that this institution will itself disappear, and a certainty that the redistribution of land; which is one of its characteristic features, will be abandoned. Village communities have existed in other countries—indeed, in every other country; and it is only because Russia lags behind the rest of civilised countries that they are an

existent institution there. In this, as in other things, Russia will follow the example of the West; and if the fate of the Western nations is what the Russians think it is, it will be the fate of all the Russias too, and the thin partition of the rural commune which protects them from it will not long stand in the way. But we referred to this matter to indicate the peculiar intellectual movements of Russian thought, to show their unpractical reference to past principles and ultimate facts, when all that is necessary is a quick decision from immediate premises. Such tendencies are indicative of youth, and in many respects Russia is a young country.

But there are various other contrasts which will strike an inquirer. Here two widely diverse creeds, that of the Mongol and that of the Orthodox, grow together without polemical disagreements. In the West men hold beliefs strongly—they do not live “by bread alone;” and will fight as much for the integrity of their intellectual conceptions as for the security of their material possessions. Differences of creed, in the apathy both of the Russian peasant and the Mongol Tartar, are regarded as natural divisions of men as those of race are, and conversion from a religious belief is no more thought of than the conversion of a Tartar into a Russian.

Again, we not only find strange differences in this hybrid country—a hybrid between Europe and Asia—but we necessarily find strange differences in development. We find all forms of life. It is said of England that it is a nation of shopkeepers, but no such general description is applicable to Russia. We have the Bashkirs and Kirghis of the steppe, who are still pastoral peoples; we find the peasantry of the black earth zone and the forest zone, who have been forced by their circumstances to become agriculturists. But a still further development is going on. In many of the towns the industrial classes are increasing, and it is also certain, from the excellent specimens which were sent to the Philadelphia Exhibition last year, that the manufactures are improving in a very marked degree. These contrasts are not without interest, for they throw light upon the national life of Russia. But the element in Russia which subordinates all these various tendencies to diversity into a national unity is the autocratic power. The country has no unity by reason of the molecular forces which interact amongst its human units, except in relation to its communal institutions, but by reason of the supreme power. Were that broken, Russia would disintegrate. Even as it is, it is true that were the repulsive force of the various elements which constitute the nation greater than it is, the aggregating and binding force of the central government might easily be over-

come; but apathy is a national characteristic, not only of the Russians, but of the Fins, the Tartars, and the other races which live under that stringent rule, and it is of more inflammable materials than these lazy, slow, phlegmatic temperaments that revolutions are made. "The affair of December" 1825 shows the small amount of revolutionary spirit which exists in Russia. It was an attempt to overthrow the imperial power, not by the people, but by the cliques. It was not put down. It was snubbed, and led only to a system of repressive police administration. There is another circumstance which contributes to the passivity of the Russian peasantry, and that is the roominess of Russia. In some parts of the country, as we have seen, the population is so small that the people can live lazily as shepherds. In other parts, it is true, that although the population is not dense (in the north little more than one to the English square mile), the lands are so poor, and the chances of starvation so numerous, that the people have been driven to become agriculturists. But, as Mr. Wallace says, until lately "Russia remained an almost exclusively agricultural empire, with abundance of unoccupied land" (i. 442). Even since the aspect of Russia has been changing in this respect, there has been no intense struggle for existence, no competition to rouse the best energies of the people, and to stir their blood in the fight for life, and the resistance of oppression which makes life unbearable. That industrial life in Russia is very different from the industrial life with which we are familiar, is proved by the fact that it is no uncommon thing in Russia to find mills open only three days in the week, or to find them suspending operations altogether in summer to enable the work-people to attend to their hay harvest. From what has been stated it will be seen that the struggle for existence is not nearly so fierce in Russia as it is in Western Europe, and that, on the whole, the means of existence are somewhat easily secured. That fact to some extent accounts for the apathy and political passivity of the peasantry, and for the unshaken grasp of the supreme power. Were the populations as dense as they are in this country, were the products of the land as small in relation to the number of the people as they are in England, were the people more aggregated in towns than they are at present, the autocratic power would have a more turbulent nation to deal with, and some real constitutional limitation of the power of the Czar might be an absolute necessity. That the territorial aggrandisement of Russia, of which we shall have more to say hereafter, that the expansion of territory and the annexation of wide lands, which have given even a greater amount of room to the Russian people, and eased the inter-relations of consumption and produc-

tion, have tended to postpone the time when the question of autocratic or democratic government will have to be raised and decided, seems to us certain. But a time will come when Russia will have to be content with boundaries, when her territorial aggrandisement will be checked by the conflicting interests of other and more powerful races; and when that time comes, the question as to the ultimate form of government will become imminent. Russia is preparing the way for the more speedy broaching of the great subject with one hand, while she is endeavouring to postpone it with the other. Hitherto Russia has been a country in chains. It has been shut out from the world by winter on the north, and by somewhat troublesome neighbours on the south and west. She has been ambitious of having ports and commerce, and Constantinople has been coveted by the Czars as "the key of their house." Much intricate diplomacy has been expended with a view to obtaining access to the ports and markets of the West. Even now it cannot be doubted that Russia is ambitious of a prominent place in the markets of the world, and much of her insidious policy has been and is directed to the securing the means to that end; amongst which a southern port and an unimpeded waterway to all the countries of the world is by no means the least important. But this anxiety to enter into the marts will, if it is gratified, expedite the practical solution of the question of ultimate government. The immediate result of successful commercial relations with other countries would be to increase the wealth and consequently to increase the population of Russia. It would also produce greater aggregations of men, and the town populations would become relatively more powerful than the country.* When that time comes, the Czar question will be raised. Russia's extensions to the east give the Emperor's throne a wider and firmer basis; her extensions either territorial or commercial to the west render the foundations of the autocratic power less and less stable. Still this is a long view into the future, and it seems certain that the question will not be a practical one for centuries.

That the rural communes will prevent the question ever becoming a practical one—as we see Russians believe—we cannot think. The village community is a most interesting institution. Any one acquainted with Sir Henry S. Maine's work upon the subject, or with Mr. Lavelaye's contribution to the same inquiry, knows how important a part these communal institutions

* In Russia the urban element composes only a tenth part of the entire population, whereas in Great Britain more than one-half of the inhabitants are dwellers in towns (Wallace, i. 255).

have played in the early history of all peoples. We find that village communities living together and owning land in common have not been confined to any one country, but have existed at a certain stage of development in all. Indeed, while land is abundant in relation to the population, and while primitive agriculture is sufficient to supply all the wants of the people, common holding of land is likely to be the only form of ownership. But when the land becomes scarce relatively to the population—when primitive modes of agriculture no longer suffice,—when the land which has been exhausted by production cannot be abandoned and other unexhausted land appropriated at will, but the exhaustion of production has to be supplied by the expensive process of manuring or high farming, and when the necessities of the time necessitate the division of labour, so that every man cannot be a farmer—then communal agriculture passes away, fixity of tenure in the same hands becomes a necessity, and the right of private property in land emerges from the primitive condition of village ownership. That stage of development has not as yet been reached in Russia. There the village community is still a living, an existing institution, and some description of it may not be altogether out of place here. It is not merely a question of archaic law; it is important because unless one understands its peculiar constitution, he will fail to understand the real social life of the peasantry.

The peasant family in Russia is, or rather was—for the emancipation of the serfs has to some extent modified the family relations—a peculiar association, in which the members had nearly all things in common. Yet the household was subject to a ruler—its head—who was called *Khözäin*, and he represented the family in its larger and more responsible relations with the outer world. The village is somewhat like the family on a larger scale, and this resemblance may be indicative of the origin of these communities. Here, as in the family, there is a common ownership of certain things—the family, and the house, its contents, and the implements of agriculture. The village community owns the arable land and pasturage. Here, too, as in the family, there is common responsibility for certain acts, and a common bearing of certain burdens. The household is responsible for the debts, while it is the village which is responsible to the imperial exchequer for the taxes. In the village, as in the house, there is a head or ruler, but instead of being the head of the household, he is the village elder or *Starosta*; and in each case the head is to a great extent amenable to the authority of those over whom he in a sense rules, and for whom he performs executive functions. There is a further similarity; for the family, in case of insolvency, cannot be deprived of its house, or of the

implements used in agriculture, while the commune cannot under any circumstances be deprived of the land. Still, notwithstanding these points of similarity, there are distinguishing features between the family and the village community. The members of the former farm in common, and are supposed to put their earnings into a common purse; the members of the latter farm separately the land allotted to them, and only contribute a quota to the common treasury, from which sums to meet the common liabilities are disbursed. It cannot be doubted that this intimate association of men and families in common rights and common burdens is fraught with common consequences which are quite unknown in the home relations which exist in this country. Here each man may do very much as he likes; there a man's autonomy is limited by the rights which the village has to his labours and his contribution to the common funds. No man can be idle in the household without throwing a greater burden of labour on the other members of the family; no man can be dissolute or thriftless in the community without imposing heavier burdens upon his yoke-fellows in the same village team. Owing to these circumstances, common rights have become associated with membership of the commune. Thus no peasant can leave the village without permission, and even when he has obtained such a passport to wander, he may be recalled to his village by the voice of the commune at any time; and during his absence he has to contribute his full share to the taxes which have to be borne by the community.

To understand the village community, one must understand its relation to the state. The names of male peasants in every part of the empire are entered in census lists, and that altogether irrespective of the age at the time the census is taken. Thus a new-born babe and a man of eighty are both entered in this list. These lists are "revised" from time to time, but meanwhile the last list is held to be correct, although many children may have been born, or many men may have died. Each commune has a list of its male members, or "revision souls," as they are called, and until the next census is taken pays taxes in proportion to the number on that list. And every peasant who pays taxes is entitled to a share in the arable land and pasturage belonging to the commune. But the taxes paid are in no sense in the nature of rent. The taxes are exacted from the commune, and the commune divides the land belonging to it as it thinks fit. There is, of course, great variety in the practice as to the division of the common land. Sometimes it is divided according to the number of males in a household, or "revision souls" in the census list. This system sometimes leads to hardship; for the share in the common land is not always to be regarded as a privilege, but

is not unfrequently a burden, and therefore some communes have allotted the land, not in proportion to the number of "revision souls" on the list, but according to the working power of the families. Each commune possesses its code of unwritten laws—laws which have passed from customs dictated by practical necessity into the stricter form of traditional rules, which are never written down, but are perfectly understood and constantly acted upon. The village elder, while in one sense the ruler, is really only the executive, and the real power rests with the village assembly, of which every head of a household is a member. These village parliaments consider all the questions which are of importance to the communal existence. They divide the lands, fix the time for making the hay, elect the elder, make rules for the moral government of the community—as, for instance, whether a gin-shop (*kabák*) shall be opened within the village precincts—and what measures shall be taken to compel the payment of the taxes; and no one ever thinks of opposing, openly at least, the will of the "mir." When it is remembered that five-sixths of the population of Russia are members of these rural communes, it will be seen that it is not an unimportant feature in Russian life.

There is another matter which it is necessary to understand in relation to the masses of the population—a matter to which Mr. Wallace has devoted many valuable pages, and that is "serfage," and the effects of its abolition. Russians have been proud of emphasising the difference between slavery and serfage, and of asserting, with more confidence than veracity, that slavery never existed in Russia. Mr. Wallace points out the error of this assertion. Indeed, the old chronicles are full of references to slavery as an institution, and to the sales of human beings, and at very low prices too. But undoubtedly in recent times serfage was of two kinds. The domestic serfs were slaves under another name, and were advertised and sold as chattels; the serfs properly so called lived in villages, possessed property, tilled the communal land for their own benefit, enjoyed a certain amount of self-government, and it was quite an exception to find any of these sold or transferred except with and as part of the estate. The origin of this serfage is, we think, rightly described by Mr. Wallace; and we cannot but agree with him in thinking, that "if serfage did not create that moral apathy and intellectual lethargy which forms, as it were, the atmosphere of Russian provincial life, it did much, at least, to preserve it" (ii. 270). However, serfage has been swept away. On the 19th of February 1861, the autocratic power which had created serfage abolished it; and two of the most interesting chapters of Mr. Wallace's book deal with the consequences of

that emancipation. He admits fully the difficulty of dealing with the subject; recognises the fact that the transition process from old legal and social relations and old modes of life is still going on, and that that fact makes it almost impossible to determine accurately "the relative importance and real significance of the phenomena observed" (ii. 311). But we cannot but feel that, so far as it was possible, he has arrived at sound and just conclusions as to the consequences of that great social and legal revolution. These conclusions are, that to the proprietors in the northern agricultural zone the abolition of serfage has occasioned serious pecuniary loss, and that the emancipation of the serfs has made agriculture an unprofitable pursuit in these penurious districts. The proprietors in the two southern regions, where the land gives abundant return for the labour bestowed upon it, have suffered no pecuniary loss if the economic changes which have occurred in the last few years are taken into consideration. With regard to the consequences of the emancipation upon the peasantry, he has to confess that he is not "prepared to pronounce any very decided opinion on the subject" (ii. 346). But at another page he remarks with truth, "The fact that the question is so difficult to answer is in itself important, and may be taken as a proof that little or no amelioration has taken place in the condition of the peasantry. If any great decided amelioration had taken place, it would certainly have been perceived and proclaimed to the world, and we should not have found, as we find at present, that men who are most capable of judging are precisely those who refrain most carefully from expressing a decided opinion on the subject" (ii. 354).

Indeed, it cannot be doubted that many grave evils have developed themselves as incident to the emancipation. After the emancipation the peasants began to drink more and work less. In the village assemblies "talk" took the place of action, and the noisy members rather than the wise ones had their own way; and, indeed, it seems certain that many of the actions of the "mir" were influenced by vodka rather than by sound wisdom. The peasants themselves will admit the correctness of such statements, and deplore the present condition of the "mir," saying, "There is no order now; the people have been spoiled; it was better in the time of the masters." But not only may the village assemblies be "treated" with vodka, but the Volost Court, presided over by peasant judges, is also amenable to bribery, and decisions are not unfrequently obtained by means of the same potent spirit. On the whole, it is not to be doubted that peasant self-government in Russia is not in a satisfactory condition, and although there is some exaggeration in the statements which are commonly made concern-

ing it, there is a good deal of truth in some of the faults which are found with its present working. It is said, for instance, that serfage has not been abolished, but that the serfs have simply changed hands. While in former times they were attached to the land by the rights of the master, they are now quite as much attached to the land by the rights of the commune. The peasant cannot leave his village, as we have seen, without the leave of the community; and if he has left the village, he is still liable to his share of the burdens which the commune has to bear. But he is not free to stay away as long as he chooses, for the commune may recall him at any time, and this power is not unfrequently—in the case of well-to-do peasants who have settled and been successful in the towns—used as a means of extorting money. Even Mr. Wallace, who is certainly not prejudiced against the rural communes, admits that in the northern regions “the commune has really taken the place of the serf proprietors, and holds its members in a state of semi-serfage” (ii. 366).

But there is another objection to the system which must not be overlooked. It is asserted that the commune deprives the peasant of all inducement to improve the land, because the whole land of the village is liable to redistribution at any time, and no peasant will think it worth his while to make permanent improvements which would only become a reason in the eyes of his neighbours for a redistribution which would deprive him of the benefits of his capital and industry. Practically, however, it is not found that this result follows; but that fact must be regarded rather as another proof of the apathy of the peasantry, and their neglect of all the better means of farming, than as an indication of the moral sense of the communities. Another fact is worthy of remark. The emancipation of the serfs had the effect of breaking up the primitive family system, and that disruption has resulted in the separation of the members into separate households—an economic disadvantage, which, whatever may be its ultimate moral and material effects, has in the meantime told against this gigantic autocratic experiment. But the other incident evils which have tended to discredit this great imperial act of justice, although numerous, are possibly only temporary, and we cannot but think that the ultimate results of this great change will be beneficial to the mass of the Russian people. Whether education, which is making some progress in Russia, will mitigate these evils, it would be difficult to say, but natural to expect. Whether the ecclesiastical reforms which have been recently introduced will tend to make the condition of the peasantry better than it is at present, we may at least hope. If the priesthood could make the peasantry more temperate and more provident, they would do good work. If they could instil

into them even elementary moral truths—of which they seem curiously ignorant—they would do much to improve their social and material position. We cannot follow Mr. Wallace through his various chapters, but, as we have mentioned in half-complaint what he has left undone, we must in fairness enumerate what he has effected in his very pleasant as well as very just and instructive book. It is impossible to single out any chapter for special praise. The earlier chapters are fluent travellers' tales, which give one a good notion of some of the external features of Russian life. But even in these there is evidence of careful observation, of wise study, and judicious criticism. If a man has a brain and eyes, he will find things worth looking at and worth thinking about, whether he is on a tarantass, a Volga steamer, or on a bed of sickness and attended by a Feldsher. But there is much weighty matter in these pages. His authentic accounts of the peasant family and of the peasantry of the north are exceedingly valuable. He has understood the great fact that to understand a country, even a country with such a mainspring as the will of the Emperor, you must understand the masses of the people. His account, too, of the Finnish and Tartar villages is interesting, and his sketches of the towns and merchant classes, the Tchinovicks and noblesse, are graphic and good. His work would be an excellent guide-book to Russia, not in the body, but in the spirit, for it tells you nothing that ordinary guide-books tell you, and everything which you wish ordinary guide-books would tell. But we find that in praising each chapter that struck us we are only giving a complete table of contents, for each subject is dealt with in a masterly fashion; and when the matter in hand requires careful thought or speculative acumen, Mr. Wallace shows that he is as much master of these as of the facts of the subject.

We come now, however, to the consideration of a question concerning which we are not in such complete accord with Mr. Wallace as we found ourselves at most parts of his pleasant work. The last chapter in his book is upon "Territorial Advancement and the Eastern Question." At the present time it would be absurd to obtain much intimate knowledge of Russia and her people, to inquire into her somewhat grim history—stained as it is with much blood—to trace her recent internal and foreign policy, without attempting to apply that knowledge and information to the paramount issue of the moment, when our own national interests are so deeply involved in the action which may be taken by that aggressive power. No doubt the important question which is behind all inquiry into the present condition and past history of Russia is—Can we predicate with any certainty what the future policy of Russia will be? Can we say

what her intentions are, and can we estimate her power to carry out these intentions, if they are directed against the common peace of Europe, or if, perchance, as many think, they are directed against the peculiar interests of our own country as bound up with those of our Indian Empire? These questions are pressing, and we have, we think, in the books before us some means of answering them. We do not propose in any way to deal with the more purely political questions, which were treated in the "Westminster Review" for January last;* but altogether apart from the question of Russian designs, as indicated by recent diplomacy, there is a question of Russian designs as indicated by the past history and policy of the ambitious Czars. As to this question, we have the advantage of having before us the distinct statements of an apologist for Russian aggression, and of a writer who takes a very extreme view with reference to the unjustifiable nature of Russian territorial advancement. We think it due to Mr. Wallace to examine with care everything he says, and we think it due to ourselves to be very careful in this regard, as we cannot but think that his conclusions are not justified by the facts which he himself adduces; and an error having the currency of his authority might be peculiarly pernicious.

No fact is more important in relation to Russia than her extraordinarily rapid growth. A thousand years ago there was no Russia; to-day her dominions extend from China to Sweden, from the Polar Ocean on the north to Turkey and Afghanistan on the south. But still she is not satisfied; annexation is going on as vigorously as ever, and her present attitude threatens even further accessions to her large boundaries. Now it is necessary to account for this spread of Russia. There is a well-recognised law which Mr. Wallace states as follows—"The natural increase of population demands a constantly increasing production of grain, whilst the primitive methods of cultivation exhaust the soil and steadily diminish its productivity." It is certain that when the production of grain becomes inadequate to the wants of the people, certain expedients will be adopted either to prevent the increase of the population or to increase the production of food. Emigration would be a means to the former; improved agriculture or commercial enterprise would be a means to the latter. According to Mr. Wallace, the Russo-Slavonians experienced this difficulty, and saw a means of escape by wholesale emigration. The thinly-peopled virgin soil which lay round about them invited their advance. They had

* "The Turkish Question : Russian Designs and English Promoters of them."

no steep mountains or savage seas between them and plenty-producing land ; and as "expansion" was more easy than improved agriculture, they expanded. He also shows that the frequent conscriptions and violent reforms of Peter the Great may have had something to do with the spread of the people over the forests of Eastern Europe and Asia, and over "the steppe" or prairies of South-Eastern Europe and of Central Asia. The forest lands of Europe and Asia could scarcely, we should have thought, have been very inviting to agriculturists, for the lands were only cleared with difficulty, and were anything but fertile when cleared. In the south the land required no clearing, and yielded abundant crops even to lazy labourers ; but the settlers in that district had disagreeable neighbours in the predatory nomadic hordes, who not only robbed agriculturists, but carried them off and sold them for slaves. To us it seems that the invitations to expansion were not very pressing, and that had the advance of the peasantry been due merely to the economic causes to which Mr. Wallace ascribes it, they would have found high-farming easier than territorial advancement, or would have adopted another expedient to continue the necessary proportion between production and consumption. Mr. Wallace admits that the colonisation of the steppe was not effected without violence, and the story of that violence is "one of the bloodiest pages of European history." These circumstances, then, make us doubt the correctness of his inference, that it was simple economic causes and the invitations of geographical position which caused this "spontaneous movement of the agricultural population." This "spontaneous movement," however, was made towards the south, not without the frequent assistance of the whole military strength of the country, and at last, as a self-defensive measure, by the complete subjugation of the troublesome neighbours. The expansion in these instances considerably outran the spontaneous movement, for there were large tracts of country so thinly peopled after their annexation that it became necessary to organise immigration, and large numbers of Germans, Bulgarians, and others have settled in these wide lands. On the whole, then, we cannot accept this theory of expansion towards the east as satisfactory ; but when we turn to Mr. Wallace's explanation of the similar movement towards the west, his reasonings are even less convincing. The western neighbours of the Russo-Slavonians were numerous, and their soil was poor. There could be no spontaneous movement in that direction. Here their expansion was the work of the Government. A long course of diplomacy, alternated with war, secured an advance in this direction. No doubt the kings of Poland were enemies, and formidable enemies, of the Czars of Mus-

covy ; and the latter, in order to make way against their enemies, felt it necessary to import into their country something of Western civilisation. But then the peculiar geographical disabilities of Russia had to be considered. She was shut out from free intercourse with the West. Her one port, Archangel on the White Sea, was blockaded during a great part of the year by ice, and the necessity of having other means of commerce with the West was pressed upon her. Hence the acquisition of the eastern coast of the Baltic became the chief object of her foreign policy. All these objects were successively attained. Poland was disintegrated, Sweden lost her trans-Baltic possessions, and the Grand Duchy of Finland was ceded to Russia in 1809. Mr. Wallace, although alluding to the facts, is silent as to any justification of them. Still he is perfectly candid, for he admits (ii. 438) that high political aims, "such as the desire to reach the sea-coast," was one of the chief motives of expansion ; and he also admits that the "foolish lust of territorial aggrandisement for its own sake and the idea of forwarding the commercial interests of the nation" were causes which contributed to this policy. But he is careful to observe that no man of official influence indulges in dreams of possessing India, and that the wish for territory for its own sake is dying out. The wish, however, to increase the commercial advantages of the country is certainly not dying out, and we may surely still have to encounter some of these "high political aims" which have influenced the policy of Russia in the past. Russia is at the present time changing in many respects. We have pointed out that her manufactures are greatly increasing, and that their quality is rapidly improving. These circumstances will make her the more earnestly desire to find ready access into the markets of the West and the East, and this implies an expansion in more than one direction. To reach the West she even now requires a better waterway than the Baltic affords to her ; to command the markets of the East she may well believe that it is best to possess the markets of the East. Her progress towards the east along the Amoor is not insignificant ; and it will not be difficult for Russia to find an excuse, in the laxity with which China performs "her police-duties towards her neighbours," for increasing annexation of that populous territory. Already Russia has possession of a Chinese province, and will hold it at least until the Chinese Government sends a force sufficient to maintain order ! How much longer it may deem it prudent to continue its occupation it would be difficult, after some experience of Russian promises, to say. But to us the advance from Central to Southern Asia is of more importance. Mr. Wallace seems to imagine that the present Czar has no

ambition to conquer India. To a country desirous of extending its commercial relations, the possession of a country like India would not be altogether unimportant, and when we find that there is no resting-place in the steppes which lie between the Russian boundary and that of our Indian Empire, and that Russia is bound to advance, it is not to be wondered at if the English people are suspicious of that expansion. But the question as to the necessity of this advance is at least doubtful. Our author seems to think that Russia has only two alternatives along the whole of her Asiatic frontier—a military cordon or annexation; and that consequently the idea of a “neutral zone” between the Russian and British frontiers cannot for a moment be entertained. Russia has always been, and still is, willing to volunteer police services to her neighbours; and the policeman who enters to keep the peace generally turns out to be in time the man in possession. But why should Russia alone be unable to tolerate the lawlessness of Central Asia? why should she find expansion southwards so necessary, when England has not been forced into annexation in a northward direction by the rascality of the zone which is at the present time neutral, and lies between British India and Asiatic Russia? Mr. Wallace thinks that Russia must push forward her frontier until it reaches a country possessed of a Government able and willing to keep order within its boundaries. But even when that limit has been reached, may not high political aims then come in, as they did in the case of Poland, Sweden, Finland? May not Russia feel a deep sympathy for the servient races in India, as she at present does for those in Turkey? We confess we see no limit to the aggressive and expansive policy of Russia.

It is admitted that Russia is anxious to forward her commercial interests. Can it be doubted that the possession of Constantinople would further these interests? Has Russia no ambition to possess the finest harbour in the world? Even Mr. Wallace says, “The aggressive tendencies of the Russians in the direction of Constantinople are nearly as old as Russian nationality, and much older than the Russian Empire.” And if the east coast of the Baltic was all-important to her for a time, how much more important would “the key of the house” be now? There is no doubt a religious element, a race sympathy, and a political element which draws Russia towards the Bosphorus. Here there is no room for “spontaneous movement” of populations, for the valley of the Danube is thickly peopled; here it is not necessary to annex a neighbour’s country in order to defend their own, for in the case of each of the eight wars which have been waged between Russia and Turkey since the beginning of the eighteenth century, Russia has been

the aggressor; here there can be no doubt we are face to face with a "high political aim." We know that Russia has aspired to be a great naval power. She secured the northern shore of the Black Sea, not without difficulty, not without bloodshed; but when she had attained that end she had only half succeeded. The Black Sea has only one outlet, and whoever can command the Bosphorus can command the Black Sea. Russia cannot be, has never been, insensible to that advantage, and the other advantages—for there are many—which would accrue to the possession of Constantinople. That our way to India might, in the event of Russian supremacy at Constantinople, and in case of a war between this country and Russia, be impeded, Mr. Wallace seems to deny.* He seems, however, to admit certain facts from which that follows as a necessary inference. So long as the Bosphorus and Dardanelles are in friendly hands, the Russian fleet can be shut up in the Black Sea; but if, on the other hand, the Russians were in possession of the Straits, their ships would have a free passage into the Mediterranean, and might at least impede, if not bar, the road of our water-communication with India. We do not propose to follow Mr. Wallace in his further remarks upon the policy and current conduct of Russia, as these are to some extent met by anticipation in the article in these pages to which we have already referred. But we must add a word or two concerning the less temperate utterances of the writer of "Savage and Civilised Russia." He holds a very strong, and not altogether unjustifiable, view of the aggressive tendencies of Russia. He has traced the history of that country, and has translated a great deal from Karamsin's history about Ivan the Terrible. He has, too, made a study of more recent works, and, amongst others, of Mr. Schuyler's, Mr. M'Gahan's, Captain Burnaby's, and Mr. Mitchell's; and his conclusion, which he supports by quotations and arguments—although with little method and sometimes a little slipshod expression—is that the imperial policy of Russia, pursued through centuries with unflinching cruelty and unvarnished diplomacy, has been aggressive, and that one of the principal objects of its aggressiveness for centuries was correctly revealed by the old prophecy mentioned by Karamsin, "that the Russians should triumph over the children of Ishmael, and reign over the seven hills of Constantinople." His own opinion † may be fitly expressed in the words of the same

* His views in this respect differ widely from those of most writers. See Major Russell's "Russian Wars with Turkey," pp. 285 and 304.

† "Russia," he says, "except when aggressive is nothing. A growing strength of expansion and absorption form her cardinal policy" (p. 149). "The policy of Russia is simply universal dominion, aimed at by incessant intrigue and conquest" (p. 135). "The natural action of her (Russia's) gov-

historian, who said, "The object and character of our military policy has invariably been to seek to be at peace with everybody, and to make conquests without war; always keeping ourselves on the defensive, placing no faith in the friendship of those whose interests do not accord with our own, and losing no opportunity of injuring them without ostensibly breaking our treaties with them;" and he goes far to make good his position. If the past actions of a country are to form a basis for reasoning as to probable policy in the future, then it behoves us to take a suspicious view of Russian policy. If the avowed intentions of the Emperor Nicholas to Sir Hamilton Seymour—that "if England thinks of establishing herself at Constantinople, I tell you plainly I will not allow it. For my own part, I am equally disposed to take the engagement not to establish myself there, as proprietor that is to say, for as occupier I do not say"*—and the like are to be believed, then we must hesitate before we believe in the good faith of the present philanthropy. Philanthropy has been the constant pretext of Russia for wars during which human nature was outraged by the cruelties which were perpetrated; and although the stories of some of these atrocities are now old, human nature stands aghast that men could perpetrate such barbarous crimes. No nation has succeeded in making war so utterly horrible and revolting as the Russians. They have given examples, these philanthropic people, which human beings will do well to avoid.

But the author of "Savage and Civilised Russia" is of opinion that a great mistake was made at the conclusion of the Crimean War by the Allies, in not exacting a war indemnity; and that, in the event of another such struggle, and in the event of a similar success, the allies who have to enforce honesty upon the miser of the dominions of the world would act more wisely, having the conduct of Germany at the end of the Franco-German War before their eyes. The author takes an unfavourable view of Russian policy;† and we cannot say that, on the whole, his view is not in substance a correct one. He is not so well informed as to the

ernment," says Major Russell, pp. 299, 300, "is essentially ambitious and aggressive." See also Lord Palmerston's letter to Lord Clarendon of 22d May 1853, quoted in appendix to "Russian Wars with Turkey," p. 315.

* But this was not the only occasion on which the partition of Turkey and the possession of Constantinople were made the direct objects of Russian diplomacy. The Empress Anne in 1736 concluded an alliance with Austria for the partition of the Sultan's dominions. In 1786 a similar convention was made between Catherine II. and Joseph II. And Alexander I. and Napoleon made a similar arrangement at the Peace of Tilsit in 1780.

† His view is that Russia's stages of development have been "savagery, subjection, triumph, and aggression."

country as Mr. Wallace, but he seems to have read with care the literature which bears upon the traditional and present policy of Russia. His book professes to be a handbook of the subject, and the various opinions of which it is mainly composed seem to have been carefully collected, although somewhat chaotically associated in the work before us.

But if we come to a conclusion adverse to that of Mr. Wallace, and in accord with that which "W. R." would impress upon us, if we believe that Russia is an aggressive and grasping Power which, although its hands are already too full of lands and countries—the spoils of the nations—is still to continue its career of territorial robbery, and is now clutching at Turkey with its inordinate avarice and with its vindictive voracity, then it becomes a question of importance to determine upon which side the chances of success really lie. If Russia and Turkey go to war in 1877, it will not be the first struggle between the great Northern Power and the Sultan. A glance at Major Russell's excellent work on "Russian Wars with Turkey" will show how many contests have been waged between these two countries—will show that the fault of the war invariably lay with Russia, and will afford some materials which may enable us to form a conjecture as to the probable results of any future contest between these states. Major Russell not only treats of the more ancient wars between that torrid and that frigid Power, when the conditions of the struggle were very different from those which exist at the present time, but he gives the particulars of the wars of 1828 and 1829 in great detail, deriving his information from such admirable works as those of Count Moltke, Colonel Chesney, Fonton, Valentine, and Allison. The account here given of these wars is exceedingly clear, and is not without its important lessons, which may well be learned by those who have the conduct on either side of any future military collision between Russia and Turkey. To some extent, it is true, the conditions have changed. Russia had then more powerful naval armaments than Turkey, whose fleet had been almost annihilated at Navarino; while now it is certain that Turkey could do far more than hold her own at sea, and might, in the event of the Russians getting near Constantinople, harass her assailants' flanks from the safety of her floating fortresses. Now, however, Russia is incomparably more powerful on land than she was in 1828, and could probably send 250,000 men across the Pruth, and 150,000 men over the Caucasus; and when her troops are compared with those of Turkey, their great superiority cannot be denied. The resources of Russia, by which the long issues of a war must be tried, are immensely greater than those of Turkey. She has from 70,000,000 to 80,000,000

peaceful subjects, while Turkey can only number a population of 14,000,000, and many of these are inimical to their oppressive masters. But even after a careful review of these and the other wars which are so well described in Major Russell's work, even after looking at his statistics of the comparative resources of these two countries, while we may be prepared to admit that the chances are very much against Turkey, we cannot but think that a war between Russia and Turkey must be carried on at imminent risk of failure to the former. The Turkish power is decaying, but in a war in 1877 many things would fight on Turkey's side. The climate would try—might ruin—the Russian troops, as it did the forces of Diebitch in 1829; and a dwindled force only would arrive at the Chekmedges. But, on the supposition that Russia would make war to gain Constantinople—and any other reward of a campaign would be as bad as failure—what chance has she of success? Major Russell seems to think that, under all the circumstances, Turkey might, even without foreign assistance, maintain an almost equal warfare with her formidable antagonist. But if Constantinople were now in danger, would she fight alone? We are more alive in these days to our interests in the East than formerly, and it is a proverb that the "Eastern question can only be solved at Vienna."

Would England and Austria stand aside and allow Russia to possess some of the richest land in the world, and one of the finest cities and harbours on the earth? We can hardly think that, if Constantinople were in danger, Turkey would fight alone. It has been, and is now more than ever, the policy of Europe to keep Constantinople out of the hands of Russia, and that the interference of the Great Powers would prevent the consummation of Russia's long and ardent schemes is, we think, notwithstanding General Rotislav Fadéeff's opinion, which is quoted in an appendix to Major Russell's book, not to be doubted. Indeed, the Imperial City is peculiarly capable of a successful defence against Russian aggression, as has been shown by Von Moltke in one of his masterly chapters;* and if Constantinople were rescued from the Russian grasp, the war would, in so far as Russia is concerned, be barren of satisfactory results. It is true she might cross the Balkans and mask Schumla. It is true she might beat the feeble levies of the Turks in the field, but the narrow isthmus at the Chekmedges, near the Bosphorus, would again, as it has done before, afford a very strong line of defence; and, even were that passed, there is a last line of defence, behind which the city, the possession of which, ac-

* See also General Mackintosh's "Strategic Tour in Bulgaria," in which he shows that the nature of the ground, "if properly strengthened and defended, would put Constantinople beyond the risk of capture."

ording to Napoleon, makes a power mistress of the world, lies. And here, we think that the Ottoman Power alone would, with all the chances which would be in its favour, be able to defy its larger enemy. Here at least we imagine that Russia would have to encounter an opposition of a very different character from that of the effeminate troops of the Sultan, and would have to return after wasting wars, not only with the Great Powers, but with an unrelenting climate, with empty hands to its barren home. The progress of Russia would be stayed for a season, not only in that direction, but in others; the legs which wear her "seven-league boots" would be crippled by the fruitless and exhausting efforts of so great, so bloody a nature. If we are right in our estimate of these chances, surely the wisdom of peace will force itself, even at this last instant—surely it has already forced itself—upon the wily politicians of St. Petersburg, and their ambition of conquest, their desire for military glory, their anxiety to add the rich plains of Bulgaria to the already overgrown empire, and their long-cherished hope to acquire the most important seat of government in the world, will be stayed and safed for a time by the most ordinary motives of prudence. Whatever happens, more, much more, will have to be written about Russia in time to come. If she still aspires to a career such as that which she has already achieved by dishonesty and violence, her history will find a place in some future Newgate Calendar of the nations. If, on the other hand, she is content to fold her hands over her wide lap, or to use them in plying the sickle and the shuttle instead of the sword and the rifle, if she will try to make the home conquests of peace and extend her dominions by the fleets of commerce instead of the mailed fleets of war, her history will be written amongst those of the practical philanthropists of the earth, and "her name will be great among the nations."

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

IT is scarcely possible to overrate the importance of "Mythology among the Hebrews," a most remarkable book,¹ admirably translated by Mr. Russell Martineau as to read like the original, and which has the author's own additions to the German work. It is the first application of the principles of comparative mythology to the entire domain of Hebrew mythology, Professor Steintal at Berlin having broken the ground fifteen years ago by a partial application of the same method, especially to the story of Samson. Mr. Martineau tells us that if any one takes up the book with the idea that it will settle anything in the history of the Jews, he will be disappointed. Its aim is not theological nor historical, but mythological, and mythology precedes history and theology, and has nothing to do with them, except as a factor that may to a certain extent determine their form. This is, of course, perfectly true; but on the negative side the book has a very large bearing indeed on the history of the Jews. To the appreciation of a vast number of people, not only to men like Professor Mozley, who represent the learned and thoughtful orthodoxy of the time, but even to Dean Stanley and others like him, Abraham and the patriarchs are as entirely real and historical as Henry VIII. or Luther. Their characters are discussed as though what is related about them, though scanty in quantity, is entirely correct as far as it goes, and Dr. Mozley especially treats Abraham as the introducer of a new and pure religious creed and worship, or rather as one who returned to what had been given by primeval revelation.

He speaks also of him as a person "who lives in the future, whose mind is cast forward beyond the immediate foreground of his own day upon a very remote epoch in the history of the world, and fixed upon a remarkable event in the most distant horizon of time, the nature of which is vague and dimly known to him. He has an idea in his mind of the world's progress, of a movement in the present order of things towards some great end and consummation." Dr. Goldziher believes that the whole of the stories of the patriarchs are mythical—that, for instance, Abraham is the heaven at night, and that the sacrifice of Isaac is but an expansion of the original form of the myth—"How Abraham, the lofty father, kills his son Yischak, the laughter, that is, how the nightly heaven and the sun or sunset, child of the night, fell into a strife in the evening, the result of which is that the lofty father kills his child—the day must give way to night." If, then, Dr. Goldziher's

¹ "Mythology among the Hebrews: Its Historical Development." By Ignas Goldziher, Ph.D. Translated by Russell Martineau. London: Longmans & Co.

mode of interpretation is accepted, or if, which is at the outset far more likely, it be granted that primeval myths have attached themselves to personages who were really in some degree historical, in either case the history of the early books of the Bible ceases to be in any degree dependable; and surely it greatly affects the history of any people to find that all on which we can rely begins many centuries later than the usually received period. The myth, Dr. Goldziher considers, accompanied mankind in all nations, and "lives from the moment that man begins to interpret physical phenomena through processes made before his eyes by his own everyday life and action, and as soon as the human mind uses in the interpretation of the phenomena of nature different means from those prevalent in all myths; that as soon as the phenomena of nature are not interpreted from human conditions, the myth is indeed its life, and yields up its elements for their combinations. But the essential difference between the Semitic and the Aryan myths is this, that whereas the Aryan looks upon the night as the dread time and the enemy of the day, which is his friend, the Semitic nomad wanderer considers the glowing heat of the sun his terrible enemy and continual adversary." Thus the myth is curiously reversed, and the powers of evil to the Aryan become powers of good to the Semitic wanderer. It is, of course, impossible, in the space at our disposal, to do more than hint at the position taken up by Dr. Goldziher. His book is deserving of the most respectful consideration, and it is impossible that he could have found any one more qualified to place it before the English public than Mr. Russell Martineau.

Dr. Davidson's little book on the "Canon of the Bible"² is the entire text of his article on the Canon, for the new edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," as it originally stood. That article, he tells us with some acerbity, "was abridged and mutilated contrary to the author's wishes." We can quite understand that it is annoying to an author to have his work mangled. At the same time, due allowance must be made for the perplexities of an editor who is absolutely obliged to keep even his most valued contributors within rigid limits of space; and both Dr. Davidson and his readers may be thankful for a curtailment which has necessitated the appearance of this work in an independent form. In the compass of less than two hundred pages it cannot be expected that we should find an exhaustive survey of all that can be said on each book of the Bible. We have here a general outline of the subject, and whoever wishes to know the conclusions of the same author in detail may find them in his "Introductions to the Old and New Testaments." The present little work is a most valuable preparation for larger study, and at the same time is quite sufficient for the ordinary layman who may feel an intelligent curiosity about the books presented to him by all the Churches as rules of life and conduct. The introductory chapter defines certain terms which occur in the dissertation, such as "canon," "ecclesiastical," "apocryphal," and the like. The book is, as it ought

² "The Canon of the Bible: Its Formation, History, and Fluctuations." By Samuel Davidson, D.D. London: Henry S. King & Co.

to be, a simple, though by no means a dry, statement of facts and opinions. Doctrinal conclusions are scarcely introduced at all.

Had Bishop Thirlwall lived, he intended, in his well-earned retirement, to reprint his charges, but to leave out of them all passages of a personal nature or what he thought to be of little permanent interest. He intended also to make a selection from his other writings. Professor Perowne, in editing two volumes³ of charges—which are to be followed by one of essays and occasional sermons—has not felt himself justified in making any excisions from the manuscript; no hand but the writer's own could be trusted to do this. We think it far better that the personal element should have been retained, because the ecclesiastical and theological controversies of the forty years with which Bishop Thirlwall's charges deal have been so largely concerned with persons as well as opinions. The Tractarian movement is absolutely inseparable from the personality of Dr. Newman; the Gorham controversy from Bishop Philpotts; the interpretation of the Bible from Dr. Rowland Williams; the controversy between science and Scripture from the Bishop of Natal. Wise, dignified, thoughtful, tolerant, are the epithets by which we should be disposed to characterise this publication, which Professor Perowne well calls a philosophical contribution to ecclesiastical literature. If now and then there is a tone of *aigreur* in the usual calm strain of unimpassioned language—as, for instance, when the Bishop deals with Dr. Rowland Williams's sermons—it must be remembered that even among Welshmen there have been few more pugnacious than the Vice-Principal of Lampeter, and that the Bishop would have been more than human who showed himself indifferent to the pointed epigrams which were directed against him. If Bishop Thirlwall published his charges, at least Dr. Rowland Williams was able to retort, by his "Earnestly Respectful Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's," and the combat between two such ecclesiastical gladiators is amusing and instructive. The controversies on which these charges touch have far from died away; they may, indeed, have taken an unexpected turn; nor are the present assailants of Bishop Thirlwall's position always open to the arguments which he brings against those of his own time with so much learning, dignity, and common sense. But the present state of the controversy could not be understood without reference to the past, and these volumes are not only a valuable but an entirely necessary addition to the ecclesiastical literature of our time. How lonely a position Bishop Thirlwall occupied on the bench of the English Church becomes more clear than ever as we read his charges. Whether this loneliness is or is not to be regretted will entirely depend on the view men take of the desirableness or undesirableness of the rapid crumbling away of the State Church of England. Learned and dignified prelates like Bishop Thirlwall do as much to preserve it as some fussy and undignified prelates who, in after-dinner speeches, propose to duck their political adversaries in a horsepond do to bring it into contempt.

³ "Remains, Literary and Theological, of Connop Thirlwall." Edited by J. J. Perowne.

Mr. Teignmouth Shore⁴ is a clergyman who tries to grapple with those difficulties of belief which beset educated men, and he speaks in simple, eloquent words to the congregation which worships at Berkeley Chapel. We need hardly say that his standpoint is utterly different to our own, but, at the same time, it is very long since we have read a volume of sermons which have so impressed us with their vigour, interest, and plain-dealing. A man deserves to be listened to who, from the pulpit, will speak against match-making mothers and the immorality of popular novels. The following words about some heroes of modern fiction are like a bracing sea-breeze coming across the hazy atmosphere of the Established Churches :—

“If a manly man is one who has proved fearless of all danger, true as steel in word and deed, pure in soul, strong in faith, earnest in life, has a chivalrous respect for women, and an unutterable scorn for what is impure, and base, and mean,—how many men are there to be found? Take the great mass of popular novels as a rough but fair test of this. As a rule, the character of the hero for whom our sympathies are enlisted, is he not generally some creature that has never thought a noble thought or done a noble deed, and is held up to the reader’s sympathetic admiration because, in the most unmanly way, he has grossly yielded to some temptation, against which any man worthy of the name would have struggled until, if need be, he laid himself and his passion in one common grave together? And is not the saddest thought just this, that such stories are only too true to life?”

The strength of orthodoxy lies in the teaching of the few such men as Mr. Shore far more than in Christian Evidence Societies and Bishops of Gloucester and Bristol.

Dr. Martineau does not need the graceful apology which he makes for publishing a new volume of sermons,⁵ although he is, as he says, a retired preacher. Ministering as he did to a highly cultivated congregation, yet one connected with a community always numerically small, he, by the publication of his far too rare volumes appeals to many whom his living voice has never reached, and who greatly prefer to ponder over his high philosophy apart from the disturbing influences of a worship with which they have scarcely any sympathy. It would be difficult to find sermons more Christian than these, in the highest sense and best sense, while yet Dr. Martineau’s standpoint is so wholly different from that usually associated with the name. While orthodox Christianity speaks of its Master and pattern as “the Mediator between God and man,” Dr. Martineau speaks of him—and the words are characteristic—as “the Mediator between the human and the divine.”

Dr. Martineau has lost none of the charm of exquisite style by which he has been so long known. He and Dr. Newman, among the theological writers at the present day, stand above all other writers in this respect. Dr. Martineau’s controversies with some of the

⁴“Some Difficulties of Belief.” By the Rev. T. Teignmouth Shore. London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. 1877.

⁵“Hours of Thought on Scripture Things.” By James Martineau, LL.D., D.D. London: Longmans & Co.

conclusions of our modern science are well known. We are glad to take, as a specimen of this beautiful volume, the passage in which he is at one with science and against the orthodox believers in a God of arbitrary change and miracle.

“What Science calls the uniformity of nature, Faith accepts as the fidelity of God. They are but the settled ways of His sole causation, the programme of His everlasting work, the dial-plate which the index of human expectation is to traverse age by age. When we speak of their unerring regularity, we do but attest His truth, which keeps the time-piece steady for us, and warns us how the shadows lie. . . . Without a reliable universe and a trustworthy God, no moral character could grow. A fickle world admits only of a lawless race. No obedience could be required from those who are planted among shifting conditions, to whom foresight is denied, and whose wisdom is as likely to go astray as their folly. . . . Thus the constancy of creation is the direct expression of the good faith of God, of His regard, not only for our security, but for the culture of our reason and the insight of our conscience. He disciplines us thus to His own love of beauty and order. His eternal patience takes away our excuse of surprise, and rebukes our pleas of disobedience. The wild sophistry of temptation is put to shame by the serene light of His natural countenance, and the steady swing of the pendulum that counts His ways. He secures us against all *passionate* sway; no *impulse* rushes into space with eruption of blessing or of curse; no *devilish element* bursts the bars of His prohibition, and maddens us by dashing with discords the music of the spheres. . . . That He may be true to us, He foregoes a portion of His infinite freedom, and binds Himself to methods whose cycle we can measure and whose exactitude we may trust. The natural universe is God’s eternal act of self-restraint.”

As Dr. Martineau may be taken as the representative of the Unitarian Church in England, so is Robert Collyer that of the Unitarian Church in America. But it is scarcely possible to conceive two more different men. While Dr. Martineau’s sermons show in their every line the traces of much and varied reading and long philosophic thought, Robert Collyer’s teaching has been that of life, the hillside, and the forge, and not of the library. Robert Collyer is a Yorkshireman, and was a working blacksmith both before and after his emigration to America in the year 1850, he being then twenty-seven years old. He is the minister of a large Unitarian Church in Chicago. It speaks well for the liberality of the American churches that we find that many pulpits not of his own faith, and some even of the Wesleyan Methodists, to which he once belonged, are open to this remarkable preacher. The whole gist of his teaching is summed up in the preface to his present volume,⁶ which is, he tells us, a selection of such sermons as he has been able to preach about the life that now is.

“If I thought,” he goes on, “that any apology was needed for saying so little about that which is to come, I would make this twofold plea—first, that many better and wiser men have said so much about it already; and, second, I am so sure that if we can but find the right way through this world, and walk in it, the doors above are as sure to open to us as ours open to our own children when they come eagerly home from school.”

⁶ “The Life that Now is, and Nature and Life Sermons.” By Robert Collyer. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. 1877.

The sermons are in themselves quite indescribable. They are couched in the homeliest language, at times rising to burning eloquence, and often full of the deepest pathos. Full also of humour and homely illustration, we can suppose that a genial smile, sometimes rising to a ripple of laughter, might run round his church; and yet there is no word in it that is not at once seemly and reverent. Lowell, writing of Theodore Parker in the "Fable for Critics," says—

"His periods fall on you, stroke after stroke,
Like the blows of a lumberer felling an oak."

In the same way Collyer's periods and vigorous protests against all that is unmanly and mean and false are like the blows which he dealt of old on his own anvil; and we cannot but think that the hearts of his hearers must often cast out sparks responsive to his strokes, and be moulded by him at his will. In the midst of the flood of washy sentimentalism that comes to us from America under the name of religion, it is most refreshing to meet with this vigorous book.

Speculations about what might have been are obviously always somewhat unprofitable, yet it is impossible in all cases to avoid them. It is especially impossible in reading a new work of the late Mr. Robertson's.⁷ We cannot but desire to know what his standpoint would have been had he lived to the present day. Would he have gone out into the regions of freer thought, carried on the tide of biblical criticism; or would he, fearful of the unknown seas before him, have turned back to the orthodoxy which he was rapidly leaving or had left? Evidently the position in which he was would have proved totally untenable for any length of time. In his days the Broad Church party had, or seemed to have, life, unity, and coherence. Now that party has vanished, and only isolated fragments of it, such as Dean Stanley and Mr. Llewelyn Davies, stand, utterly disconnected from each other, like dissimilar pillars of some ruined building. In the "Notes on Genesis" we do not find—neither do we expect to find—any of the results of advanced biblical criticism. The disintegration of the Book of Genesis had begun indeed in his day, but had only begun, and the position which he took up is not to be maintained at the present time. That position may be best described in the words of Mr. Stopford Brooke:—

"While declaring that the Mosaic cosmogony could not be reconciled with the geological facts, he still succeeded in showing its inner harmony in principle with the principles of scientific geology. He made his congregation acquainted with the discussion on the Jehovah and Elohim documents, but he did not deny the Mosaic compilation of these documents. He discusses fully the question of the universality of the Flood. He spoke with boldness adorned with a rare reverence upon the text, and generally avoided subjects of the confusion of tongues, destruction of the Cities of the Plain, temptation of Abraham. In no case, however, was his preaching destructive, but constructive."

But it is now plain that either these subjects must be wholly let alone

⁷ "Notes on Genesis." By the late F. W. Robertson. London: Henry S. King & Co.

by the religious teacher, or that destruction of the most complete kind must precede reconstruction. Taking the narratives, however, as they stand, the moral and religious lessons which Mr. Robertson drew from them are full of interest and full of beauty, and he never tampers for a moment with questions of morality, as so many do, to save the credit of Scripture heroes. He is quite as severe on the deceit of Rebecca and Jacob as he is on the crimes of those who are recognised as Scriptural rascals. The picturesqueness and the beauty of the language is remarkable throughout, and we believe that great credit is due to the loving care and attention of several of Mr. Robertson's friends, who have reconstructed these lectures from the mere fragments which were left in his own notes, and the hurried jottings of friends set down as the lectures were delivered. We anticipate for the book quite as wide a popularity as for any other of Mr. Robertson's volumes.

The Church of England is, as has been said, an Elizabethan compromise, and there have therefore always been in it two entirely different parties—that which approximates to the Catholic, and that which tends to the Genevan type of opinion. Ordinary people are wont to recognise the Liturgy and Offices of the Prayer-Book as representing the Catholic side of this compromise, and the Articles the Calvinistic. There have, of course, never been wanting persons who are most anxious to show that the whole of the Offices are to be interpreted in the Calvinistic sense, and the whole of the Articles in the Catholic sense. In fact, were it not that people are able so to persuade themselves, the extremes of neither party could remain contentedly in the Church of England, as we see them now do. Mr. Ball's* is another attempt to show that the Articles may be frankly accepted by the extreme Catholic party, and, yet more, he boldly endeavours to make a compendium of theological doctrine for the use of laymen out of the Articles themselves. He recognises, however, that the Articles are a compromise, and that being a compromise, a double teaching runs throughout them, and their language is capable of receiving different meanings, according to the different schools which their object was to harmonise. He doubts, indeed, whether it is creditable to the interest of the composers to suit all parties, but it is obviously no part of a High Churchman's business to defend the Reformers. All that Mr. Bennett contends for in his preface is, that Catholic doctrine is tenable by those who hold the Articles as well. Many of us well remember the words in which Dr. Newman justified his acceptance of the Articles and his continued adherence to the Church of England but a very short time before he left it:—

“Let the Church sit still; let her be content to be in bondage; let her work in chains; let her submit to her imperfections as a punishment; let her go on teaching with the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies and inconsistent precedents and principles but partially developed. We

* “The Orthodox Doctrine of the Church of England.” By the Rev. Thomas Isaac Ball, with an Introduction by the Rev. W. J. Bennett.

are not better than our fathers ; let us bear to be what Hammond was, or Andrews, or Hooker ; let us not faint under that body of death which they bore about in patience, nor shrink from the penalty of sins which they inherited from the age before them."

These words occur in the introduction to the celebrated Tract 90. The treatise which we are at present discussing is, as might be supposed, in the entire spirit of Tract 90, and there is a good deal of what the lay mind might term juggling. For instance, few persons approaching the subject without bias would doubt that extreme unction is above all others that sacrament of the Roman Church which is described in the Article as having "grown of the corrupt following of the apostles ;" yet, says Mr. Ball, unction of the sick (the words of St. James would certainly teach us to allow of unction to the sick) is a sacrament of which the minister must be a presbyter, *i.e.*, priest, the recipient a sick believer in a state of rest, the outward sign anointing with oil, and prayer the inward grace, remission of sins, with spiritual and even bodily raising up." He goes on to point out that the English Church in the first English Book of Common Prayer, A.D. 1549, provided a form for the anointing of the sick in exact accordance with the words of St. James. No reason has been assigned for the subsequent withdrawal of this service and of its restoration. "I may say, as the Church of England says of public penance, it is much to be wished ;" and then in a note he gives the order for the unction of the sick from the Book of Common Prayer, 1549. Another instance of remarkable juggling is on the words "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." Mr. Ball is careful to show that the end for which Christ ordained the Eucharist was that it might be received ; secondly, that to use it for any other end is to go beyond the ordinance of Christ ; and that this is all the Article asserts. He then endeavours to show that reservation, procession, elevation, and adoration are all pious, justifiable, and even necessary. Such books as the present might help wavering clergymen and laymen who are inclined to go to Rome to remain a little longer within the Church of England, but it can only be at the sacrifice, conscious or unconscious, of honesty and the plain meaning of words. There is an Appendix to the book enjoining fasting communion, and excessive ritual in the Communion Service. To one who stands outside the whole thing, the book is curious and interesting.

Deans and other people are often accustomed to take a simple verse of Scripture, and out of it to construct, with extreme rapidity, an enormous quantity of literature and meditation. We may compare books of this kind⁹ to the *soufflé* which a cook makes out of a few eggs and a little flour till it overflows the saucepan, though, after all, the nourishment remains only the small quantity of eggs and flour. We are far from meaning to be profane, but this is really the only similitude

⁹ "The Gospel of the Childhood." By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D.D., Dean of Norwich. London: Rivingtons.

that occurs to us for Dr. Goulburn's volume, unless it be that of a man whom we sometimes see in the streets, who has in his hand what is apparently only a sheet of folded paper, and who out of this proceeds to make, in the space of a minute or two, a hat, a bonnet, a frying-pan, a coal-scuttle, and a variety of other articles more ingenious than useful. The verses in the Gospel containing the history of the childhood of Jesus are quite unsurpassable in their simple beauty and dignity. The Dean's expositions, meant for his choristers, are simply froth heaped upon the top of them, and his incidental expositions of the Psalms destroy all their historical character, and with it their reality, fitness, and beauty. When, for instance, he says of the 8th Psalm, "This Psalm also speaks of Christ, who was once a babe and suckling and afterwards a child, out of whose mouth God ordained strength when He showed such marvellous understanding among the doctors in the temple as astonished those grey-headed sages," he is talking what, if he were not a Dean, we should have attempted to describe as twaddle. Little books like these can foster nothing but an effeminate and sickly form of piety, as different to the *pietas puerilis* inculcated to boys by that great scholar and divine, Erasmus, as can possibly be conceived.

A very large and imposing title ¹⁰ proves to be the designation of eleven very dull and commonplace sermons. Mr. Molyneux has not succeeded in convincing us that he has succeeded where so many greater men have failed.

Mr. Blew has edited, and Mr. Pickering has published ¹¹ with his usual taste, the Communion Services in use in the Church of England in the reign of Edward VI., with a view to showing that that for which the party now called the Ritualists contends is lawful and necessary.

"Strange that such a difference should be
"Twixt tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee."

The late Mr. Barclay was an earnest and devout Friend, but saw, and could not but say, that the present position of the Society of Friends is that of just maintaining its numbers; but he believed that there are grounds for thinking that an intelligent adaptation of the ideas of George Fox might more fully realise the idea of a working Church. In a very large volume, ¹² which he left all but completed at the time of his death, he wished to show, both for instruction and for warning, the history of the rise and decline of the various religious societies of the Commonwealth, and one of his chief objects has been to exhibit the Society to which he belongs as one of the links in the chain of experiments in Church organisation which were made at the period of its rise. The book is full of a great deal of curious informa-

¹⁰ "The Reconciliation of Reason and Faith." By Reginald E. Molyneux, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1877.

¹¹ "The Altar Service of the Church of England for 1548." Edited by John William Blew, M.A. London: Pickering. 1877.

¹² "The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth." By Robert Barclay. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1876.

tion, and is quite worth turning over, even by those who are far from sympathising in the religious views of the author. It is marked throughout by a tolerant and candid spirit.

"The Life Beyond the Grave" is as foolish as most books on spiritualism.¹³ The writing medium rambles on about life beyond the grave with the only clear result that he can tell us no definite facts about it. The only ingenious sentence in the book appears to be that in which he endeavours to meet an objection often brought against so-called spiritual communications which purport to come from the shades of great men. Poetry has been given purporting to come from Shakespeare or Shelley, and on reading it people have said, "If we are thus to deteriorate in another life, then let this life be all." "Ah!" says our author, "when these people were on earth, that which we admired in their writings was really communicated to them by higher intelligences. Now those who were considered great geniuses are robbed of all the splendour which was not theirs." "You wonder," he says, "at the trivial nature of their sentiments, and think that a medium is an impostor because it is clear that Burns or Shakespeare could never have written such stuff as that. Else how are the mighty fallen when the spirit world reveals to them how little they really were, and how useless have been their attempts at self-glorification, they begin to be wiser and sadder men." Sadder they may be, but we have seldom seen anything like wisdom in spiritual communications or in those who believe in them.

We have received also a large number of tracts from Mr. Scott—the last, we imagine, of his series, since we hear that he is giving up the work on which he has been so long engaged. We regret to hear that ill-health is the cause for which he ceases his labours.

PHILOSOPHY.

OUR English Universities cannot be any longer fairly charged with unproductiveness. It may, indeed, be feared that, in a reaction from the customs of a preceding generation, the Horatian rule of nine years' silence may be too much disregarded, and a flood of unripe theories cast upon the world. But as yet this has not been the case; and the most recent work of Young Oxford—Mr. Shute's "Discourse on Truth"¹—does not seem likely to inaugurate the change. Mr. Shute is too independent a thinker, too sincere a worshipper of the goddess of truth (p. 27), ever to trouble the world with theories with which he is not himself fully satisfied. Even reviewers bring no

¹³ "The Life Beyond the Grave: Described by a Spirit through a Spirit Medium."

¹ "A Discourse on Truth." By Richard Shute, M.A., Senior Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

terrors to his mind. "I would rather," he says, "waken up to sincere and unprejudiced consideration of these questions one plain man of unbiassed understanding than secure the tepid admiration of all the judges of philosophic style in the universe. The approval of one who is both learned and earnest I prize above all things; that of him who is earnest without being learned I greatly esteem; but for him who has been corrupted by a various diet of philosophies, not having a digestion strong enough to assimilate any, I care not for his strictures, neither value his praise."

Qui s'excuse s'accuse. But Mr. Shute's indifference to any opinions other than his own is a most laudable assistance to the work of the reviewer. It is at least satisfactory to think that, when we disagree with Mr. Shute in his results, we shall be classed with various "serene philosophers," "great metaphysicians," or people called "logicians," who, it appears, have "branded" propositions with a stamp not recognised in the "Discourse on Truth." And even if we do at times fall out, Mr. Shute's appeal to us as "gentle reader" will effect a reconciliation; and at times we shall accept his verdict in all humility, when he assures us, "with no slight confidence," that he has "explored every corner" of some field of study. And, from first to last, the antiquated style of Mr. Shute's "Discourse" will, he "must needs foresee," lead us to treat him with such reverence and awe as becometh every student of the art of history. Nor will there ever be any dispute between us and Mr. Shute on this one point, that Locke is "one of the greatest, because the humblest, of philosophers"—an aphorism which we recommend all would-be philosophers to ponder, only remarking, for Mr. Shute's behoof, that Locke never wrote an "Essay on the Human Understanding," as he will find by turning to the title-pages of Locke's writings.

Still we are unable to "assimilate" the philosophy of Mr. Shute so far as to be blind to all the difficulties it contains. Style apart, Mr. Shute's work is a valuable protest against some of the "idols" of the age. His immediate definition of truth does not, indeed, call for much remark. Mr. Shute has nothing to do with truth for all intelligence, about which "the philosophers" have talked; they remind him of nothing so much as of "children who delight to interchange in the nursery a gibberish which is not understood of their elders." The object, in fact, of the "Discourse," is practically to show that there is no such thing as truth. A proposition merely asserts the connection or repugnance of our ideas; and thus no meaning whatever can be assigned to such expressions as "absolute certainty," "immutable truth." "Certainty is extremely quick progress from one idea to another (or from sensation to idea); so that 'absolute certainty' can mean nothing more than absolute quickness, that is, can mean nought whatsoever." The idea of cause is of an equally subjective character: it is merely an "arbitrary link manufactured by the mind of man to connect phenomena." Nor does Mr. Shute even leave us the comfort of the uniformity of nature: this law "is only not untrue because it is absolutely unmeaning. The future is a mere

fiction of the mind ; there is no future other than that which exists in the mind of each individual thinking being."

There is, it will be seen, a singular harmony between the ideas of Mr. Shute and the diction in which he expresses his results. For Mr. Shute, Kant and his doctrine never have existed ; nor has the profound critique of sensational idealism which Mr. Green prefixed to his edition of the works of Hume dissuaded him from his results. He is undisturbed by all those questions of the origin of experience and the apprehension of a thing round which metaphysic has fought its toughest battles. The method of "plain common sense" is apparently identical with that of uncritical self-complacency. Even the eighteenth century does not always do for Mr. Shute ; he sometimes goes back to adopt the views of Thomas Hobbes. Induction, he teaches, with Hobbes, has no functions beyond that of tying things into bundles—it therefore gives us no new truth.

What, however, is taken from induction is repaid with interest to deduction. The chapter bearing on this subject is perhaps the most valuable in Mr. Shute's treatise. Against Mill, he argues that particulars as particulars never lead to knowledge. "Before John and James are any use to me for an inference, I must transmute them by means of somewhat which is not in them, but which I add to them. . . . We cannot argue from particular to particular without first in our own mind constituting the particular for the moment a universal, without making a mental addition to it." This we regard as sound teaching ; and though we question how far Mr. Shute's metaphysic—for Mr. Shute, of course, knows that we can never escape the bugbear—gives him ground to go beyond the individual now and here ; and though the note on p. 220 about the *origin* of syllogism, as if any one man had invented it, implies a radically false conception of syllogistic reasoning, we none the less thankfully accept his defence of deductive argument from the charges which ignorance has levelled at it.

But we must take our leave of Mr. Shute, and allow our readers to examine for themselves the remaining chapters in his book. They will find it always entertaining and suggestive ; if it occasionally lead them to examine the grounds upon which Mr. Shute has founded his conclusions, it will confer the best service that can be rendered by a treatise on philosophy. Even if they accept Mr. Shute's results, they will find that he has a balm of Gilead for them in the consolations of religion ; only let them not venture in that field to rationalise. "There is one form of religion, and one only, which philosophical scepticism would sweep to the winds—that which pretends to be purely rational, to found itself entirely upon reason, and to make no demand upon that faith which is the evidence of things not seen."

If Oxford finds a self-satisfied champion of Locke and Hume in Mr. Shute, the other side of speculation is by no means without its advocates. Mr. Bradley, whose "Ethical Studies" we mentioned six months ago, has published a good-sized pamphlet of sixty-four pages as an examination of the hedonistic leanings in Mr. Sidgwick's well-

known "Methods of Ethics."² We fear that Mr. Bradley's arguments are not always expressed in a language "understood of the people," and that they cannot be fully appreciated without a closer acquaintance with Mr. Sidgwick's work than most readers of the pamphlet will possess; but Mr. Bradley shows the same critical Socratic power as marked his "Studies," and he does succeed in laying hands upon a number of *notiones male terminatae*—e.g., "reason," "pleasure," &c.—in the pages of our modern Cambridge moralist.

Professor Elmendorf (of Racine College, U.S.) has no doubt conferred a benefit upon his pupils by publishing the "Outlines" of his "Lectures on the History of Philosophy;"³ but he should not have inflicted them upon the world in general. The book can be of little use to any but those who have its statements filled up by the lectures of which it is an abstract; especially if, as we can hardly expect, the lectures correct the many mistakes and inaccuracies with which the work abounds. Where, for example, did Professor Elmendorf find the word *τὸ καλαγαθόν* (p. 33); and what is the passage in which Socrates speaks of his *δαίμων*; or where is it that Aristotle makes "essence, *τὸ τι ἦν εἶναι*," the first of his ten categories? The year 1651, not 1650, is the date usually assigned to Hobbes's "Leviathan," and 1690, not 1689, to Locke's "Essay." "Much learning," as Heraclitus said, "does not educate the reason;" and we fear that to Professor Elmendorf himself we must apply what he most unjustifiably remarks of Aristotle: he "is most unspiritual, unsympathetic, wanting the intuition of genius, and the ability to unite the multiplicity of experience." Certainly, at least, Professor Elmendorf is "often condensed to obscurity, abrupt, and wanting in connection."

Dr. Rudolf Medem's work is more remarkable for its autobiographical personalities than for its views upon the "Mechanism of the Senses."⁴ Addressing his "dear father," the writer in the preface explains the way in which his present work came to be taken up. The negative conclusions of Du Bois Reymond had confirmed in the son the doubts his father had expressed about a merely scientific study of nature. But philosophy, he saw, must at the same time find a new foundation; it must throw up its "mythological" idea of soul and mind, and adopt the methods of natural science, if it were destined to make real progress. Man's life being a combination of physiological and psychological antecedents, the first condition of a profitable study lay in the separation of the two (about this, were the space at our disposal, something might perhaps be said); and since the

² "Mr. Sidgwick's Hedonism: An Examination of the Main Argument of the 'Methods of Ethics.'" By F. H. Bradley, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

³ "Outlines of Lectures on the History of Philosophy." By John J. Elmendorf, S.T.D., University Professor of Philosophy and English Literature in Racine College. New York: Putnam. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

⁴ "Grundzüge einer Exakten Psychologie." Von Rudolf Medem, Dr. jur. "I. Die Mechanik der Empfindungen, gegründet auf die Lehre von den Wellenbewegungen." Leipzig: Erich Koschny. 1876.

latter set of conditions are unknown, while the former are subject to the laws of elementary forces, it remained to choose the former, and begin with physiology rather than with the phenomena of mind. Such is the standpoint of Dr. Medem's "Elements of Exact Psychology;" and in this, the first instalment, he has applied his method to the senses and sensations. There is, however, nothing very novel in the views which he enunciates, although the work will be of value in bringing together the divided labours of such men as Weber, Wundt, and Helmholtz. Basing his observations on the wave-theory, which the brothers Weber introduced, the writer proceeds to explain the mode in which the various undulations meet, arrest, and cross each other in the nervous system. With Fechner and his followers, he shows how the intensity of the sensations corresponds to the intensity of the stimuli which produce them; but it is especially to explain the sensations of the eye and ear that the theory of undulations is most skilfully applied. "The sensations of hearing," the writer holds, "correspond in pitch to the number of vibrations in the notes producing them; in form, to the partial tones combined together in the sound." Similarly, "the sensations of light correspond in colour to the number of undulations in the rays of light; in form, to the mathematical superficies of the objects seen." The outcome of these doctrines is not difficult to trace. "They show that to explain sensation we do not need the hypothesis of 'soul-organs' and 'the interpretation of the stimuli' by means of them, but that our sensations rather repose upon realities as basis, and are *measurable* as the stimuli of light and sound producing them."

The conclusion with which Medem closes is in some respects the basis of Herr Albrecht Krause's formidable volume.⁵ "The laws of the human heart," "the formal logic of pure feeling," are the expressions under which the writer formulates his object. These phrases are not so meaningless as they at first appear. As Krause says, "Since the human understanding thinks in accordance with laws, it is natural to suppose that the human heart likewise feels in accordance with laws; otherwise human nature would fall asunder into two halves, the one regulated, the other unregulated." The mere fact, indeed, that we give names to our feelings, and that these names suffice to indicate to others the mental states intended, proves that the feelings are not so devoid of properties and laws as they are sometimes thought to be.

The end which Krause has proposed to himself is one of no slight importance and no small amount of labour, and we are not surprised to hear that the work which now appears is the result of seventeen years of study. Yet it may be doubted how far those many years of life have been profitably spent. Much of the treatise strikes us as little else than a not over-brilliant adaptation of the results of Kant's

⁵ "Die Gesetze des menschlichen Herzens, wissenschaftlich dargestellt als die formale Logik des reinen Gefühles." Von Albrecht Krause. Lahr: Moritz Schauenburg. 1876.

“Critique.” It is, in fact, the writer holds, only on the ground of Kant’s *Æsthetic* and *Analytic* that the laws of feeling can be discovered. The first three parts, therefore, of the volume deal with the ordinary Kantian formulæ, and show how they require to be modified and corrected. Part fourth begins the superstructure. The pure sensitive forms of perception are first noticed. They are divided into the forms of time, space, and sensation; while each of these is in turn subdivided. Thus we have the moment, which is unity as time; length, which is multiplicity as time; shortness, which is littleness as time; eternity (*immer*), which is universality as time; present, which is position as time; and past, which is separation as time. More interesting than those painfully analytic definitions is, at first sight, the seventh part, dealing with the feelings of aspiration and of expectation. But here also the same cut-and-dry method meets us; and we close the book with the feeling that if Krause has, as he maintains, reduced the mental processes to the elements of their conditions, he has, in so doing, allowed all that is valuable in these processes to evaporate in the refinements of an unintelligible analysis.

It is with a sense of relief that we turn from the mathematical symbols and analytic phrases of Krause’s “Heart” to the felicitous illustrations and ingenious theories of Herr Fechner’s “Introduction to *Æsthetic*.”⁶ The second volume of the work exhibits the same wide experience and power of lucid exposition as marked the earlier volume; though, we must add, the hedonistic bias, which subordinates all art to the pleasure it produces, stands out with even greater prominence than in the earlier portion of the work. Fechner, however, is no party advocate; the conclusions of the “*Psychophysik*” enable him to view the adherents of opposing lines in art with a critical if not impartial eye. It is in this spirit that he discusses the question between the supporters of matter and the advocates of form in artistic products. The two, he rightly shows, are not exclusive. The work of art, *e.g.*, a Bacchus giving drink to Amor, may be grasped in its idea as an older and a younger man in graceful attitudes; but this content or idea is expressed, and must be expressed, under the particular form mentioned. Between Idealism and Realism in reference to art, Fechner holds a more dogmatic view, but he is no way blind to the ideal construction necessary in good art. With Aristotle he would say, that “art partly imitates, partly perfects nature;” but, like Aristotle, he emphasises that relation to nature which is involved in art, whether it imitate or perfect. “Art,” he says (p. 57), “may represent winged angels, because it would not be able otherwise to represent the divine majesty and messengers of God to man; but it will be forced to represent the wings, the floating and the flying, in as natural a mode as possible. It will venture to give a Jupiter or Venus such countenance and features as we can nowhere

⁶ “*Vorschule der Aesthetik.*” Von Gustav Theodor Fechner. Zweiter Theil. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. 1876.

actually find or expect to find, but still such only as nature approaches the more closely, the more majestic and beautiful the personalities it shows us, and which, further, did they actually appear in nature, would impress us as the loftiest and fairest characters." High, however, as Fechner ranks the realistic side of art, it is evident that under art he understands what others would describe as an ideal rendering of nature. "Though art," he remarks, "is one of the highest points for realising nature, it is at the same time not the highest point. That pinnacle will always be held by religion, which assuredly does not owe its origin to art, but itself lends art its highest stimulus, receiving back from art in turn important influences." The breadth of view which we have already noted in Fechner's work will now be obvious. No fact, however humble, but can serve to illustrate his theories; the surprise felt by the Shah in London when he found a living donkey cost eight pounds, while one painted cost a hundred, is applied as readily as some experience of Goethe or a criticism of Da Vinci. A second series of aesthetic principles—connected partly with the impressions produced by contrast, sequence, and reconciliation, partly with the effects of continuance, custom, and the like—form, though somewhat briefly stated, a valuable supplement to the first series of laws contained within the earlier volume. Altogether, Fechner's "Introduction" is a book which will be read with very great profit by all interested in art criticism.

Dr. Herzog deals with a much larger problem than the number of pages in his little work⁷ would lead us to expect. His object is to offer something towards answering the cosmological question of the original ἀρχή of the universe. This he finds in atoms as the material receptive principle upon the one hand, and ether as the formative active element upon the other. The new Atomism combines itself with a Pythagorean theory of relations; and in psychology, maintaining the essential connection of mental states with physiological processes, infers from the existence of two hemispheres of the brain the duplicity of our mind and ego.

Philology rather than philosophy is the subject with which Dr. Sparschuh's work⁸ of erudition is concerned. It is not, however, wanting in that philosophic interest without the light of which the study of words tends to become a rather barren exercise of thought. Words are to Dr. Sparschuh the monuments of early thought, more valuable than menhirs, tumuli, or dolmens, because they throw a greater flood of light upon the associations and ideas of the people who first employed them. The immediate object of his volume is to show the essential unity of Greek and Celtic. In support of this

⁷ "Kosmologisches: Ein Versuch zur Lösung höchster Probleme." Von E. A. Herzog. Berlin: Stuhr'sche Buchhandlung (S. Gerstmann). 1877.

⁸ "Kelten, Griechen, Germanen. Vorhomerische Kulturdenkmäler. Eine Sprachstudie." Von Dr. N. Sparschuh. München: Lindauer'sche Buchhandlung (Schöpping). London: Trübner & Co. 1877.

conclusion, the writer introduces Aristotle as having in his "Dialogue on Magic" maintained that philosophy originated with the Celts. This, however, is much more than Aristotle says, as any one will find on turning to the Berlin Aristotle, vol. ii. p. 1479, a 34; not to mention the fact that little value can be attached to the words in which Diogenes Laertius quotes the Stagirite. Apart, however, from the authority of Aristotle, Dr. Sparschuh makes his conclusions very plausible by the instances which he collects to show affinity between the two languages. Thus ἀγνία corresponds to the Welsh *aguez* and the Irish *cuidh*; αἰνῶν to the Irish *ainm*; ἄβας to the Irish *posdam*, to marry; ἄκρης to Welsh *chwegyr*. So, again, the Celtic dialects enable us to explain many features of the Greek mythology. Pelias and Neleus are Welsh *pellaz*, the far horizon, and Irish *neall*, the clouds; while their parents, Poseidon and Tyro, are the moist and dry, Tyro being the Welsh *twyr*, dry, with which *terra* itself is co-ordinate. More closely connected with the work of the philosopher are the pages in which Dr. Sparschuh indicates the idealism of early language in the phraseology of truth and thought. In their distinction between the outward seeing, *suil*, *sillim*, and the inner judgment, *saoil* and *saolim*, the Celtic dialects apprehended the supra-sensuous origin of knowledge, and rendered this still clearer by employing one word, *en*, to signify both mind and God. Dr. Sparschuh's work is always interesting, but we fear that its etymologies are too simple to be always trustworthy. "Sound etymology," as Professor Max Müller has so ably pointed out, "has nothing to do with sound;" and we fear that there may be no more connection between ἄβας and *posdam* than between ποταμὸς and *potamac*.

The seventy-eighth number in the series of German pamphlets dealing with "disputed questions of the day," supplies the general reader with a clear and interesting discussion on "The Nature and Function of Philosophy."⁹ The writer, Herr Horwicz, is fully justified in regarding the position of philosophy as one of the debated problems of the times; and philosophers will have no reason to accuse him of under-estimating the importance of their favourite pursuit. "Philosophy," the writer teaches, "is not only a science beside other sciences possessed of equal or of greater authority, it is the science of the sciences, and the queen of all. It is the science of the highest ideas—i.e., the science of the highest, most universal, and most important speculative questions, and, what is still more important, of the highest and most burning problems of humanity. It is, therefore, finally, also the most necessary and most indispensable science, from which a nation cannot for long turn aside, except at the danger of the greatest injury to the most essential interests of life." The further execution of these views, the vigour with which the writer shows the need of philosophy in morals, art, and religion,

⁹ "Wesen und Aufgabe der Philosophie, ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart und ihre Aussichten für die Zukunft." Von Adolf Horwicz. ("Deutsche Zeit- und Streit-Fragen." Jahrgang V., Heft 78.) Berlin: Carl Habel. 1876.

and the happy touches in which he shows the influence of their absence at the present time, must be read within the pages of the work itself.

Two Italian pamphlets¹⁰ which we have received do not call for any extended notice at our hands. Both are written in the interests of Roman Catholicism—the one showing as against the supremacy which Hegel and Machiavelli conferred upon the State, the counter-claims demanded by the Church ; the other pointing out that because “the end of the school is the harmonious development of the different powers and faculties of man,” the school must necessarily unite in itself the three elements—the domestic, the civil, and the religious.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

MR. BRASSEY'S book on “British Seamen”¹ is one of considerable importance and value. He says it is “the result of much study of blue-books, Parliamentary returns, reports of commissions and committees, and the evidence of the most competent witnesses have been diligently examined in an impartial spirit.” Thus this work will, for some time to come, form the best *resumé* of all that is to be known on the subject. On the great question whether the British seaman has deteriorated, Mr. Brassey is of opinion that “the falling off in the quality and the character of our seamen is confined chiefly to the men employed in long-voyage sailing ships. The seamen are not deteriorated, though unhappily they have the same faults they have always had.” As to remedial measures, Mr. Brassey suggests the abolition of the advance notes ; the allowance of interest in case of unnecessary delay in paying off the crews ; the giving by Government of a bonus to ship-owners for apprentices trained under suitable conditions, and under engagement to serve a year in the navy, and afterwards to join the reserve ; the establishment of training-ships under the Admiralty at the commercial ports ; the establishment of a compulsory, self-supporting seamen's pension fund, under the management of the Board of Trade and the guarantee of the State ; the establishment of voluntary examinations in modern languages and commercial subjects for masters and mates ; and the preparation of a scale of provisions by the Board of Trade for ships on long voyages.

Of two accounts before us of the work of the “Challenger,” Lord George Campbell's ought—for his youth, his position in the expedition,

¹⁰ “Hegel e Machiavelli ossia la Germania e l'Italia nella presente lotta religiosa.” Pensieri di un Giovini. Napoli : Tipografia editrice degli Accattoncelli. 1875.

“La Famiglia, lo Stato, la Chiesa et la libera Scuola.” Considerazioni di Carlo Conestabile. Napoli. 1876.

¹ “British Seamen, as Described in Recent Parliamentary and Official Documents.” By Thomas Brassey, M.P. London : Longmans & Co. 1877.

and his less severe method—to be read last, and its priority of date does not weigh against these considerations. Mr. Spry² had probably to write his account after his return, and had at least carefully to consider his matter. For his task was to lay before the public a grave and careful account of the result of an expedition undertaken at the public expense, and to establish its success in the objects for which it was sent out. His style is not alluring, but he lays a good foundation of clear knowledge of what this company of scientific men did, so far as they as yet know themselves. They sounded depths of the ocean greater than any which had been placed on trustworthy record before, though the Americans are our rivals. They have made collections of many new, more old but rare, and most familiar things from the depths, and from the islands and lands they visited. They obtained materials for exploding some favourite scientific ideas. Mr. Spry winds up by saying that it is impossible to foresee the amount of information which will result from their labours. To those who have dutifully, and with a certain carefully sustained attention, read Mr. Spry's volume, Lord George Campbell's³ book will be particularly charming. He has apparently escaped—perhaps because he is a sailor—the disastrous effects of ordinary education on a boy's power of quick and lively observation, and of lifelike description. He has a large vocabulary—a rare gift to authors of books of travel. He does not despise and hate people who are not white, and he does not long to kill every living thing that he sees for the first time. True he does kill many, but he conveys to his readers the impression that it was not for the love of killing. His volume is one that will give great pleasure and much instruction to old and young, for he puts enough of the serious work of the ship's inhabitants to ballast his lighter and more purely picturesque adventures. His dog "Sam" grows very dear to his readers, whether doing doughty deeds in early days among the vast armies of penguins, or obeying orders in soberer times among savages, to whom his size was a wonder so great, that a dog of their smaller breed was brought to identify and be introduced to him at the porthole of the ship. Landing in New Guinea, which was one of the objects of desire among the whole party, was impossible without conflict with the natives; and it appears only too probable that this was because of the visits of a certain kidnapping vessel; for a certain English merchant "master" said he went there every year, but there were no signs among the natives of any trade except one rusty axe, and hoop-iron was a very precious commodity to them at first till they saw axes and knives; the natives also absolutely refused to come on board. Lord George Campbell is very enthusiastic about life in Japan. He was fortunate in having an opportunity to go quite into the interior; and his advice is, that all those who wish to travel and find real novelty of scene, combined with comfort

² "The Cruise of H.M.S. 'Challenger.'" By W. J. Spry, R.N. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

³ "Log Letters from the 'Challenger.'" By Lord George Campbell. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

and cleanliness, should go to Japan. This cleanliness probably arises from the combined facts that houses are not furnished there—beds being mere temporary and fluctuating arrangements of quilts between paper screens, and that it appears to be a Japanese national foible to boil one's self, as nearly as is consistent with life, every night, though somewhat publicly, and in a primitive Christian way, so far as regards common property in the bath and its water. A final chapter, summarising the "Challenger's" work, is of considerable popular utility.

We have great pleasure in calling attention to Mr. John Lancelot Shadwell's "System of Political Economy."⁴ The work is a complete and exhaustive treatise on the whole subject, and the points of difference between the views contained in it and those of other established authorities are of considerable interest. For instance, on the subjects of value and wages, Mr. Shadwell is at variance with most of the recent writers, though, on the former subject, he is able to claim the support of Adam Smith, and, on the latter, that of Mr. Jevons. Mr. Shadwell objects to using the word *value* as an expression of general exchangeable worth, instead of recognising it as merely determining the worth of a particular commodity, as measured by the amount of definite labour the production of that particular commodity costs. "The human mind," says Mr. Shadwell, "can only compare two things at once, and when it is said that a commodity has a certain power of purchasing all other commodities, the words, though they may be pronounced, written, and printed, do not really present any idea to the mind." On the subject of wages, Mr. Shadwell holds that wages (and not merely prices) have a tendency to rise as society advances, by which he means that the labourers can obtain all the commodities which they could in the earlier stages of society, and many others in addition. The standard of wages must not, according to Mr. Shadwell, be measured by the monetary measurement of them, but by the increasing advantages of all sorts which money enables the labourer to procure. Better lodging, better conditions of health, cheap newspapers, the use of tobacco, tea, and coffee, all indicate that improvements of a variety of sorts have increased the productiveness of labour, and thereby the wages of the labourer. Mr. Shadwell is a faithful but not servile, and certainly most worthy, pupil of the lamented Professor Cairnes.

Sir Edward Creasy is Professor of Jurisprudence to the four Inns of Court, and his work, styled the "First Platform of International Law,"⁵ distributed as it is into twelve chapters, affords unmistakable signs of being, in fact, twelve republished lectures. And herein consists the main fault of the book. It is partly systematic and partly desultory. It touches upon an infinitude of subjects, but does not do much more than re-state what has been said by the most illustrious

⁴ "A System of Political Economy." By John Lancelot Shadwell. London: Trübner & Co. 1877.

⁵ "First Platform of International Law." By Sir Edward S. Creasy, M.A. London: John Van Voorst. 1876.

writers about them. The book is, in fact, too large for an elementary treatise on a subject of a somewhat narrow compass; and yet its method does not admit of being complete and exhaustive. However, most questions of modern interest are touched upon, and the writer's style is always easy and erudite, and often luminous.

Sergeant Cox's "*Principles of Punishment, as applied in the Administration of the Criminal Law,*"⁶ is a very practical treatise, recording the experience of a criminal judge. The work shows a large-minded view of the subject, as well as a delicate perception of the psychological and moral elements involved. It exhibits the principles of Bentham applied to the actual exigencies of modern society, corrected by a familiar cognisance of the chief manifestations of crime. Mr. Sergeant Cox favours the retention of capital punishment, and objects to the further extension of the punishment of the lash.

We have much pleasure in calling attention to Mr. Theobald's "*Concise Treatise on the Construction of Wills.*"⁷ It is, in fact, the first comprehensive (and not only concise) treatise on the subject which has appeared for fifteen years. Of course, it is technical in the extreme, but its value is none the less for this.

Captain E. H. Wickham has translated an anonymous German work, entitled the "*Influence of Firearms upon Tactics.*"⁸ The object of the book is to represent the tactics which came to light in the campaign of 1870 in their relation to the past. A general historical sketch is given of the progress of modern tactics from the first introduction of firearms at the latter half of the fourteenth century, up to the period when rifled firearms came into general use. This last date is marked by the campaign of 1859 in Italy. The writer says that "it may be taken for granted as a general fact that rifled firearms chiefly produced an influential effect according to the manner in which they were used by the various arms, infantry, cavalry, and artillery; but that the general laws of tactics in the combination of the different arms, as they had already hitherto stood, were on the other hand slightly affected." Each of the leading campaigns since 1859 is passed in review, and the effect of firearms on their result and conduct is estimated. The work seems accurately, but is not elegantly, translated.

The "*History of the Regiment of Bengal Artillery*"⁹ commences with the raising of the first company in 1749, and the destruction of forty-five men among them in the Black Hole of Calcutta on the night of June 20, 1756. The history is chiefly of a technical military inte-

⁶ "*The Principles of Punishment, as applied in the Administration of the Criminal Law by Judges and Magistrates.*" By Edward W. Cox. London: Law Inns Office.

⁷ "*A Concise Treatise on the Construction of Wills.*" By H. S. Theobald. London: Stevens. 1876.

⁸ "*The Influence of Firearms upon Tactics.*" Translated from the German by Captain E. H. Wickham, R.A. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

⁹ "*History of the Organisation, Equipment, and War Services of the Regiment of Bengal Artillery.*" By Francis W. Stubbs.

rest, but it necessarily follows the main lines of the general history of the British Empire in India.

A new volume—the second “for fifth standard”—on domestic economy¹⁰ deals with furniture and appliances of the house, warming, and ventilation. It is a well-arranged and admirable little volume, and will help any inexperienced manager of a house into whose hands it may fall, as well as teach girls—or possibly boys; for it is difficult in some aspects to understand why all these things concern girls and not boys. “The importance of fresh air” is as true to a man, a father, and a husband, as to his feminine correlative. The “warming the house,” so far as it is dependent on construction, is a matter rather for boys than for girls, till we have women bricklayers and builders. The difficulties of early housekeeping days are surely shared by every newly-married couple; and woe betide the wife whose husband thinks that little etceteras cost nothing, and requires them without giving money to buy them. And they do their Saturday marketing together all the world over, surely. Is not the boy the future tenant, too; and does he not pay the rates and taxes? But it is ungracious thus to go through the book. Only “Economy for girls” has grown into such a cant cry, that women are fain to open their eyes and ears and ask why they are to be so very economical while society countenances men in wasting their wages in tobacco; tempts them from their home, either to the public-house or coffee-house or reading-room—anywhere away from their domestic duties; and persists in regarding the man, with his limited hours of labour, as the breadwinner and master of the purse, while the toiling wife and mother, who knows no rest or respite, is only lectured to be grindingly economical and punctiliously self-denying. But the book is well done.

An inquiry having arisen for “good temperance reading,” Mr. Tyler¹¹ has made a collection which he thinks will prove useful, and of which he is able to say that all the narratives are true. There can be no doubt that, for the purpose it is meant for, it is a very suitable little volume, with a fair amount of variety within such limits as would be approved by the *clientèle* for whom it is prepared. An account of the journey of Mr. Sturge to see the Emperor of Russia in 1854, the story of J. B. Gough, accounts of the difficulties of conscientious Friends drawn for the army in the American War, and such like papers, form the bulk of the little book.

The system of poor-law relief pursued at Elberfeld in Prussia has long arrested the attention of poor-law reformers in this country, and the Rev. Richard Hibbs¹² now describes from personal observation the contrast of the results brought about by the English and the Elberfeld systems respectively. Mr. Hibbs notices that all poor-law

¹⁰ “Domestic Economy for Girls.” Edited by the Rev. G. T. Stevens, M.A. Oxon. London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

¹¹ “The Faggot.” By Charles Tyler. London: Samuel Harris & Co. 1876.

¹² “Prussia and the Poor; or, Observations upon the Systematised Relief of the Poor at Elberfeld, in Contrast with that of England.” By the Rev. Richard Hibbs, M.A. London. 1876.

reforms in England are in the direction of granting indoor relief only, and that an undue spirit of severity characterises the whole system. The Elberfeld system is administered by 250 district visitors (*Armenpfleger*), who inquire personally into all the circumstances of every applicant for relief, and, unless the need is immediate, report at the next district meeting. The necessitous poor able to work, but unable to obtain work, or unable to work, and in either case having no direct claims on other persons, are effectually relieved on the spot. In fact, the system represents a sort of charity organisation society as well as a poor-law board, and it is in the union of these two features that the merits of the system consist. Whether it could be adapted to the enormous mass of pauperism already at hand in a capital like London remains yet to be seen.

Mr. Haswell,¹³ who himself is blind, gives in a very unpretending form a curious and somewhat pathetic account of the life of the blind in London, and of the insufficient and unintelligent provision made for their comfort. He objects to "exile" schools and workshops, and holds that the blind ought as far as possible to be associated with those who can see.

An interesting lecture on deafness,¹⁴ by Mr. St. J. Ackers, traces the causes and history of deafness, and expounds the leading methods in use for educating the deaf.

We have to call attention to further numbers of the two valuable German series of political and scientific tracts, "German Controversial Questions of the Day," edited by Herr F. von Holzendorf and W. Oncken, and the "Collection of Popular Scientific Treatises," edited by Herr Rud. Virchow and F. von Holzendorf. The number of the former series is on the "Increase of Price in the Necessaries of Life," by Professor Gustav Cohn of Zurich.¹⁵ He first of all substantiates the fact of such an increase, and examines into the more obvious causes of it, such as the higher standard of comfort, the depreciation of the precious metals, and the greater use of means of transport not yet fully organised nor become habitual. He then compares minutely the expenses of living in London and at Zurich, and cites a memorial presented by Civil servants to the British Treasury in 1873 to the effect that whereas, for a certain style of housekeeping, £193 sufficed in 1858, no less than £233 was required for the same style of living in 1873. The same advance in the chief articles of food had been taking place at Zurich, and a house in the neighbourhood of Zurich was now rented at twice the rent of a similar house at Wimbledon. This seems scarcely accountable to the Professor, and the only explanation he can give of it is to

¹³ "The Social Condition of the Blind: An Essay." By D. O. Haswell. Second Edition. London. 1876.

¹⁴ "Deaf not Dumb: A Lecture delivered 12th October 1876, before the Gloucester Literary and Scientific Institution." By B. St. J. Ackers. London: Longmans & Co.

¹⁵ "Deutsche Zeit- und Streit-Fragen." Heft 77. "Vertheuerung des Lebensunterhaltes in der Gegenwart." Von Gustav Cohn. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1876.

be found in the more highly developed economical relations in London, the superior progress in technical contrivances, and the greater efficiency of labour. The new number of the "Popular Scientific Treatises" is on the "Agate Industry in Birkenfeld of the Principality of Oldenburg,"¹⁶ by Herr Gustav Adolph Nöggerath. It gives an interesting glimpse of the ways of finding and working the agate, and of the recent history of the industry.

Herr Adolph Samter,¹⁷ in his treatise on "Public (or rather corporate) and Private Property as a Basis of Social Politics," claims for himself some originality in supporting the institution of private property in all movable things, while declaring against private property in land. The writer begins at the very beginning, and traces the growth of the idea of property from the inborn tendency to exert natural powers over corporeal objects, and then over weaker persons, by which time the conception of a claim to the services of other persons became formed. Thereupon society and the State intervene, abolishing slavery, ascertaining and enforcing contractual engagements, and effecting a fresh and artificial distribution of material things. Reason is called to determine what things can be appropriated by private persons and what cannot. Herr Adolph Samter then proceeds to examine, in a way long familiar to the disciples of Mr. J. S. Mill, the considerations which place land in a different category from every other thing susceptible of appropriation, and which point, with ever-increasing force, to the expediency of its being owned exclusively by the State.

Dr. Karl Walcker¹⁸ makes an interesting contribution to the solution of the problem concerning the depreciation of silver. The work is small in compass, but very full of matter. After stating the arguments for and against a gold and a silver standard, and for and against a double standard, the author arranges all the leading States under different heads, according as they have (1) a gold standard, (2) a silver standard, (3) a double standard, or (4) a paper standard, and reviews the special circumstances of each country in succession. He advocates a double international standard.

Dr. Kaufmann's¹⁹ tract on the conflicting aspects of the French and German systems of education, with especial reference to the state of things in Elsass and Lothringen, affords an instructive exhibition of an educational and political problem which, on both its sides, is quite alien to the problems presented in England. The radical difference between the rival systems may be traced back to their original history.

¹⁶ "Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge." Heft 264. "Die Achat-Industrie im Oldenburgischen Fürstenthum Birkenfeld." Von Gustav Adolph Nöggerath. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1877.

¹⁷ "Gesellschaftliches und Privat-Eigenthum als Grundlage der Socialpolitik." Von Adolph Samter. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1877.

¹⁸ "Die Silber-Entwerthungs-Frage. Kritische Uebersicht der Währungs politischen Ansichten der namhaftesten Europäischen und Amerikanischen National-ökonomien." Von Dr. Karl Walcker. Strasburg: J. Schneider. 1877.

¹⁹ "Der Kampf der Französischen und Deutschen Schulorganisation und seine neueste Phase in Elsass-Lothringen." Von Dr. George Kaufmann. Berlin. 1877.

The French system is alleged to have been the product of Napoleonic and Jesuitical centralisation; the German system, of Protestantism, Independence, and of elements diverse from both these. Of course, in the newly-acquired provinces, in which Dr. Kaufmann is a president of a Lyceum, the question as to which type should be followed is of pressing importance.

Herr Julius Schvarcz's²⁰ work on "Democracy," of which half the first volume is now completed, promises to be a treatise of considerable value. Even the table of contents of the work is a distinct contribution to a philosophical analysis of the great subject. The first part is to be mainly historical, and discusses all the most notable democracies of the world, from that of Athens to those of modern France and South America. The second part will discuss the possibility of a democratical organisation, and the third part will investigate the international conditions needed to support it.

Miss M. Betham Edwards's²¹ facile pen and eye for the more picturesque sides of life have long secured for her a warm welcome from those who must do much of their travelling by proxy. Her present volume deals with ground nearer home, if not more practically accessible, than her last, and life goes more easily in it. But the chief interest of her new publication lies in the information she gives on the state of the peasantry, of the agriculture, of education, and the towns in Brittany. She winds up with a eulogistic notice of some of the great men Brittany has produced in times past and in these days; notably one, little known in England, who died only four years ago, after a life of devotion to the cause of progress, and especially of the education and general advancement of women. This Dr. Guépin filled Nantes with the results of his labours, and Brittany with love for his name. And few know the services rendered to humanity by Dr. Bodichon, who procured the liberation of slaves throughout Algeria, and who spends part of his most useful and devoted life in our midst, little regarded because his extreme modesty prevents his deeds from becoming adequately known. Miss Edwards recommends to those interested in Central African exploration a chapter in his "Considérations sur l'Algérie." But to return to the more general subjects of this volume. Throughout the whole of Brittany, peasant proprietorship is the almost invariable rule, and though, in some respects, the peasantry might gain by having resident-gentry among them, and might learn habits of cleanliness, yet the fact that this system of small landed possessions is favourable to persistent economy, sobriety, and self-respect, makes up for much possible loss. Then, also, those who grow rich are not thereby tempted to give up their simple habits and dress, or to despise the class from which they have emerged. And a certain conservatism tends to steady this great bulk of a nation which is com-

²⁰ "Die Demokratie." Von Julius Schvarcz. Erster Band. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1877.

²¹ "A Year in Western France." By M. Betham Edwards. London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

monly called vacillating and flippant, while self-interest and improved education lead to the adoption of better methods of agriculture. A model farm at Grand Jouan makes farming experiments and tries new machinery, and as it is an agricultural school, the results are rapidly spread throughout the surrounding small farms. Those who wish to know more about it, must read Miss Edwards's lively description of her visit ; those who wish to know still more, must follow in her steps. She notices, as the result of free libraries and open art galleries, a higher tone of culture in the townspeople than among English working men. She notes one significant fact, that in much respectable society in France military men are not now received, partly because their manners have become dissolute through the increased difficulties lying in the way of their marriage. It is not usually known that Roman Catholicism has, during the last six years, established throughout France a network of *Cercles d'ouvriers Catholiques*, a sort of clubs where working men can meet in the evenings and play billiards, see plays acted, exercise themselves in the gymnasium, or loiter in well-arranged gardens, for about a halfpenny a week. No books or papers disturb their minds in these abodes of syrens, and it must be a self-denying working man who prefers to all these things the dearer if more solid attractions of the halfpenny paper, which is the best that Republicanism can offer him instead. The paper, too, is to be found in the *cabaret*, while drinking, quarrelling, and bad language are not allowed at the *cercle*. The working men's wives, therefore, are naturally in favour of the *cercle*. These things ought to be widely known and thought about in England, for help might cross the Channel if necessary to form some rival organisation. Miss Edwards comments on the French laws of inheritance as though they bore more hardly on women than the English laws ; and she shares the common error of ascribing the Code to Napoleon himself because it bears his name ; then she traces the hardship of the laws to the fact of his being a woman-hater. To act as signpost to the points of interest in this little volume is difficult, for each chapter has its special attraction both of matter and of manner. Miss Edwards might well employ her holidays in similar fashion in some other part of France, and do away with another cloud of ignorance that obscures our view of so near neighbours.

M. Narjoux²² has travelled through Holland, Hanover, Hamburg, the Duchies, and Denmark, seeking to fit himself for his architect's profession in France. For those who still suffer from the French disinclination for travel, or who cannot follow in his steps, he publishes his notes and sketches, keeping closely to his professional interests except on German ground, when all the bitter feeling of the Frenchman towards the German makes itself visible in sneers at the manners and blame of the

²² "Notes and Sketches of an Architect in the North-West of Europe." By Felix Narjoux, translated from the French by John Peto. London : Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

Arrangements he sees everywhere. Yet he is studiously fair in his estimate of their architecture. It is somewhat amusing to read his grave statement that the English subjects in Heligoland are exempt from imperial taxation and from military service. The translation is thoroughly good, and the volume altogether is likely to be useful to the student architect.

Mr. C. Barrington Brown was Government surveyor for some time in British Guiana, and therefore had some special advantages as an explorer of the interior of the country—that is, he was not a mere passing visitor, as Mr. Palgrave was to the Dutch colony; and he was able to make repeated journeys with a certain preparedness which must have served him well. His colonial reports are not in this volume.²³ His expeditions resulted in the discovery of a very fine waterfall on the Potaro river some nine hundred feet high; within pleasurable reach of a former Dutch settlement, and in a region from which Indian labourers often come to Demerara, and which yet had remained unknown till his visit. The whole region traversed by him, watered by the Essequibo, Mazaruni, and less well-known rivers, is inhabited by friendly tribes, presents no insuperable difficulties for travellers disposed to explore its beauties and capabilities, and certainly would afford legitimate and useful occupation for many whose sporting propensities render them the bane of their native country and the nuisance of many foreign lands. Here is real danger to be found, and real service to be done to mankind in destroying ravening beasts that are amenable to no keepers, and valuable to no neighbouring populations. Let sportsmen resort thither from England and America, and leave the tame pheasants and the valuable buffaloes alone.

The love of travel and even of adventure, so far as may be, into imperfectly explored regions, is by no means confined to the unencumbered men of England. The free and unfettered women are beginning to tread closely on their heels, and Miss A. B. Edwards²⁴ has before now found occasion to publish some of her doings. Her new publication—magnificent in its proportions and outward appearance, and luxurious in its wealth of admirable illustrations and in its wide margins and “leading,”—conducts her readers up and down the Nile. It is not too much to say that any one who reads her soft-flowing descriptions will, without effort, imbibe from them, in all probability, a far more considerable and well-ordered amount of knowledge of the latest steps of Egyptian antiquarian lore than is to be found in the heads of the bulk of those who have been themselves to Egypt. Miss Edwards has been credited with some original discovery, but does not claim it for herself; but the appreciation she shows of the work of the party to which she belonged, and the lucidity with which she makes her readers

²³ “Canoe and Camp Life in British Guiana.” By C. Barrington Brown, Assoc. R.S.M. London: Edward Stanford. 1876.

²⁴ “A Thousand Miles up the Nile.” By Amelia B. Edwards. London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

understand both the laboriousness of that work and the importance of its results, are worthy of high praise. What they found was possibly the library of the great Temple of Aboo Simbel, which Miss Edwards conjectures to have been hidden from view since the time of Rameses. Those who take up the book to seek for this particular portion will not be content without reading the whole volume.

Mr. Drew²⁵ has extracted from his larger work, "The Jummoo and Kashmir Territories," a popular account of the great mountain mass which lies between India and Badakshan and Eastern Turkistan, of the tribes which inhabit its valleys and plateaux and heights, of their general condition and peculiarities of customs and characteristics. It is a compressed and most valuable handbook for those who find it difficult to acquire anything approaching to a knowledge of Indian affairs. Mr. Drew, who has been in the service of the Maharajah of Kashmir, and knows the ground well as a civilian, not as a military man, is of opinion that the valleys which intersect this mountain barrier are either impracticable for a foe advancing from the north, or easily defensible, while the time that they are in any way traversable is so short each year, that any invading force would find its retreat cut off by winter.

Mr. R. N. Fowler's²⁶ account of his journey round the world depends for its interest on different considerations from those which give curiosity and importance to the story of ordinary travellers. Mr. Fowler was, before the last general election, an active member of the House of Commons, and concerned himself with a class of questions of great international concern, and yet which, not forming topics of party warfare, are attended to only by a few. Mr. Fowler's visit to India and China gave him special opportunities for informing himself of the actual condition of the British Administration in the former country and of the British settlements in the latter. He discusses in considerable detail the opium question, both from an Indian and Chinese point. He is of opinion that India could not afford to make good the loss of £6,000,000 of revenue which the abandonment of the opium revenue would occasion, but that if "we wish to relieve ourselves from the responsibility of this reproach, we must be prepared to put our hands into our pockets." He also suggests that the Government might at once arrest the increased cultivation of the poppy, with a view gradually to diminish the supply, and to substitute for opium other sources of revenue.

In two pamphlets—"England and China," by "Justum,"²⁷ and "China and her Apologist," by Dr. Denny's,²⁸ published at Hong-Kong

²⁵ "The Northern Barrier of India." By Frederic Drew. London: Edward Stanford. 1877.

²⁶ "A Visit to Japan, China, and India." By R. N. Fowler, M.A. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

²⁷ "England and China: Two Episodes of Recent Anglo-Chinese History illustrating British Policy in China." By "Justum." London: James Bain. 1877.

²⁸ "China and her Apologist: A Short Rejoinder to Sir Charles Dilke's Article in 'Macmillan's Magazine' on 'English Influence in China.'" By N. B. Denny's, Ph.D. Hong-Kong. 1876.

—the recent relations of England and China are brought clearly into view from opposite sides, especially in the matter of the construction of the Woosang Railway. The "Apologist" for China was Sir Charles Dilke.

Mr. Boyle²⁹ describes in a series of papers, and with a most unmistakable power of giving his readers a sympathy in his excitement, various adventures in the diamond fields of South Africa, in Borneo, in Mexico, Egypt, and the Malay Peninsula, and finally adds some rather feeble paragraphs on the Lakes of Westmoreland and Cumberland, and the tourists who there abound. It might have been difficult to believe in some of the more harrowing of his stories had he not said in his dedication—"I may conscientiously declare that no tale in the collection is without its solid foundation of truth." The account of Borneo and its prosperity under its English Rajah is of great interest. The natives were astonished a year ago to find that a mountain had been blown up that its stores of cinnabar might be more conveniently got at, an operation which argues that much antimony was to be found to repay the cost of mining. A tramway is now bringing good coal to the port of Pinding, where it sells at three dollars per ton, a fact of great importance for our merchant fleet. What sympathy would be felt for the Dyaks if our china maniacs knew that certain earthenware jars are held there in such esteem that eight of them are demanded as full compensation for a murder committed by one of the warlike inland tribes! Perhaps not exactly as a volume of travels, but certainly as a most entertaining companion for an hour or two, Mr. Boyle's book may be recommended to those who can read and enjoy at the same time that they do not forget the necessary grain of salt.

Major H. A. Leveson,³⁰ known to sportsmen and to many readers of sporting travels as "The Old Shekarry," a writer of considerable descriptive power, is recently dead at an early age, and his friend prefixes to the present posthumous publication of scattered papers by him an affectionate memoir, lauding his services in the Crimean War, in Africa as Colonial Secretary at Lagos, and in Abyssinia. These splendidly illustrated volumes appear to be a compendium of directions and hints to any sportsman wishing to go to any quarter of the globe in pursuit of unhappy game. And the stories are told without undue self-glorification. It is interesting to see that experience of the Turkish service in the Crimean War brought him to the conclusion that, "as a body, they" (the Turks) "are the most detestable race of people under the sun, and I think that their kingdom will soon pass away into other hands;" though he appears in 1864 to have been on such good terms with a Turkish Pasha (Hassan), with whom he was staying, that he went with him when he went to select additions to his harem from boys and girls who were to be bought cheap on board a Turkish man-

²⁹ "The Savage Life: A Second Series of Camp Notes." By Frederick Boyle. London: Chapman & Hall. 1876.

³⁰ "Sport in Many Lands." By "The Old Shekarry." London: Chapman & Hall. 1877.

of-war just returned from the Caucasus with refugees. His remark is, that "although slavery as a rule is not to be defended, it must be admitted that in this case the arrangements made were equally advantageous to the buyer, the seller, and the sold." Indeed, he himself became possessed of a boy of thirteen, "who forthwith became a part of my goods and chattels in exchange for ten five-franc pieces." He believes that the buffaloes and Indians together must disappear from the prairies of North America, the nature and needs of both being diametrically opposed to the spirit of white men's progress, and says that the hunters, who regard the red man as their natural enemy, are the pioneers of civilisation. It is strange how hunting animals seems to blunt the intelligence in relation to questions of human interests.

Captain Burnaby³¹ has made himself so well known by his adventurous ride to Khiva, and his recall thence has been the subject of so much political remark, that it may be worth while—at the same time that the inherent interest of the expedition into difficult country and his own powers of endurance are freely acknowledged—to consider whether this volume is one worth offering to the public. Captain Burnaby went in such haste, to avoid being stopped by the Russian authorities, that he gave himself no time to acquire any knowledge of the people and the country; and, indeed, he exhibits no interest in anything but the one endeavour to prove, by reiterated assertion, that the Russian officers look forward with certainty and great impatience to an encounter with England in Asia in their own time. Whatever may be the political complications before us, they are not likely to be rendered less difficult of solution by English officers travelling for their own amusement, and without leave, in places where they find at every step that their journey is understood to have a political significance, so that they involve England in their own personal whims and freaks. Appendices are added on the condition of the Turkomans, the importance of Merve, the mode of travelling over the steppes by the Russian troops, and on routes in Bokhara, Kashmir, Afghanistan, China, and Central Asia. The whole volume is one elaborate effort to rouse English feeling on the subject of Russian advance in Asia; and though this is a matter needing attention, it should be friendly, not unnecessarily or prematurely hostile attention. Above all, a military opinion is to be distrusted when it brings the charge that the officers of another nation demand war for the sake of promotion.

An anonymous pamphlet on "The Northern Question; or, Russia's Policy in Turkey Unmasked,"³² has already shared the fate of pamphlets written in the midst of stirring events—that of becoming in a few weeks obsolete. The author reviews from a strongly marked anti-Russian point of view the history of the late revolution in the Turkish provinces.

³¹ "A Ride to Khiva." By Frederick Burnaby. Sixth Edition. London, Paris, and New York: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin.

³² "The Northern Question; or, Russia's Policy in Turkey Unmasked." London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876.

He speaks strongly of the intolerance of Russia, of the danger of England losing "the best bulwark of her Indian dominions," the Bosphorus, and the necessity of the *de facto* maintenance of the Turkish Empire. At the same time he extols the tolerance of the Turk, and says that to "assist in delivering the peoples of European Turkey over to Russia would be an outrage; to look idly on at their conquest, a stain on our humanity and philanthropy." He says that, in the interests of humanity, our policy should be to let all Europe clearly understand that if Russia attacks Turkey we shall fight. As a matter of fact, England has by this time given Europe clearly to understand exactly the reverse of this.

Mr. W. J. Stillman,³³ special correspondent of the "Times," examines the causes and traces the history of the uprising in Herzegovina, and incidentally discusses the whole issue presented by Turkish misgovernment. He connects the Herzegovinian insurrection closely with the Cretan insurrection, and alleges that the latter made the former practicable and successful. He holds that "from the two the independent existence of the Ottoman Empire is henceforward impossible, even if Russia should not succeed in breaking it down completely. The Slavs have been progressing in political knowledge as well as moral force in spite of oppression, and the Mussulmans have followed the usual course of nations which govern without regard to justice or political economy, and destroy the sources of their own power, growing weaker and less coherent with each generation." Mr. Stillman says that the condition of the Christian Herzegovinian was the most intolerable of all the subjects of Turkey, for the poverty of the country gave little solace for his slavery, and the nearness of Montenegro and Dalmatia made the contrast between his condition and that of his near kinsman the greater. He says that the visit of the Emperor of Austria to the Dalmatian coasts (which are the coasts also of Herzegovina), and the marked interest thus for the first time shown in the Slav population of this section, stimulated the ferment continually going on there, and led the Catholic Herzegovinians to anticipate an Austrian intervention. The insurrection spread because the whole country was ripe for it, and because the military conduct of the Turks was inefficient and unintelligent, and perversely directed, as far as it went, to provoke rather than subdue or allay the insubordination. "Under governments which give no basis or motive for loyalty, insurrection is chronic even if latent; and under the rule of the Turks there is never peace, only a truce between conqueror and conquered, in which no law has ever intervened to limit the right of the victor over his victims. It is only the law of force in its first and uncrystallised or uncodified state—an extended brigandage, for a long time feared by all Europe, and since respected as a *fait accompli*, with the respect men pay to the work of four centuries, even when, as in this case, the work is in itself utterly evil." The Appendix contains a transcript of the Andrassy and Berlin Notes.

³³ "Herzegovina and the Late Uprising: The Causes of the Latter, and the Remedies." By W. J. Stillman. London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

It is scarcely possible to compress into a shorter space the quantity of already condensed material contained in Mr. G. H. Reid's "Essay on New South Wales," "the mother colony of the Australias."³⁴ The work has been prepared in connection with the Centenary Exposition of the United States. Mr. Reid says that the motive for the appearance at the Exposition of exhibits from New South Wales is not that of older countries. "They seek custom: her supreme anxiety is for men." "The chief articles of our export trade," says Mr. Reid, "are raw materials, which find ready markets. But if we could only divert to these shores a stream of industrious emigrants, who would scarcely be missed at home, the fertility it would impart to Australian enterprise would soon disperse its fruits to every quarter of the globe. The idea that the commercial interests of communities are naturally opposed, and that it is better to sell abroad for cash than for goods, is not yet quite laughed out of credit; but most reflective minds see the doctrine to be a foolish one, and that it has crippled commerce to the injury of trade everywhere." The work deals seriatim with all the chief elements of political progress, as physical aspect, soil, climate, population, administration of justice, internal communication, public finances, land policy, pastoral progress and resources, agricultural progress and resources, timber, fisheries, mineral progress and resources, manufactories, commerce, shipping, municipalities, defences, charitable and literary institutions, position and advantages of labour, and relations with the mother country. With respect to the last of these subjects, Mr. Reid says—

"We can safely assert that nothing would be more unpopular in Australia than a further strain upon the ties which connect the colonies settled along its coasts with the rest of the British Empire. It is true that the policies of the several colonies have not a great deal in common, and that in each political controversies are keen, often bitter. But it is not less true that all parties are united in attachment to Fatherland. With us the sentiment of loyalty has all the force of a passion. If political change lift into power men who do not share the general feeling, they are always careful to respect it."

Finally, Mr. Reid says—

"That it would be well if the energy of the advocates of Australian federation, of representation in the House of Commons, of a council for colonial affairs, and of all those other proposals which seem to attract the zeal of our friends at home, were bestowed on the one great subject upon which the progress of the colonies depends, *Emigration*."

No more inspiring or indeed hopeful picture of the present condition of the United States could be given than is contained in the bulky reports of the "Public Libraries in the United States of America: their History, Condition, and Management."³⁵ The subject of these

³⁴ "An Essay on New South Wales." By G. H. Reid. Sydney: Thomas Richards. 1876.

³⁵ "Public Libraries of the United States of America: Their History, Condition, and Management." Special Report. Parts I. and II. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1876.

reports ought to be of peculiar interest to Englishmen, who do so much to fill the libraries. The amount of labour and thought which is given to collecting, arranging, cataloguing, and organising throughout the States is almost astounding. Part II. on a dictionary catalogue has especial claims on the attention of the librarians of public libraries in this country.

A well-printed, sufficiently well-written volume details the particulars of Sir Rose Price's visit to South and North America.³⁶ He does not appear to have seen or done anything out of the way, but has derived, from his journey, much confirmation to his aristocratic and conservative opinions. He is convinced that the United States of America have not much to boast of, and that whatever evils they or the South American States suffer under are owing to their republican institutions. One or two points of general interest appear in his pages. The first is an assertion, which ought to be subject of inquiry, that a common custom prevails in the merchant service of England to stop the pay of a shipwrecked crew from the date the ship is heard of as lost. Another is that our men-of-war cruising in Mexican waters are mixed up in smuggling silver out of Mexico to avoid the heavy export duty. He speaks with due reprehension of our former protection of opium-smuggling in China. He tells, on secondhand authority, a strange fact that a very severe earthquake in Virginia city was quite unfelt in the mines close at hand, but fifteen hundred feet deep. His remedy for the Red Indian difficulty is compulsory education for all the children, then enforced work, and their strict supervision until middle life, for this next generation. The present one is to be "permitted to die out quietly."

The "Victoria Year-Book for 1875"³⁷ contains in a very compact form a vast amount of information, which the English politician, as well as the colonist, stands constantly in need of, and yet on which he is not always able at once to lay his hand. The "Year-Book" is prepared by Mr. Henry Heylin Hayter, "Government Statist" of Victoria, and therefore the information it conveys may be treated, in some measure, as authoritative. Among the most valuable features of the work are a series of tables at the commencement of it, giving (1) a statistical summary of the colony from 1836 to 1875; (2) the agricultural statistics of the colony for the same period; and (3) a general summary of the statistics of all the Australian colonies for 1875. The fulness and exactness of colonial statistics in every department is an almost fascinating spectacle.

The report of the Commissioner of Railways of New South Wales for 1875³⁸ is an interesting document. No passengers were killed

³⁶ "The Two Americas." By Major Sir Rose Lambert Price, Bart., F.R.G.S. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

³⁷ "Victoria Year-Book for 1875." By Henry Heylin Hayter. Melbourne: Ferris. 1876.

³⁸ "Railways of New South Wales: Report on their Construction and Working from 1872 to 1875 inclusive." By John Rae, A.M. Sydney: Thomas Richards. 1876.

from causes beyond their own control. The passenger traffic is said to be much less remunerative than the goods, but the Commissioner says, "Now that we have reached the tableland, and can construct our railways at £7000 instead of an average of £16,500 per mile, I consider that a reduction of the fares on the cheap lines would give satisfaction to the public and probably not diminish the receipts." The competition on the Victorian border is mentioned as a further reason for a reduction of fares.

The Indian Government is doing well in publishing what it calls "Indian Meteorological Memoirs."³⁹ This work is intended as a vehicle for the publication of such portions of work of the Indian Meteorological Department as do not form part of the regular annual report on the meteorology of India. It is printed in a somewhat magnificent quarto form, "with a view to the more convenient printing of tabular matter, and to the illustration of the memoir by suitable plates."

We have had occasion before to call attention to the excellent economical and commercial statistics issued by the Italian Government, and we have now before us some characteristic specimens of them in the "Report on the Progress of Italian Shipping in Foreign Ports,"⁴⁰ from 1869-74, and the "Report on the Shipping in the Home Ports"⁴¹ for 1875. The latter report contains in a condensed, and, of course, arithmetical, form a quantity of subsidiary information on such matters as the passenger traffic in the chief ports, the fishing in the chief seas, shipbuilding and shipwrecks throughout the year. In this report the ships of almost all nations figure, as in the other report do the harbours of almost all nations. Thirty-three harbours in all are included in that report, which, in fact, takes up, as best it can, the narrative which was accidentally suspended at the end of the year 1868.

Debrett's "Peerage and Baronetage, Titles of Courtesy, and the Knighthage,"⁴² to which is added "much information respecting the immediate family connections of the peers and baronets," speaks for itself, and fulfils the expectations which its title raises. It is a very compact and convenient work, and an excellent and inexpensive book of reference on the strangely artificial topics on which it will be consulted.

³⁹ "Indian Meteorological Memoirs: Being Occasional Discussions and Compilations of Meteorological Data relating to India and the Neighbouring Countries." Published under the direction of Henry F. Blandford. Calcutta. 1876.

⁴⁰ "Movimento della Navigazione Italiana nei Porti Esteri." Anni dal 1869 al 1874. Roma. 1876.

⁴¹ "Navigazione nei Porti del Regno." Anno 1875. Roma. 1877.

⁴² "Debrett's Illustrated Peerage and Baronetage, Titles of Courtesy, and the Knighthage." London: Dean & Son. 1877.

SCIENCE.

PHYSICISTS in this country and elsewhere will welcome the appearance of the second part of Professor Pickering's "Physical Manipulation,"¹ which is thus completed. Although it will be found inexpedient, if not impossible, to adopt *in extenso* in one laboratory the course of instruction in practical physics followed in another, in consequence of the difference in students' requirements, and in consequence, also, of the difference in space, instruments, and means at the teacher's disposal; nevertheless, a book like Professor Pickering's, which gives details of the practical operations performed by the students in his laboratory, is replete with valuable information and suggestions to those who are endeavouring to systematise for their own pupils a course of practical physics.

The original scope of the work has in the second part been considerably enlarged. It is now made to include, not only physics proper, but several kindred branches, and aims at describing the principle methods of experiment with which every physicist ought to be familiar. For instance, there is a section on the physical problems involved in mechanical engineering, and another on astronomy. The author is of opinion that the laboratory method may be employed to teach astronomy as successfully as chemistry or physics. To this subject, as many as fifty pages are devoted, the most important instruments being described and their use explained. There are also sections on meteorological instruments and observations, and on lantern projections, the latter intended especially for those who have to lecture to large audiences.

In the first volume, after an extremely valuable introduction relating to measurements generally, and the graphical method of co-ordinating the results of experiment, the author disposes of the subjects mechanics, hydromechanics, acoustics, and optics. In the second volume, in addition to the sections of astronomy, &c., above mentioned, there are others in which the laboratory experiments connected with magnetism, electricity, and heat are treated. In the chapter on magnetism we find first of all a number of merely qualitative experiments described, such as the testing of the repulsion of similar and attraction of dissimilar poles of a magnet, the methods of touch for magnetising steel bars, &c. We notice here that what most writers call "separate touch," Professor Pickering speaks of as "single touch," the method, namely, in which a steel bar is magnetised by being rubbed from the centre towards the two ends by the opposite poles of two similar magnets. In reference to the process of magnetising a steel bar by

¹ "Elements of Physical Manipulation." By Edward C. Pickering, Thayer Professor of Physics in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Part II. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

the voltaic current, the information given is vague and insufficient. What a student wants to know is, What kind of magnetising helix, and what strength of current he is to use,—whether the current is to be maintained for a long or a short time,—whether it should be preferably of high tension? &c. But no help is given on these points. Among the more interesting operations described on this subject is one for finding the distribution of induced magnetism in an iron bar by means of induction currents produced in a thin coil of wire enveloping the bar, and another for the investigation of the magnetic field due to a circular current.

Later on in the volume, in the section on meteorology, we come to the operations required for determining the elements of the earth's magnetism, declination, dip, and horizontal face (by the method of vibration and deflection). As a rule, the directions given are lucid enough, and explain themselves; nothing could be better. But on reading over the paragraphs on magnetic dip, we could not help noticing a strange confusion in the reasons stated for making certain "correction" observations. The dip of the needle is the angle its magnetic axis makes with the horizon when it swings in the plane of the magnetic meridian. But the dip thus measured will be subject to error (1.) if the axis of suspension of the needle do not pass accurately through its centre of gravity, (2.) if the magnetic axis of the needle do not coincide with its axis of figure, and (3.) if the line of zeros on the vertical circle be not horizontal. According to the instructions given, the first error is eliminated by turning the circle round through 180° , *when the needle turns over so that the other side is uppermost*. The smallest consideration will show that this is nonsense. The error is really got rid of by reversing the magnetism of the needle, making the end that was south, north, and *vice versa*. Again, the book says, to eliminate the incorrect position of the magnetic axis, the magnetism is reversed. Here again is confusion, as, to counteract the error from this cause, the needle is merely reversed on its bearings, so that the side of it that faced the east now faces the west. There is a similar jumble with regard to the third correction mentioned above. It would be absurd, however, in face of the admirable character of the book as a whole, to lay much stress on such defects as these. A little transposition would make all right, and the requisite transpositions will doubtless be effected in the next edition.

We should have been glad to see more space allotted to the subject of electricity. Such matters as electrolysis, the voltameter, the resistances of liquids, the sine-galvanometer, and torsion balance deserved larger consideration. We may observe here that we object to the Yankee spelling of Weber with a V.

In an Appendix at the end of the book are some very useful tables of constants. One of them gives the more important properties of the metals,—such as their atomic weight, specific gravity, modulus of elasticity, hardness, specific heat, point of fusion, coefficient of expansion, thermal and electrical conductivity, thermo-electrical constant and refractive index; all arranged so as to be seen at a glance. In

another Appendix are a number of practical suggestions and information relating to the fitting up of a physical laboratory; the selection of rooms, an arrangement of tables, cost of appliances, &c. ; also a list of books of reference.

"The Applications of Physical Forces,"² translated from the French of Guillemin by Mrs. Norman Lockyer, is a book which we can heartily recommend, both on account of the width and soundness of its contents, and also because of the excellence of its print, its illustrations, and external appearance. It is intended to be complementary to the former work by M. Guillemin, "The Forces of Nature," also translated by Mrs. Lockyer. The style is easy and explanatory, and great pains have been taken by the editor to give in all cases the most recent improvements, both in methods and instruments, independently of the French original. In the case of lighthouse appliances, for instance, we find described the latest forms which have been adopted of lenses and reflecting prisms, Serrin's regulator for the electric lamp, and the newest type of Gramme's magneto-electric machine for generating electricity for lighthouse purposes. The chapters on the telegraph give a very fair account of the methods of telegraphy at present in use, without going into minute details and technicalities; while that on musical instruments will be found of especial interest.

Although our literature in the domain of theoretical electricity has in late years been enriched by the valuable works of Professors Clerk Maxwell, Sir William Thomson, and others, much that has been written is in such a form as to be beyond the reach of a great number of students. The want of a book capable of conveying to a student devoid of any advanced mathematical knowledge an adequate notion of the theory of electricity as understood nowadays has been long felt, and this want Mr. Cumming's book³ goes far to supply. Teachers and students alike will appreciate the facilities thus put into their hands. There are no difficult mathematics to surmount; although a large proportion of the propositions involve the doctrine of limits, the notation of the Calculus has been avoided. The notion of electrical potential is always found by beginners a difficult one to grasp, partly because it involves a mode of regarding the action of electrical forces to which they are not accustomed, and partly because it may sometimes be employed synonymously with terms which have been long in use. It is here first developed in relation to gravitation forces, and is afterwards applied to electrical forces. With regard to the famous dispute between the adherents of the chemical and contact theories of electrical separation, after pointing out distinctly what the dispute really turns upon, the author says, "So great is the intrinsic difficulty of these ex-

² "The Applications of Physical Forces." By Amédée Guillemin. Translated from the French by Mrs. Norman Lockyer, and Edited, with Additions and Notes, by J. Norman Lockyer, F.R.S. London: Macmillan & Co. 1877.

³ "An Introduction to the Theory of Electricity, with Numerous Examples." By Linnæus Cumming, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Assistant-Master at Rugby School. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

periments, that it is hardly too much to say that at present in no single instance has a difference of potential been directly shown between two bodies, independent of the gaseous medium between them, of the pressure with which they are brought together, and of the friction with which they are separated; the existence of such a difference of potential in every case lying at the foundation of Volta's theory." Chapter VIII. on magnetism and electro-magnetism is very important. The leading feature here, as elsewhere throughout the volume, is the use of the conception of lines of force, so largely employed by Faraday as a means of exhibiting without mathematical symbols the quantitative relations of a field of force. From this starting-point are investigated the mutual action of circuits carrying currents, coefficients of mutual and self-induction, induced currents produced by the movements of a conductor in a magnetic field, &c. The last chapter, on problems on magnetism, is illustrative of those which precede, and clears up a number of difficulties which probably will have occurred to the reader. The centimetre-gramme-second system of units is adopted throughout, the unit of force being consequently the dyne, and the unit of work the erg; and there is a useful chapter on the dimensions of the physical units. In one or two places (as on pages 30, 31, 48), we observe a loose use of the word *acceleration* in the sense of *force*. This should be corrected in a new edition. A scientific man has in these days no excuse for using the term *force* in any than its strictly proper sense, nor for confounding any other term with it.

Two of the series of "Lectures to Science Teachers" at South Kensington during the last summer, some of which we have already noticed, were delivered by Professor Stokes.⁴ Their subjects are "The Absorption of Light and the Colours of Natural Bodies," and "Fluorescence." No one is better fitted to discourse on these subjects than Professor Stokes, whose researches have been so intimately connected with them; and in this instance the happy combination of clearness of style and simplicity of illustration makes the lectures quite a treat to read. It is well pointed out that the colour of a body as seen by reflected light is due, in the bulk of cases, to absorption, and not to reflection directly. But sometimes (*e.g.*, in the case of gold or copper) there is in the act of reflection a preferential selection of one kind of light rather than another. Certain of the aniline colours also show the coloured reflection, appearing by transmitted light of a colour quite different from that seen by reflection.

A lecture on the history of "Geodetic Measurements,"⁵ by M. Sadebeck, forms one of the useful collection of popular lectures on scientific subjects edited by Virchow and Von Holtzendorff. The history of the attempts which have been made to determine the size

⁴ "Science Lectures at South Kensington." "The Absorption of Light and the Colours of Natural Bodies." "Fluorescence." By Professor Stokes, F.R.S. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

⁵ "Entwicklungsgang der Gradmessungs-Arbeiten." Von M. Sadebeck. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1876.

and form of the earth is traced from the time of Willebrod Snell's measurements to the latest achievements of the Geodetic Institute of Berlin. Snell (1617), who is probably better known as the discoverer of the law of simple refraction of light, was the first to employ the method of triangulation, but he solved his triangles as plane and not as spherical triangles. Interesting accounts are given of the expeditions sent out, at the instance of the French Academy, to Peru and Lapland (in 1735), to measure meridian arcs with the object of determining the earth's form, and of the numerous measurements made subsequently by various Governments for the same purpose. From the latest determinations, it appears that the earth, independently of the irregularities of its surface due to mountains and valleys, cannot be regarded as an exact oblate spheroid, nor is it an ellipsoid with three unequal axes. Bessel long ago expressed the opinion that even if the earth contained no dry land on its surface, but were entirely covered with a motionless sea, its surface would not be perfectly regular in form. Much more ideal, then, is a regular form under the actual combinations of continent and sea. The author strongly urges the importance of an international European system of measures, and incidentally remarks with regard to the toise of Bessel, which was made in Paris by Fortin in 1823, and compared by Arago with the toise of Peru, that it is probably the most exact natural standard in existence, doubts having been cast on the perfectness of the French normal metre (*mètre des Archives*). The pamphlet is accompanied by a map showing the systems of triangulation for survey, and for the measurements of arcs, carried out by the Geodetic Institute of Berlin.

"Aerial Navigation"⁶ was written by the late Mr. Charles Blachford Mansfield in 1851. Its object is the strictly scientific one of determining the conditions under which the practical navigation of the air may be realised. Unfortunately it was left by its author in an unfinished state, and this is one of the reasons why its publication has been deferred so long. Its appearance at the present time is justified by the editor, partly on the ground that no publication issued since the author's death has taken the place which this volume was intended to occupy, and partly because during the same interval "events of high gravity in the world's history have shown that the question of aerial navigation may be one of life and death to a nation; for we have seen, what Charles Mansfield did not, France governed through balloons from besieged Paris, and a dictator who refused to despair of his country cross the air over the heads of hostile armies."

The first part of the volume consists of a discussion of what have already been effected by others towards overcoming the difficulties which must be met with in realising any practical plan for the navigation of the air. In the second part, the author gives his own

⁶ "Aerial Navigation." By the late Charles Blachford Mansfield, M.A. Edited by his Brother, Robert Blachford Mansfield, B.A., with a Preface by J. M. Ludlow. London: Macmillan & Co. 1877.

views, which are always ingenious, though sometimes impracticable. He is full of enthusiasm, and thoroughly believes in the future of aerial navigation; that a time will come when, by associations and other means, the necessarily expensive preliminary experiments shall have been made; when the navigation of the air by air-craft (as he calls them) will be as common as the navigation of the sea by steamships now is; when we shall have our daily mail service by air to America, and our weekly service to Australia and New Zealand!

He discusses at length the form to give the air-craft, in order that it may most easily cleave its way through the opposing air, and remarks how strange it is that scientific men should have been so long contented, as they have for the most part been, with assuming that aerial propulsion is impossible, not only without making any attempts to demonstrate that it is so, but without trying or quoting a single experiment at all applicable to the purpose upon the most important condition of the problem, viz., the resistance of the air. The form of the vessel proposed somewhat resembles an elongated prolate spheroid, with slightly pointed ends. There must be at least two vessels, one to contain the buoyant gas (hydrogen), the other slung below in a peculiar manner for the accommodation of the propelling machinery and passengers. The mode of slinging is important, since it must be such that the man-vessel may remain always—whether at rest or in motion—in a horizontal position. Change of level will be effected, not by the wasteful means resorted to in balloons, where ballast is thrown out for ascent, and gas allowed to escape for descent, but by a sort of horizontal rudder, which will, when the vessel is maintaining its level, meet the air edgewise, but can be fitted with its forward edge up or down, according as the craft is required to fall or rise. The book terminates in the middle of one of its most important chapters, that which treats of the mode of propulsion and the propelling power. But although we have not the author's complete views on this part of his subject, we are not left without many valuable suggestions, one or two of which we may mention. Too enumerate all would occupy too much space. If an engine is to be employed, steam (*i.e.*, water) need not be the working substance. There are other substances which, in respect of boiling-point, capacity for heat, &c., would be preferable. For fuel, a liquid hydrocarbon is proposed, and perhaps the reaction principle of the sky-rocket might be taken advantage of as a means of propulsion.

Hopeful and enthusiastic as this book is (and it will repay perusal), we must bear in mind that the author never made any experiments on the subject himself, and confesses that he never was in a balloon in his life. It suggests and proposes only; but to the air-craft engineer of the future its suggestions will be of no small value.

“Astronomical Myths,”⁷ by Mr. J. F. Blake, is not a mere transla-

⁷ “Astronomical Myths.” Based on Flammarion's, “History of the Heavens.” By John F. Blake. London: Macmillan & Co. 1877.

tion of the French work by Flammarion. The form in which it was originally presented to the French public has been entirely changed, and much additional matter has been incorporated. Mr. Blake has thus succeeded in producing a very readable and attractive book. It is impossible to open it at any page without coming upon much that is quaint, and to most readers new, relating to ancient ideas about our globe and the nature and structure of the heavens. The "celestial harmony," for instance, was in ancient times understood not as a mere harmonious motion of the planets, but as a real concert, and the intervals between the notes sounded by the different planets were actually calculated. Plato fancied, or at any rate taught, that each sphere carried a siren. Cicero thought it most natural that the notes of the nearest and most distant should be exactly an octave apart. True, no one has ever heard this harmony, but that is because our ears are accustomed to it from our birth, so that having nothing different to compare it with, we cannot perceive it. One of the most interesting chapters is that on the Pleiades. According to Mr. Blake, the Pleiades have been more mixed up with the early history of astronomy, and have made more marks on the history of past nations, than any other celestial object except the sun and moon. They form part of the constellation Taurus, and being near the equator, are visible to observers in both hemispheres. The chief details respecting the history of the Pleiades have been obtained from a work by Mr. R. G. Haliburton entitled "New Materials for the History of Man." A New Year's day connected with and determined by the Pleiades appears to be one of the most universal of all customs. We find it among the Australians and the Society Islanders of the present day. According to Hesiod, the Greeks commenced their winter season by the setting of the Pleiades in the morning, and their summer season by their rising at the same time. Everywhere the festival of the Pleiades' culmination at midnight was connected with the memory of the dead. In Peru at this season the tombs of relatives were visited, and food and drink left in them. Similar practices were observed by the Fiji and Society Islanders, in India and Ceylon, and among the ancient Egyptians. "With the Druids the 1st of November was a day full of mystery. . . . The sacred fires were extinguished, and a primitive night reigned throughout the land. The relics of Druidism still remain among us, for in our calendar we still find November 1 as All Saints' Day, and in the pre-Reformation calendars we find October 31 as All Hallows' and November 2 as All Souls' Day, indicating a three days' festival of the dead, commencing in the evening, and originally regulated by the Pleiades—an emphatic testimony how much astronomy has been mixed up with the rites and customs even of the English of to-day. In France the Parisians at this festival repair to the cemeteries and lunch at the graves of their ancestors." The history of the development of astronomical systems is briefly but clearly traced. Before the time of Copernicus there were many modifications of Ptolemy's system, but all were based on the principle of the earth being the immovable centre of the universe. Although Copernicus

made the earth and other planets revolve round the sun, he did not give up the eccentrics and epicycles of Ptolemy for the explanation of the irregular motions of the planets. These were finally swept away by Kepler and Newton. We have alluded to a few points only of this book, every chapter of which is worthy of attentive reading. It has the advantage that any chapter may be read by itself independently of the rest.

We have before us the third part of "Weisbach's Ingenieur,"⁸ which has now reached the sixth edition. This part contains formulæ, rules and tables connected with theoretical mechanics and hydro-mechanics, compressed into such a form as to be most useful to the mechanic, architect, and engineer. It is not, however, a mere collection of numbers and tables, but claims to be, to some extent at least, a text-book of the subjects treated. It appears to be a trustworthy compilation of its kind, and the fact that the names of Professor Reuleaux, Director of the Gewerbe Academy of Berlin, and Professor Querfurth of the Polytechnic of Brunswick, are associated in this edition, is a voucher for its excellence.

Mr. Piddington's work on the "Law of Storms"⁹ appears to be as popular as ever, and has now reached its sixth edition. Although not officially recognised by the Admiralty, it is largely used by the navigating officers in the Royal Navy; but it is in the merchant-service that its merits are most widely known. Mr. Piddington's style is such as to be intelligible to the least instructed (scientifically) of navigators. As no special preface accompanies this edition, and we have not the fifth edition by us, we are unable to say how far it is an advance upon its predecessors.

Major Ross's "Pyrology"¹⁰ is a handsome quarto, giving a well-arranged and exhaustive exposition of the nature and method of blow-pipe analysis. The author has himself done a large amount of original work in this department of inquiry, and we have no doubt his book will prove a valuable aid to the chemical and mining analyst. In his preface he rudely assaults (with reason) the atomic theory, and abuses (without reason) the study of mathematics.

The third edition of Mr. Sutton's "Volumetric Analysis"¹¹ maintains the high character of the previous edition. While the whole book has been carefully revised, the most important chapters, as, for instance, those on gas analysis, and the analysis of potash waters and sewage, have been considerably expanded, so as to include the most recent methods adopted.

⁸ "Weisbach's Ingenieur." Sechste, völlig umgearbeitete Auflage, unter Mitwirkung von F. Reuleaux, herausgegeben von G. Querfurth. Dritte Abtheilung. Braunschweig: Vieweg & Sohn. 1877.

⁹ "The Sailor's Hornbook for the Law of Storms." By Henry Piddington, President of the Marine Courts, Calcutta. London: Norgate. 1876.

¹⁰ "Pyrology; or, Fire Chemistry." By William Alexander Ross, lately a Major in the Royal Artillery. London: Spon. 1875.

¹¹ "A Systematic Handbook of Volumetric Analysis." By Francis Sutton, F.C.S. Third Edition. London: Churchill. 1876.

The first aim of a geological student is to understand the structure of the country. Long before he knows the name of a fossil or the sequence of the formations, his imagination and wonder are roused by the sight of a geological map, and instruction in the right way to make such a map is usually his first geological lesson. The science teachers of Britain have fallen on happy times, when the Director of the Geological Survey of Scotland tells them in a pamphlet of sixty-one pages the chief mysteries of his craft.¹² Every one who would make geological observations in the field must either have a good topographical map, or make one. And though an azimuth compass will suffice for making the topographical map in a rough way, the student is also advised to provide himself with a hammer, a lens, clinometer for measuring the dip, and notebook and pencils for memoranda, while he may have at hand for evening use a blowpipe box for testing minerals, a rock-slicing machine for making sections of igneous rocks, and a microscope for examining their structure. First, preliminary traverses are made along the coast, up the beds of streams, and the strike and dip of the rocks forming hills are examined from the chief elevations. This determines whether the beds are granite, basalt, clays, shales, or sandstones; settles the direction in which they lie on each other, and probably determines their geological age. For the mineral character is usually settled by a knife, lens, or bottle of weak acid; and the relative age is commonly found out by noticing the common fossils. The detailed survey is then made by tracing the outcrop of each formation, which is marked on a map in the places where it can be seen; and afterwards these isolated patches of sections are connected together by lines which show how each bed is known or inferred to extend over the surface of the land. All the elementary geological knowledge necessary for making geological maps and sections is also clearly explained by the author, whose little book ought to become a pocket companion for every tourist who has leisure to be interested in the land on which he travels, while it is fitted by its clearness to become a first primer for every school in which geology can be taught practically by excursions in the field.

"The Succession of Life on the Earth"¹³ lends itself easily to popular exposition, and in these three lectures Professor Williamson gives a simple sketch of the characteristic features of life which covered the earth during the three great geological periods called primary, secondary, and tertiary. The language used is not always polished, and there is but little art in the construction of the lectures, which are addressed to an unlearned audience. But the subject is treated in a

¹² "Science Lectures at South Kensington: Outlines of Field Geology." By Professor Geikie, LL.D., F.R.S. With illustrations. London: Macmillan & Co. 1876.

¹³ "Manchester Science Lectures for the People." Eighth Series. 1876-77. "The Succession of Life on the Earth." Three Lectures by Professor W. C. Williamson, F.R.S., delivered in the Association Hall, Manchester, October 1876. With illustrations. London: Macmillan & Co. 1877.

way more than usually philosophical, especially in its bearings on the doctrine of evolution. Professor Williamson is an evolutionist, but at the same time a scientific man, and therefore does not accept the derivation of existing life from a fossilised ancestry as a necessary matter of faith, but as a doctrine which must be demonstrated in all its details, like any other scientific doctrine, before it can be permitted to colour his interpretation of nature. Attention is drawn to the remarkable way in which most of the groups of life first appear in the rocks, represented by highly complex types, and to the fact that most of the modifications which are commonly supposed to demonstrate evolution indicate the withering away of useless parts, and not the formation of new structures.

It may perhaps be a mootpoint whether "Alice in Wonderland" or small doses of elementary geology is the better mental food for children in the nursery, and it is not unlikely that a child's chief business is not to learn but to grow. The question, however, is to be tested practically, for "The Puzzle of Life"¹⁴ is geology translated into the language of children five or six years old. The chapters are called the framework of the puzzle—the vegetable part, the animal part, the human part, and conclusion. The puzzle is that bones of animals and other fossils exist in the earth, and the book is a successful attempt to explain the simplest facts of geology and of the succession of life on the earth to the infantile mind. The book might profit by some revision both of the explanations and of the illustrations. Thus the pterodactyle is drawn with five fingers instead of four; the paddles of the ichthyosaurus are unlike the bones in any specimen in existence; and the well-known Ammonites Humphresianus, from the inferior oolite, should not have been included among the diagrams of chalk fossils.

No amount of civilisation appears to diminish the hunter instincts inherited from prehistoric times. And though the story has been often told of the wonderful sport of Northern India, sportsmen and others will read with interest Captain Baldwin's account of the large and small game which fell to his gun in Bengal and the North-West Provinces.¹⁵ The book is no mere account of exciting chase, but gives a vivid idea of such habits and characteristics of the animals as the experience of the hunter enables him to record. He commences with the tiger. We learn that a tiger preys chiefly on bullocks and buffaloes; that it has been known to leap a ravine with a bullock in its mouth, and to drag a bullock out of an enclosure five feet high, over fields for a distance of two or three hundred yards. The tiger seizes

¹⁴ "The Puzzle of Life, and how it has been put together: A Short History of Vegetable and Animal Life upon the Earth from the Earliest Times, including an Account of Prehistoric Man, his Weapons, Tools, and Works." By Arthur Nicol, F.R.C.S. With Illustrations by Frederick Waddy. London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

¹⁵ "The Large and Small Game of Bengal and the North-Western Provinces of India." By Captain J. H. Baldwin, F.Z.S. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

an animal by the back of the neck, and never drinks its blood. Fights take place in the swampy forests between tigers and various other animals; sometimes they are killed by packs of wild dogs; occasionally the bear falls a victim to the tiger, and in one case a wild boar and a tiger were both found dead close by the scene of battle. All the large wild mammals and game birds of India are treated in succession, and the author gives his own experience of them, with some notes from his friends, with a view to enabling the hunter fresh from England to make the most of his chances when they come.

When an author has a more ready command of ideas than of facts, and considers a statement of his conclusions more important than the demonstration of new views, it is not likely that he will make discussion of scientific questions a contribution to science. The question "What is Vital Force?"¹⁶ may be a fruitful source of investigation for some time to come, but it will probably be treated in a different way to that adopted by Mr. Battye. First, the author gives an abstract of the book, which is called an introduction, and then follows the book itself. The part called vital physics treats of almost everything except questions concerning life, but chiefly of the universe in general, which we are assured is built up of three entities, one ponderable, which is matter, and two imponderable, which penetrate matter and interpenetrate each other. One of these, called "the attractive fluid," appears to be more familiar to us as gravitation; the other force, named repulsion, is apparently solar energy and the forms of force into which it is convertible. Every atom of matter is coated with one of these fluids externally and contains the other internally, but as the same force is not always external in the same atoms, and varies in amount in different substances, it follows, according to the author, that perpetual motion is produced in the heavenly bodies and constant change in matter and animated nature. Then follows a chapter on chemical affinities, in which the same ideas form the theme upon which the words are variations. The second part of the book is designed to elucidate animal morphology and differentiation. The grand idea here seems to be, that while vegetables consist of binary membranes, animals consist of tripartite membranes. Thus a sponge is said to consist of a silicon coat (*sic*), a very low sarcode or jelly, and an undetected tissue existing in the jelly. From which it is obvious, according to the author's definition, that a sponge is an animal. This undetected tissue is probably discovered by some such membrane as that which accounts for a defect of reasoning power in the author. Animals differ from each other in the number of membranes of which they consist. Thus mammalia are formed of ten tripartite membranes. These are the gastro-intestinal, the broncho-pleural, the genito-urinary,

¹⁶ "What is Vital Force? or, A Short and Comprehensive Sketch, including Vital Physics, Animal Morphology and Epidemics; to which is added an Appendix upon Geology: Is the Detrital Theory of Geology Tenable?" By Richard Fawcett Battye. London: Trübner & Co. 1877.

the mammary, the vascular, the lacto-lymphatic, the ganglionic, the locomotive, the integument, and the cerebro-spinal membrane. And then the senses are treated of, to the number of seven. The author now makes a rapid transition to vital force as affecting large areas, and thus lands himself in the third part of the book, called epidemics. A good deal of space seems appropriately given to the things which do not cause epidemics, and to the history of epidemics, from which it is concluded that epidemics go in periods of 640 years, which is also stated to be the period of the cycle of the magnetic pole. Epidemic diseases are supposed to have a regular course, being at first infectious, and then becoming hereditary. A good deal of the supposed change of type of disease is accounted for on the hypothesis that the force of the heart's action is diminishing. And given a few epidemics, the author combines them together so as to form new diseases; thus, syphilis is a hybrid between leprosy and the plague. Epidemics occupy about half of the book, and through those pages a good deal of curious and interesting information will be found scattered. The Appendix is written to show that the commonly accepted origin of the geological strata can no longer be held. If the author had been more familiar with geology, he would have discovered that his difficulties rest on misconceptions concerning geological truths.

In Heidelberg, during the winter sessions, courses of public lectures have long been delivered to ladies by several of the Professors. One of the most interesting of these, by Professor Heule, treating of anthropology, which was repeated during the years 1847-52, is now published¹⁷ in a revised form. The course comprises six lectures. In the first lecture the various movements of the body are explained; the action of the muscles and nerves concerned in dancing, walking, piano-playing, &c., is well described. He remarks upon the slowness with which man learns to use his limbs as compared with the young of other animals, and regards it as a natural consequence of the complexity of motions which the same muscles have by various combinations to be educated to produce. The second lecture is devoted to faith and materialism. Belief is shown to depend on the evidence of our senses, which create sound, colour, size, and form,—the consciousness of all external things being but physiological functions of the body. The third lecture is the natural history of respiration. In this the nature of sighing is dwelt upon. The fourth lecture treats of the physiology of the emotions. Emotion is defined to be a consciousness of excited sensations causing sympathetic motions. The fifth lecture, entitled "Taste and Conscience," treats of the freedom of the will, the religious and social feelings and the reasoning powers. The last lecture is upon temperaments, and is to a great extent historical.

In the present number of the series of popular scientific pamphlets,

¹⁷ "Anthropologische Vorträge." Von J. Heule. Erster Heft. Braunschweig: Vieweg & Sohn. 1876.

Dr. Münter¹⁸ discourses in an agreeable way upon the mollusca, chiefly dwelling upon their organs, habits, and the practical ways in which man is brought in contact with them. Dr. Münter is not one of those who accept the Darwinian hypothesis, which he compares to a *fata morgana*, and regards the evidence from the geological formations as antagonistic to that doctrine both in the gasteropoda and among the bivalves; so many of the genera which abound in existing seas having survived from a remote antiquity.

The International Congress of Archæologists, held last September in Budapesth, is reported in a pamphlet of some sixty-three pages.¹⁹ A list of the papers read includes one on the earliest traces of men in Hungary; on the character of the culture of the neolithic period in Eastern Europe; on the character of the bronze age; on the existence of a copper age; on the prehistoric iron age; on the anatomical and ethnological character of the Hungarian skull; on the antiquity of the ornaments found in Hungary. The remarks made by the various speakers on these subjects are briefly reported.

The present volume of Dr. Wigand's "Darwinism"²⁰ is almost entirely devoted to a discussion of the views of the various authors who have written on the subject. These include Wallace, Nageli, Askenasy, Sachs, Hofmeister, M. Wagner, Weisman, Kevner, Lubbock, Virchow, Preyer, G. Th. Fechner, Von Hartmann, F. A. Lange, G. Th. Bischoff, C. Vogt, E. Hackel, His, and Semper.

Microscopic study of the tissues of the body have now become a chief means of teaching physiology in its elementary stages. And Professor Frey's "Compendium of Histology"²¹ will do much to facilitate histological work in this country. Written in an interesting manner, it contains as much information as the ordinary student needs. The illustrations are good. The first lecture treats of the cell, and the second of the tissues and fluids. Then a lecture is devoted to each of the tissues, such as epidermis, connective tissue, bone, muscle, &c. The book is rendered into clear language.

Dr. Hubrecht continues his summary of the general anatomy of fishes. In the present number²² a well-digested description is given

¹⁸ "Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge." Herausgegeben von Rud. Virchow und Fr. von Holtzendorff. XI. Serie, Heft 260. "Ueber Muscheln, Schnecken und verwandte Weichtheire." Von Prof. Dr. J. Münter. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1876.

¹⁹ "Der Internationale Anthropologen- und Archäologen-Congress in Budapest, vom 4 bis 11 September 1876." Achte Versammlung, Aufzeichnungen von J. Mestorf. Hamburg: Otto Meissner. 1876.

²⁰ "Der Darwinismus und die Naturforschung Newtons und Cuviers. Beiträge zur Methodik der Naturforschung und der Speciesfrage." Von Dr. Albert Wigand. Dritter Band. Braunschweig: Vieweg & Sohn. 1877.

²¹ "Compendium of Histology." Twenty-four Lectures by Henry Frey, Professor. Translated from the German, by permission of the Author, by George R. Cutter, M.D. Illustrated by 208 Engravings on Wood. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

²² Dr. H. G. Bronn's "Klassen und Ordnungen des Thier-Reichs, wissen-

of that part of the skeleton of cartilaginous fishes which is comprised in the head and its appended arches. Gegenbaur's work has been chiefly drawn upon for the descriptive anatomy, and the numerous figures in the plates are all after that author.

The third volume of *Osiris*²³ opens with a chapter on the growth of man's knowledge of himself. The slow accumulation of knowledge is illustrated by the history of the art of healing. The second chapter treats of the position of man as a dweller on the earth; and the author contrasts man with the higher apes, not only from the points of view of physical structure, but in the more curious manifestations of the intellectual and emotional qualities. The third chapter is devoted to man as the ruler of the earth, and necessarily treats of the implements which he uses, and of the conditions of nature with which he has to contend. The fourth chapter explains the conditions under which nourishment is carried on, chiefly from the chemical point of view. The food taken by people engaged in different occupations is discussed at some length, and the cost of the several items of food, drink, and tobacco is given. This naturally leads up to consideration of the struggle for existence in its various practical forms, such as the tenure of land, and the domination of individuals or classes over the rest of the community. The fifth chapter elucidates the functions of the nervous system, commencing with the appreciation of such simple ideas as time, space, weight, form, size, and proceeding to the more complex functions such as are manifested in inventions, religious beliefs, and the development of sciences. The sixth chapter concerns language and its modification from parent stocks. The seventh chapter treats of the constructive arts as displayed in the dwellings and architectural monuments of the various races of mankind. The eighth chapter is occupied with selfishness and morals. From selfishness proceeds the qualities which concern self-preservation, such as bravery, cowardice, and rashness, of which examples are given from the lives of the most distinguished men. The ninth chapter gives an account of the principal races of men, dwelling upon the physical features in which they differ from each other. The tenth chapter is taken up with a detailed account of the Egyptians, tracing out their dynasties and religious belief, and the influence of the Nile on the people. The eleventh chapter in a similar way takes up the subject of the Semitic races. The last chapter gives the author's conclusions, upon which he builds up some aspirations as to the future of mankind.

The present quarter is remarkably poor in medical literature, both home and foreign. Dr. Dickenson has published a second edition of

schaftlich dargestellt in Wort und Bild." Fortgesetzt von Dr. A. A. W. Hubrecht. Sechster Band, I. Abtheilung, "Fische," 2 Lieferung. Leipzig und Heidelberg: C. F. Winter'sche Verlagshandlung. 1876.

²³ "Osiris. Weltgesetze in der Erdgeschichte." Von C. Radenhausen. Dritter Band. Hamburg: Otto Meissner. 1876.

his able treatise on "Albuminuria,"²⁴ and being a second edition, would have needed no notice from us did it not appear also in another connection—namely, as the second volume of a series of which the first, on "Diabetes," was recently reviewed in these columns. The volume on "Albuminuria" is enlarged and improved.

Dr. Aitken has also edited a little tractate on "Public Health,"²⁵ which was found among the papers of the late Dr. Parkes. This little book, his last work, cannot fail, as his editor says, to be of great interest and of great value—of great interest, as the last parting words of one whose life was devoted to the public good; of great value, as giving form and expression to the results of a prolonged, varied, and matured experience. The little book gives a general outline of the questions embraced by the legislative Acts of the country regarding public health, and the points of legislation and of sanitary duties which call for especial attention.

Dr. Cleland's treatise²⁶ is also a concise handbook issued by a high authority. Totally distinct from his directions in the seventh edition of "Quain's Anatomy," Dr. Cleland's little book is intended, not as a work on anatomical demonstration or on systematic anatomy, but rather as a guide to the student, who should study for himself. Dr. Cleland forcibly remarks that students fall into the too common error of looking upon dissections as mere illustrations for the statements of the text-book. By means of the present handbook it is hoped that he will rather cultivate his manipulative powers and his observation, comparing on his return home his own observations and notes made at the time with those of more experienced men as recorded in works of reference. With the object of such a treatise we most cordially agree; and written as it is by one of the most able of living anatomical teachers, we cannot doubt that the treatise will be found to be admirably adapted to its purpose.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

WE warmly welcome a new edition of Kemble's great work on the Anglo Saxons,¹ which has been out of print too long. It is a book which combines a labour and research more than German, with

²⁴ "Diseases of the Kidneys." In Three Parts. Part II. By W. Howship Dickenson. London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

²⁵ "Public Health." By E. A. Parkes, M.D. Revised by W. Aitken, M.D. London: Churchill. 1876.

²⁶ "A Directory for the Dissection of the Human Body." By J. Cleland, M.D. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

¹ "The Saxons in England." By J. M. Kemble, M.A., F.C.F.S., &c., &c. New Edition. Revised by W. de G. Birch, F.R.S.L. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch.

a clearness and attractiveness only too rarely met with in German works. Kemble was undoubtedly an enthusiast in respect of his subject, but only an enthusiast could have produced such a book. The second title of this work, "A History of the English Commonwealth till the Period of the Norman Conquest," is a curious misnomer. No part of the book can be called historical in the ordinary sense of the word. It is nothing else than a descriptive treatise of the most exhaustive kind on the early English institutions; indeed, it might be termed a collection of essays on the various institutions. Throughout the book the author shows himself thoroughly alive to the essential continuity of principle which prevails from the Anglo-Saxon period until to-day. The present issue is edited by Mr. Birch of the British Museum, who has limited his labours to the correction of typographical and other slight inaccuracies. Except the addition of an index, nothing more was needed, for the book keeps its place. All the more recent investigations have tended only to confirm Kemble's theories.

Captain Hozier has produced a very important and interesting work² under the title of "The Invasions of England." We have to quarrel *in limine* with its appellation, for most of these invasions were attempted in Ireland or Scotland. Captain Hozier, moreover, includes in his work several invasions that never took place. After making this little protest, we are glad to proceed by speaking highly of the work. The author gives a fair account of every invasion which has been made, attempted, or threatened; and, in a work on national defence, he is perfectly right in including invasions that were not effected. Indeed, we may say that the accounts of the contemplated invasions are the most valuable part of his work. The three great invasions—those of the Romans, the English, and the Normans—are, after all, old stories, and are, from the change of conditions, of little importance in discussing the question of a modern attack. Unless the Chinese are destined to swallow up Europe, no power is likely to desire to annex these islands. Of the other actual landings, those of Louis of France, of Queen Isabella, of William of Orange, and the attempts to restore the Stuarts, can hardly be said to deserve the name of invasions, because in each case the foreigner was invited and aided by a party in the country; while the lesser intrusions, as in Ireland in 1798, are not worth considering. But that great failure, the Armada, and the contemplated French invasions of 1744, 1779, and 1804-5 are of great importance in teaching us at once our weakness and our strength. In his conclusions and suggestions for the future, Captain Hozier is exceptionally moderate for a soldier. We think he over-estimates the danger of our wealth making us a temptation to a predatory power. We doubt if any European power is likely to make war for the sake of the money profit; and the experience of Germany since 1871 makes such a scheme even less likely than before. A reasonable and fair foreign policy is our best

² "The Invasions of England." By Captain H. M. Hozier. London: Macmillan & Co.

defence; our fleet must be the next. There can be little doubt that we are too niggardly in our expenditure on the means of defence, and that what we do spend is not always spent economically. The uniforms of some of our regiments, especially in the cavalry; the ludicrously extravagant and useless headgear of very many more; the hundred and fifty sinecures of £1000 a year in the army; the expense of transport of soldiers, whom on land at least it should cost little more to move than to keep stationary; the economies which might easily be made on these and many other points would pay for the conversion of our volunteers into a real army of defence—a pressing duty which has hitherto been conspicuously ignored by our authorities. But when we have introduced every possible economy, it will still be necessary to pay more in order to make ourselves secure, and our influence duly felt. We are far too easy on the subject of national defence. A common argument is that we pay as much for our forces as any of the great powers, and that we cannot do more. But it should be remembered that other nations pay a huge tax in their persons in addition to their money contributions. If this liability be estimated, it will be found that the Englishman's sacrifice for national security is poor beside that of any other European. If virtue governed the world, doubtless we should be right; but, as things are, it is certain that we shall have to do more, unless the great military powers find the strain too exhausting, and come over to our practice.

We have received a "Critical History"³ of the American War of Secession, by A. Mahan. London is apparently favoured with the first publication of this remarkable work, either from the author's regard for European opinion, or perhaps from a judicious respect for his own ears; for American warriors, great and small, are discussed in his work with a freedom and contemptuousness which may well cause a little irritation on the other side of the Atlantic. In taking up the volume, our first curiosity was to read the "Introductory Letter by Lieut.-General M. W. Smith," and we were a little disappointed to find a letter of less than a page, addressed by that gallant veteran from the United Service Club to "My dear Sirs," in which he points out that the perusal of the book "may lead its readers to think out the matter for themselves," and that "this may be a beneficial exercise of intellect with reference both to military men and civilians." Who "My dear Sirs" are, and why Lieut.-General M. W. Smith's brief and unimportant remarks to them should be so conspicuously announced, these are still unsettled points. An examination of the work itself leads us to the opinion that A. Mahan is probably an American, that he was in America during the war, that he is styled "Dr.," and that he is a civilian. And we must say with Ergasilus—

"Ut sæpe summa ingenia in occulto latent:
Hic qualis imperator nunc privatus est!"

³ "A Critical History of the late American War." By A. Mahan. With an Introductory Letter by Lieut.-General M. W. Smith. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

For indeed there appears to have been no moment in the war at which Dr. Mahan was not ready to end it in a few minutes with a quarter of the forces that were available. Earl Russell's achievements with the Channel Fleet are pale by the side of Dr. Mahan's operations on land. The illustrious strategist's opinions are as decided as it is possible to be. McClellan was either "a blind and self-willed imbecile" or a deliberate traitor: Grant's "ignorance and stupidity" are his only excuse for "a campaign conducted upon such a false principle, and in such a recklessly careless and presumptuous manner:" Sherman's neglect, &c., "involves not only a palpable blunder, but a mystery which the present generation will probably be wholly unable to solve." Every event and almost every actor in the war is criticised in this trenchant manner. And when we learn that during the whole war Dr. Mahan was constantly sending plans of campaigns to Washington, and that he once went there in person to urge his views, the loss of life and treasure seems to have been hardly too severe a punishment for the Northern States, which could tolerate the treachery and imbecility of a succession of villains, cowards, and impostors, when they had at call at any moment Dr. Mahan with his pockets full of plans for subjugating the South in less than no time at a merely nominal cost. This work is replete with apt historical illustrations, among which we find one that is to us both new and strange. At Austerlitz it appears that Napoleon had to send a certain order no less than three times to Marshal Sault (*sic*). "'Tell the Emperor,' was the reply, 'that I will obey his order, but not know.' When the right moment arrived the movement was made, and with such results that the Emperor, when he came up, thus addressed the Marshal, 'Marshal Sault, you are the greatest tactician of modern times.'" The Napoleonic ring about this speech is so like Dr. Mahan's own form of expression as to confirm his main idea in the present work, viz., that he greatly resembles Napoleon as a strategist. Among the defects of this work we would note dulness, conceit, a strong taste for calumny, and the absence of index and maps, which are of some importance in a book on strategy. Moreover, in a book crammed with facts and figures which generally tend to prove that some living man is either a coward or a traitor, it would have been well to give authorities occasionally. Dr. Mahan rarely or never gives a reference, unless to some chaplain's catchpenny book on the war. In one place he bases a calumnious story on something that a chaplain heard from a young man "on board a steamer from James River to Baltimore;" and in this, and this only, he reminds us of Dr. Liddon. We will conclude by observing, that if this book is worth anything, and if the Turks can secure Dr. Mahan's services, the Russians will never be able so much as to pay General Ignatieff's travelling expenses.

Miss Cooper's "History of England,"⁴ though much larger in bulk,

⁴ "The History of England." By Emily Cooper. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

is in no way superior in merit to the ordinary school history; and it is a mystery to us why it should be published when there is such a book as Mr. Franck Bright's in existence. It is simply one of the old-fashioned collections of battles, dates, &c., carefully sorted into reigns. An idea of the work may be gained from the fact that while Henry II. fills 26 pages, the long and very important reign of Henry III. occupies only 17 pages; while in more modern times 55 pages are assigned to the twenty-two years of James I., and only 68 pages to the sixty of George III.

We have received a third series of Miss Yonge's "Cameos from English History,"⁵ treating of the period of the Wars of the Roses. We approve of the principle on which these books are written, namely, that of attracting and fixing interest by a succession of great names or events, in preference to the old-fashioned annal system of reigns. The incidents or persons around whom the events are grouped in Miss Yonge's work are well selected. We think, however, that the history, though it proves careful study, is a little too full of names and occurrences to be quite what is desirable for young people, and the style is not very clear or easy. This extract affords a specimen of these two defects, the crowding of information and the long, intricate sentence:—"It (a chronicle) was by a man named Humfrey Brereton, an officer in the household of Lord Stanley, the husband of the Lady Margaret, mother to the Earl of Richmond, and describing how his master met the Lady Bessie, as the young Elizabeth Plantagenet was called, at a place appointed, and how she urged him piteously to assist her." The sentence is indeed ungrammatical as well as long; and we are astonished that the distinguished writer could have overlooked such a phrase as—"The King consulted them who they wished to have as regent." If Miss Yonge would resolutely shorten her sentences, suppress half of the facts and names, and add a few genealogical tables, a fourth series of "Cameos" would be one of the best of histories for the young.

Mr. Bisset has produced a history of the reign of Charles I., under the title of a "History of the Struggle for Parliamentary Government."⁶ The narrative is admirably clear, and the views are, on the whole, just, though we cannot but think that greater impartiality in form would have improved the work. Mr. Bisset is an ardent Parliamentarian, taking what we hold to be the right side. This, of course, involves opposition to the other party. At the same time, we think that a historical work cannot be too temperate in tone, however decided it may be in spirit. We would have the historian adopt towards a party which he reprobates the tone of a judge towards a convicted prisoner; not that of a prosecuting advocate. The Royalist side has, it is true, had more than its share of advocacy hitherto; and Mr. Bisset has some

⁵ "Cameos from English History." By the Author of the "Heir of Redclyffe." Third Series. London: Macmillan & Co.

⁶ "History of the Struggle for Parliamentary Government in England." By Andrew Bisset. London: Henry S. King & Co.

very hard things to say of Hume in particular, whose views are difficult of comprehension. The book ends rather too abruptly with the King's execution. Much occurred under the Protectorate which is of great importance in considering the institution of Parliament. Mr. Bisset does not throw very much new light on his subject, which, indeed, is hardly needed; he has, however, given a pleasing and useful addition to our literature.

We have received the concluding portion of Mr. Black's translation of Guizot's "History of France for the Young."⁷ The work in its complete form is brought down to 1789. It is a good book, and has been very well translated. It is liberally and excellently illustrated, is printed in very handsome form, and is supplied with an ample index, a boon for which we are always grateful.

We welcome from America a translation of Dr. V. Holst's first volume on the "Constitutional History of the United States."⁸ This is a most important work—one that will obtain a position not inferior to that of De Tocqueville. We shall say very little of it here, because we shall in all probability have to discuss it at greater length before long, but we hasten to say that it is a work of very high rank. It has the advantage of being written by a distinguished *neutral*. We purposely avoid the word *foreigner*, because this would include Englishmen; and we can hardly expect a really disinterested view of the history of the United States, at least of their early history, either from one of their own citizens or from one of our countrymen. Professor Von Holst has also had the practical advantage of a residence of five years in the States. The period discussed in the present volume comprises the history of the United States down to 1833, in other words, the great struggles anent slavery, federation, the tariff, and the right of secession, ending with Jackson's famous declaration and prophecy, "The Union must and shall be preserved." All these great questions are understood by Europeans even still less than by Americans of the present day, whose view extends but a very short distance into the past. We shall eagerly await the continuation of the work. For the present, we will only say that Dr. Von Holst is producing an admirable work on perhaps the most important political development in the world's history.

The first quarter of a popular "History of the United States,"⁹ by W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, has reached us. This is a very different book to that last discussed. It will, however, find its place and that a very large place, which it will fill usefully. The work is what it

⁷ "The History of France." By M. Guizot. Translated by Robert Black, M. A. London: Sampson Low & Co.

⁸ "The Constitutional and Political Histories of the United States." Vol. I. 1750-1833. By Dr. Von Holst, Professor at the University of Freiburg. Translated by J. J. Lalor and A. B. Mason. Chicago: Callaghan & Co. London: Trübner & Co.

⁹ "Popular History of the United States." By W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay. Illustrated. Vol. I. London: Sampson Low & Co.

claims to be—*popular*—an adjective which has now attained a definite and generally understood meaning. The first volume brings us down only to 1636; and as the work is announced as to be completed in four volumes, the subsequent history must be written on a smaller scale if the promise is to be kept. Mr. Bryant's name is a sufficient guarantee that the work will be well done. The present instalment is very readable. It is profusely and prettily illustrated. We have our own opinion on the value of aoristic imagery of historical events, and it is not favourable. It is, however, probable that such pictures attract many who otherwise would never read. Who has not in the circle of his acquaintance many persons who throughout the year read nothing in print except the daily paper, and occasionally a playbill or a *carte du jour*? And so, then, illustrations may have their efficient reason, and may justify their immense cost.

Our last-received contribution to American history is an oration¹⁰ on the battle of Harlem Plains, delivered by Mr. John Say to the New York Historical Society on the centenary of the combat. This great event, in which no less than eighty-seven men were killed on both sides, was not a Marathon, or a Leipzig, or a Waterloo; but it has affected Mr. Say at least as deeply as either of those events. If Mr. Say and many other American fourth-of-July orators would talk as well as the Continentals fought, it would be a gain to the world at large, but a heavy loss to the printers. On the other hand, had the Continentals fought as Mr. Say and his likes talk, the territory of the United States would now probably be either a British penal settlement, or a despotism under Mr. Gutierrez, Baron Munchausen, or perhaps Mr. John Say.

Another centenary (the seventh) is commemorated by Dr. F. Hoyer in his pamphlet "*Canossa und Venedig*."¹¹ This paper is published in the well-known series, "*Deutsche Zeit- und Streit-Fragen*." It is not quite so good as the general run of that series, because it is produced to order for a certain occasion, and that at a time when questions between the Empire and the Papacy are not likely to be calmly discussed in Germany. But it is a tolerably good sketch of one of the most extraordinary and most fruitful events in history.

Another paper in the same excellent series¹² treats of the position of the Flemish inhabitants of Belgium. It seems that the Belgian Government—under a German royal family, by the way, from Saxe-Coburg-Gotha—does everything to encourage and develop the French element in the population at the cost of the Flemish element, which is as much akin to the Germans "as left hand is to right." Therefore, "the German eagle, free from any desire for foreign territory, ought to

¹⁰ "The Battle of Harlem Plains: Oration before the New York Historical Society." By John Say. New York: Published by the Society.

¹¹ "*Canossa und Venedig*." Festschrift zur Canossa-Feier. Von Dr. F. Hoyer. Berlin: Carl Habel.

¹² "*Die Stellung der Niederdeutschen (Vlaamen) in Belgien*." Von Dr. jur. E. von Sagemann. Berlin: Carl Habel.

extend his protecting wing," &c. All this is very like the worst talk of the worst periods of Napoleonism. It would apply equally to the annexation of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Great Britain and her colonies, Switzerland, and parts of Austria and Russia. As coming from Germany at the present day, we do not like Dr. jur. Von. Sagemann's pamphlet.

Mr. Cartwright sends us a volume on the Jesuits,¹³ consisting of an enlarged revision of two recent articles in the "Quarterly Review." The reader must not seek here for a record of the acts of the famous Order; but he will find a calm and judicial survey of its constitution, and of the question as to the degree of fidelity with which the Jesuits have adhered to their professed principles. The author has avoided narrative, save where it was necessary for the justification of his views. As we have said, Mr. Cartwright writes in a calm and fair spirit. He regards the famous Society as being a dangerous element in the world of to-day. Its later tendency, especially by its last great achievement, the Vatican Council, has, he well says, been to change the Pope into a Pontifical Cæsar with the Jesuits as his Prætorian Guard; and he sees little hope for the future except in a revival of independent spirit in Roman Catholics, of which there is but too little sign at present.

The second volume of Marquardt's great work on the "Administration of the Romans"¹⁴ treats of the finances and the military system. The quantity of minute and searching labour which such a book implies is simply stupendous. It is obviously impossible to attempt to criticise such a work in our space; suffice it to say, that 300 pages full of matter are devoted to each of those important departments of government, and that the treatment of them is exhaustive, and at the same time admirably queer. This work forms part of the comprehensive "Handbuch der Römischen Alterthümer," written by Marquardt and Mommsen, a series which makes an epoch in our knowledge of the public and private life of the Romans.

Mr. Tozer has written a small treatise on ancient geography¹⁵ in the series of "Literature Primers" now being published under the editorship of Mr. J. R. Green. It appears to us to be a very good little sketch, which would be improved by the addition of maps. But we greatly wonder for what class such books as this, or as Mr. Peile's "Primer of Philology," are written.

We have received from Messrs. Longmans two later volumes of their "Epochs of Ancient History." The first, Mr. Curteis's "Rise of the Macedonia Empire,"¹⁶ is a spirited narrative of the lives of Philip and his world-renowned son Alexander, whose career probably made

¹³ "The Jesuits: Their Constitution and Teaching." By W. C. Cartwright, M.P. London: John Murray.

¹⁴ "Römische Staatsverwaltung." Von J. Marquardt. II. Band. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

¹⁵ "Classical Geography." By H. F. Tozer, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co.

¹⁶ "Rise of the Macedonian Empire." By A. M. Curteis. London: Longmans & Co.

possible, if it did not cause, the vast disasters inflicted on Europe in this century by Napoleon I. This book is furnished with several admirable maps. Mr. Beesly's account of what he well calls the revolutionary era of the Roman republic¹⁷ is less romantic in its subject, and is, without prejudice to the author, far harder reading. The half century which he describes, beginning with Tiberius Gracchus, and ending with the death of Sulla, comprises all the steps of the great change from the old republicanism which made Cæsarism possible a little later. That change is well narrated in his volume, the chief defect of which is that it is too brief.

The historians of the day are never more contented than when they are proving the excellence of those whom previous ages have regarded with execration. The volume under consideration,¹⁸ which is a development of the prize Hulsean Essay of 1874, treats of the edicts against the Christians during the reign of Diocletian; and we rise from its perusal with the opinion, not only that that Augustus was much abused, but that he leaned distinctly towards ritualistic Christianity, and would, had he lived among us, have filled a position similar to that of those High-Churchmen who approve of disestablishment. Every student of history has long known that the persecutions under Diocletian are notable only as occurring in times when religion was not held to be a subject for persecution; and that they are infinitesimal when compared with the discipline inflicted on Christians by Christians in modern times. Diocletian's wife and daughter at least inclined to Christianity, and many of the chiefs of his household professed that faith. He himself was neither intolerant nor bloodthirsty. It is, therefore, fair to assume that his edicts had political motives. His earlier edicts were milder than those issued half a century before by Valerian; and Mr. Mason shows some reason for supposing that the fourth edict was published by his colleague Maximian at a time when Diocletian was incapacitated by illness. We are glad to see that he has far less authority to show for his statement as to the compulsory defilement of Christian nuns, a story which we still regard as purely legendary. We cannot speak very favourably of this work. The period, with its two Augusti and two Cæsars, who generally change their names on their accession, is undoubtedly difficult of clear description; the author has, however, allowed himself an unnecessary amount of confusedness. There is, moreover, occasionally a regrettable flippancy in his style, the titles of the pages, for instance, being comparable to nothing but the paragraph headings of the "New York Herald." Mr. Mason's rendering of some pretty verses of Prudentius will recall to every reader the parody of Wordsworth in the "Rejected Addresses." As to minor faults, hypocrisy is about the last vice which we should

¹⁷ "The Gracchi, Marius, and Sulla." By A. H. Beesly. London: Longmans & Co.

¹⁸ "The Persecution of Diocletian." By Arthur James Mason, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & Co.

attribute to Louis XI. ; and "vol. ii. p. 490," is not a satisfactory mode of reference to Gibbon, whose work has met with considerable and deserved success, and has been reissued in more than one form.

Mr. Withrow, apparently an American clergyman, publishes a small volume on "The Catacombs of Rome,"¹⁹ of which we are bound to say that the illustrations form the more valuable part. As the book is intended for the general reader, this is not a very serious fault. The descriptions of the localities and of the paintings are fairly good, and the illustrations are ample. We are, however, disappointed to find the old exaggerations of the persecutions repeated ; and we are not better pleased when we come to that portion of the book which discusses the inscriptions. We have long thought that these early Christian epitaphs have been overrated. They are, indeed, better than many of those of later Christians. One does not find among them anything so clumsy as this (from Winchester College) : "Hic jacet A. B., in hac schola primus, in cœlo (ut speramus) non ultimus, quod pro Oxonio adiit anno — ;" or so ambiguous as an inscription at Diedenhofen (Thionville), which commemorates a gentleman who, when he died, "a emporté avec lui le triste souvenir de tous ses amis." But after all, the inscriptions of the Catacombs greatly resemble those of other cemeteries : there are a few that are simple and touching, and the rest are mainly conventionalisms and indifferent verse. Mr. Withrow disappoints us by his criticisms and by the doctrinal inferences which he draws. His remarks are almost all indiscriminately panegyrical. He is indeed unnecessarily severe on the faulty Latinity of some of the epitaphs. It is true that they err widely from the language of the classical writers ; but we should not be so much inclined to find fault with this, as to be thankful for the light thrown by these barbarisms on the spoken Latin, and especially on the transition from Latin to the almost uninflected French. Thus the frequent use of the accusative after all prepositions shows how that case usurped the functions of all the other oblique cases, and proves the theory that French nouns are generally descended from the accusative of the Latin ancestor. So, too, the occurrence of Greek inscriptions and of Latin inscriptions in Greek letters illustrates the history of the early Christians. The latter practice, it may be noted, is oddly paralleled among the German Jews, who not unfrequently write, and even print, German in the Hebrew character. Mr. Withrow's own Latin is not quite above suspicion. He is guilty occasionally of obvious miscopyings ; and, like *M. Jourdain*, he often fails to notice that fine but clear line which distinguishes Latin verse from Latin prose. He possesses a mysterious gift of seeing traces of Greek influence in the substitution of *filies* for *filiæ* ; and he refers us to Lucian's *Philopat. ad fine*. As, however, after a troublesome search, we found the passage in question nearer the beginning than the end of the dialogue, *ad* is perhaps a misprint

¹⁹ "The Catacombs of Rome." By the Rev. W. H. Withrow, M. A. London : Hodder & Stoughton.

for *ab*, and *ab fine* is intended to guide the investigator away from the latter part. In reading the chapter on the doctrinal teaching of the Catacombs, we are forced to renew our frequent complaint against clerical historians. Mr. Withrow remarks, *à propos* of an inscription to *Aurelia dulcissima filia*, that this not very uncommon adjective is "peculiarly appropriate to the Christian character." The most harmless phrases are declared to disprove this or the other doctrine of that dreadful Church of Rome; but if anything is made certain by the inscriptions, it is that the early Christians practised prayer for the dead. The author implies that the doctrine of the Trinity is to be found in the Catacombs; but there is no inscription which alludes to it until long after the Council of Nicæa; and a writer who styles himself *reverend* is open to grave animadversion when he attributes to Lucian (in the second century A.D.) the very clear mention of it—*ἴν' ἐκ τριῶν καὶ ἑξ ἑνὸς τρία*. It is universally admitted that the *Philopatris*, in which the passage occurs, was not written by Lucian, or indeed before the fourth century. The book, then, is not very impartial, and is not very scholarly; but it is, we believe, the first short work on the subject; and containing, as it does, a good description of the Catacombs, and very many inscriptions and sketches, it will be found a very acceptable volume by the general reader.

Professor Nichol of Glasgow University has published a series of "Chronological Tables of Ancient History,"²⁰ a companion to those of modern history, of which we recently had occasion to speak favourably. The present series appears to be in every way equal to its predecessor. Its fulness and clear arrangement will make it a most useful book of reference.

The latest volume²¹ of Mr. Lucas Collins's "Ancient Classics for English Readers" which we have seen is on Demosthenes, and is from the pen of Mr. Brodribb, so well known for his translation of Tacitus. The life and noble political career of the great orator are worthily narrated; the important speeches are analysed, and well-rendered extracts are given. The volume ends with a very lively chapter on the judicial system of Athens, which contains sketches of several striking cases. It is a charming book, which no one will easily lay aside until he has finished it.

Turning from Mr. Brodribb's book, we light with pleasure upon another work²² on a great classic, more ambitious indeed than the former, and possessing the same attracting charm of style. Professor Sellar has followed up his "Roman Poets of the Republic" with a volume on "Virgil," which is to be the harbinger of further essays on the

²⁰ "Tables of Ancient Literature and History." By John Nichol, LL.D. Glasgow: J. Maclehose.

²¹ "Demosthenes." By the Rev. W. J. Brodribb, M.A. Edinburgh: Blackwood & Son.

²² "The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age." By W. Y. Sellar, M.A. "Virgil." Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Augustan poets. It is not always without compunction that we venture to make mention in our limited space of important works of which we are unable to speak adequately. Our misgivings are, however, agreeably diminished when we can speak in unmingled commendation. And this we can do of Professor Sellar's work. It is not often that books on scholars' subjects are both scholarly and well written: too often one of these qualities ousts the other. The present generation has, however, produced many learned works which are pleasant to read, Mr. Sellar's, for instance, Mr. Jebb's, and Mr. Collins's "Ancient Classics;" and even the German savants now often write agreeably. Mr. Sellar begins with a sketch of the condition of poetry before and during the Augustan age; a description of Virgil's personality follows; and then *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Æneid* are amply discussed. The chapters on the relation of Virgil's poetry to that of Lucretius, and on the national character of the *Æneid*, are especially good. For originality, perhaps that portion of the work which treats of the *Æneid* as a poem of human life bears the palm. Not a little singular have been the changes in the estimate of Virgil at various periods, and especially the modern tendency to depreciate him. This latter tendency is doubtless caused, as the author points out, by the advances made in the knowledge of Greek literature, and by our increased interest in archaic antiquity—an interest which, we believe, is stimulated by the activity of this generation in matters of natural science. But however Virgil may rise or fall in the estimation of this or that age, as long as men are possessed by the idea of the unseen Power beyond; as long as they are charmed by the etherealised presentment of passions, deeds, and scenes which are not before the body's eye; as long as we are more pleased and inspired by the same fact in one form of words than in another, so long will Virgil hold a permanent place in the highest rank. Mr. Sellar's book will please and teach the deepest students of Virgil; it will no less interest those who read Virgil only as one among great men of letters.

From Italy we receive a volume of interesting essays²³ from Signor Alberto Mario, the husband of our distinguished countrywoman, Jessie White Mario. Its shorter papers are on Dante, the Napoleon portion of Michelet's History, and Campanella, a cleric who dared to think in the Italy of the sixteenth century. Two essays are devoted to the fair sex—one on female artists, the other a paper of remarkable interest, especially in the present day, on four Italian women who have filled professional chairs in the University of Bologna. The first two lived in the thirteenth century, and are but briefly mentioned. "Accorsa, figlia di quest' ultimo vi insegnava giurisprudenza; e Bettisia Gozzadini 'celeberrima, scrive il Sigonio citando un documento contemporaneo, creata dottore in Diritto nel 1236, vi insegnò pure giurisprudenza in mezzo all' ammirazione d' un affollatissimo uditorio . . . incomparabile decoro dell' Archiginnasio.'" Catterina Laura Bassi

²³ "Teste e Figure." *Studii Biografici* di Alberto Mario. Padova: Fratelli Salmin.

(1711–1778) and Maria Gaetana Agnesi (1718–1799) are described at greater length. Laura Bassi devoted herself to speculative philosophy. After a public dispute, she received the doctorate of Bologna in great ceremony in her twenty-first year, and was elected to the Chair of Philosophy in that University a few months later. Laura, we read, “penetrò molto addentro nella metafisica, ma gusto molto più la fisica moderna, et particolarmente l'inglese.” Vegetation, the origin of springs, the tides, light, colour, sound, astronomy, the Newtonian system, all were objects of her study. She married a doctor of medicine. Like our own Mrs. Somerville, her learning did not interfere with her duties as a wife. “Questo nuovo stato le accrebbe un nuovo merito senza punto violentarla, e senza nulla togliere al suo genio per le lettere . . . sostenne bravamente una numerosa figliuolanza, la provvide, la collucò, e seppe in tal maniera dedicarsi all' economia domestica, e alle diligenze di una provvida madre, che parve una semplice donna e volgare.” L'Agnesi at an early age became skilled in languages, in speculative sciences, and in geometry. A published work on the latter subject procured her the membership of the Bolognese Accademia delle Scienze at the age of thirty. A year later, her great work, the “Istituzioni Analitiche,” was published. It was soon translated into several languages, and speedily gave its author a European fame. In 1750 Pope Benedict XVI. appointed her to the honorary Chair of Mathematics at Bologna, and wrote, “che ella non deve ringraziar noi, ma che noi dobbiamo ringraziar lei.” At an early age L'Agnesi withdrew from the world, devoting herself, firstly, to the education of a young brother, and giving up the remainder of her long life to the alleviation of the sufferings of the poor. Cattaneo, patriot and philosopher, and the author's friend, and Ugo Foscolo are the subjects of two very interesting essays. We have, however, derived most pleasure from a sketch of Scipione de' Ricci, the Jansenist Bishop of Pistoia at the end of the last century; whose end, like that of Galileo, affords a terrible example of the cruelty with which Roman despotism crushes, not merely the body, but the very soul of those of her sons who dare to see and say the truth. De' Ricci began by urging the reform of the monastic orders, with the support of Leopold of Tuscany as long as that prince lived. Afterwards his views became wider, and he strove for vast changes in the Church. He had, of course, to experience the unceasing enmity of Pius VI. and Pius VII., and was alternately supported and thrown over by Napoleon. Finally, in his weaker years, every sort of threat, entreaty, and influence was applied, and he was persuaded into recantation, as Galileo was, and as many others nearer us in time and place have been. He was received back with effusion, but died in his seventieth year (1810), broken-hearted at his own weakness. Nine years before he had written prophetically, “L'odio di Roma uccide il corpo; la sua amicizia uccide l'anima.” “Teste e Figuri” is one of the most interesting volumes of the quarter.

Two recent numbers of the excellent “Wissenschaftliche Vorträge”

of Virchow and Von Holtzendorff treat of Goethe and his dwelling-places, and are quite equal to the high average of the series. Dr. Stricker, who has written a "Neuere Geschichte von Frankfurt," gives us an admirable little sketch²⁴ of the poet's native town in the last century, with many interesting details of the families connected with Goethe. Dr. Remy's essay²⁵ describes the wild early years at Weimar, which so shocked Wieland, and the amusingly absurd indignation of the old Medes and Persians of the little state when Goethe received his official appointment.

This is a meet place in which to speak of Dr. Buchheim's handy volume²⁶ of extracts from Goethe's prose writings, intended for the use of students of German. The main part of the book is taken from "Wahrheit und Dichtung;" and if it is a good thing to read Goethe in his best prose style, to learn a great deal of those surroundings and influences of his youth which show their effects so conspicuously in the man and his works, and to study a wondrous picture of the life of the German higher middle class, no better selection could have been made. Dr. Buchheim's historical notes and occasional translations are just what the student requires—as short as they can be made for a work of this high standard. The book, which is a companion to "Schillers Prosa" by the same editor, is well printed in convenient size. Though primarily intended for the student, the book quite deserves the attention of the general reader.

We receive an admirable short "German Accidence"²⁷ by Mr. Vecqueray of Rugby School. This accidence, which is very complete, is contained in thirty-four quarto pages, the large size of which enables the various inflections to be arranged in tabular form. This is, of course, a very great help to the student, as he thereby obtains a better grasp of the subject, and his eye is made to assist his intelligence. The rules and arrangements are very clear, and we have not been able to detect any omissions in the book except one, which is rare in publications of the kind—the omission of all that is not wanted. Our only complaint is that it has not a few pages devoted to syntax.

We have received the eighteenth edition of Vilmar's "History of German Literature."²⁸ Of course, none but a reasonably good book could have run so long and prosperous a course. This single octavo volume contains a remarkable quantity of matter; and the matter is on the whole decidedly valuable. Vilmar is generally accurate in his facts, and his criticisms are always safe—at times, perhaps, a trifle too

²⁴ "Goethe und Frankfurt am Main." Von Dr. W. Stricker. Berlin: Carl Habel.

²⁵ "Goethe's Erscheinen in Weimar." Von Dr. M. Remy. Berlin: Carl Habel.

²⁶ "Goethes Prosa, with Introductions and Notes." By C. A. Buchheim, Ph.D., F.C.P. London: Sampson Low & Co.

²⁷ "A German Accidence." By J. W. J. Vecqueray, Assistant-Master at Rugby School. New Edition. London: Rivingtons.

²⁸ "Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur." Von A. F. C. Vilmar. 18te vermehrte Auflage. Marburg: Elwert.

safe ; for if they have a fault, it is that they incline to what is orthodox and correct. For a comprehensive view of German literature, the book has still no rival of its size.

Messrs. Moxon & Co. have published what they announce to be the only complete edition of Charles Lamb's writings,"²⁹ Mr Percy Fitzgerald being the editor. The first volume consists of a Life of Lamb, ingeniously arranged from the two sketches by Talfourd. The present edition contains many hitherto unpublished letters, and several papers not before included among Lamb's works. Mr. Fitzgerald has added a few brief and necessary notes and an index. We would have preferred to see the edition on thinner paper and in fewer volumes. It is, however, a handsome collection, and apparently very complete and well edited.

Messrs Ward, Lock, & Tyler print a handy and cheap selection³⁰ from the writings of Burke. We find in it the speech on the Law of Libel, the essay on the Sublime, the chapters on English History, and an abridgment of the reflections on the French Revolution—all things good to be read by every one.

The Manchester Library Club sends us a volume³¹ containing its report and the papers read before it in 1875-76. The collection, though naturally unequal in merit and interest, contains several very good papers, notably those on the circulation of periodicals in Manchester, and on Pepys' system of shorthand. Much good work is done by such societies in our large towns, and we are glad to hear of so active a body in Manchester. If we may venture a word of advice, we would suggest that local dialects, and local history and legends form the field which such a club can till most usefully.

The career of the famous Rajah Brooke was romantic enough to afford material for a most interesting biography ; and an account³² of that strange career has just appeared, written by Miss Jacob. Brooke, who was born in 1803, was a man of high principle, of considerable attainments, and of great energy. He thought that his original profession, that of an officer in the East India Company's service, hardly afforded him sufficient scope, and he accordingly left it. Having considerable means, he bought a ship, and travelled for some time in the Eastern Seas. He returned to England, and in a few years inherited a respectable fortune. True to his old tastes, he equipped another ship, and again sought the gorgeous East. Arriving at Sarawak, he ingratiated himself with its ruler, Muda Hassin, a weak prince, who was a sort of vassal of the Sultan of Borneo. Like many weak men, Muda Hassim had a certain amount of feeble cunning. Owing to his endeavouring to cheat Brooke in a contract, the latter had to remain in

²⁹ "Life, Letters, and Writings of Charles Lamb." Edited by P. Fitzgerald, M.A., F.S.A. 6 vols. London : Moxon & Co.

³⁰ "Essays." By Edmund Burke. London : Ward, Lock, & Tyler.

³¹ "Papers of the Manchester Library Club." Vol. II. Manchester : Ireland & Co.

³² "The Rajah of Sarawak ; An Account of Sir James Brooke, K.C.B., LL.D.'" By Gertrude L. Jacob. 2 vols. London : Macmillan & Co.

Sarawak for a long time. He took a lively and vigorous part in the politics and wars of the place, and finally protected Muda Hassim so effectually against certain rebels, that in 1841 he received the sovereignty of the country from its grateful ruler. Brooke proved an excellent sovereign. He maintained order in his own territories and those of his neighbours; he vigorously suppressed piracy on the seas, and made himself beloved and respected by his subjects. The wish of his heart was to get his domain accepted by the British Government. In this he failed; and, on the other hand, owing to the indiscretion or treachery of his agent in England, he became an object of vituperation to Exeter Hall as a pirate and murderer. The worry and ultimate failure of his overtures to the British Government, and the sense of the injustice which he received, acted cruelly on a lively and sensitive temperament. He indeed lived down the aspersions which men made on him, and returned to die at home at the age of sixty-five, leaving his realm to his heir. But though his work prospered and still prospers, he was a disappointed and almost heartbroken man. His letters and journals, which most properly form the bulk of Miss Jacob's volumes, are wonderfully interesting. With an earnest and pious character, he combined a daring and vigour which were really extraordinary. Whatever may be thought of the morality of his adventure, there can be no doubt in the mind of any one who reads these letters that he felt himself actuated by a high moral purpose, and that his work has been highly beneficial to those at whose expense, so to speak, it was made. His character reminds us strongly of the old Elizabethan sailors, half-discoverers, half-buccaneers, who were such a natural outcome of some of our strongest national tendencies. Our readers will remember that Charles Kingsley dedicated his "Westward Ho!" to James Brooke (personally unknown to him), and the present Bishop of Lichfield, then a missionary in the South. Let it be always remembered that Brooke neither made nor sought profit, that he indeed sank a considerable fortune in Sarawak. Miss Jacob has given us a worthy account of this great Englishman, and we warmly commend the book both to those who admire and to those who disbelieve in real courage and disinterestedness.

Mr. Pole's "Life of Sir William Fairbairn"³³ commemorates another Englishman of great pluck and energy in another field. It is a little singular that Sir James Brooke, of whom we have just spoken, was seized with his fatal illness in the house of the son of Sir William Fairbairn, the subject of this paragraph. Fairbairn's life was very different from the romantic career of Rajah Brooke, but it too has its adventure and its energetic deeds. The wealthy manufacturer and eminent man of science who so lately passed from among us was born in 1789, the son of a small farmer in Scotland. He received a little education, and was apprenticed to an engineer. At the age of twenty-five he was glad to be able to earn two or three pounds a week. From

³³ "Life of Sir William Fairbairn, Bart." By William Pole, F.R.S. London: Longmans & Co.

these humble beginnings, by sheer force of talent, energy, and uprightness, he had attained, when he died in 1874, the honours of membership of the Royal Society and of the Institut de France, and of a baronetcy, the bestowal of which was applauded by all. There is little in Mr. Pole's work on which we can here dilate. Suffice it to say, that he narrates clearly and pleasantly the stages in the life of Fairbairn, and gives due prominence to the great engineer's many important contributions to the science and to the material welfare of the world.

The "Recollections" of Dr. Mackay³⁴ are interesting enough; and that is about the highest praise which we can give to his book. The author has had the advantage of living through a considerable number of years, and has further been editor of the "Illustrated London News" during a considerable portion of those years. These two conditions of his existence enable him to furnish us with a respectable amount of reminiscence; but we are bound to say that there is nothing in these volumes which a middle-aged man either does not remember or has not read in the newspapers.

Our next book³⁵ is a memoir of a very remarkable man. Thomas Davidson is the name of a man who *would have been*. Born in 1838 and dead in 1870, he had not a real opportunity of making himself known; but the fact that a prize-poem which he wrote as a lad was accepted by the "Cornhill Magazine" in 1860 reflects equal credit on Thackeray as an editor and on Davidson as an aspirant. The son of a peasant, Davidson became a candidate for the ministry—in all countries the peasant's substitute for *noblesse*. He attained the position of *probationer*, which is about equivalent to that of deacon in the Church of England; but then his health failed, and he was still a probationer when he died in his thirty-third year. A large part even of his brief career was cancelled by the threat of early death. His actual departure was delayed; and to this chance we owe several sermons and many charming poems,—enough to show that in Davidson we lost a poet at least equal to Kingsley, and probably one who would have attained the highest rank. Is it the mountains, is it the sea, or what is it, that inspires our fellows of the North? Out of their infinitesimal fraction they have produced at least one world-poet, Burns; and it is impossible to count the Scotch poets of the second order. Even in translation, with the advantage of a choice between classic English and a recognised dialect, they have beaten us out of the field. Davidson was a poet both in English and in the Scottish dialect; but he was at his best in his letters. We do not hesitate to pronounce these to be nearly equal to those of Charles Lamb; and there is no other writer to whom we would so willingly compare him, except, perhaps, Dr. John Brown of Edinburgh. Davidson's letters are longer

³⁴ "Forty Years' Recollections." By Charles Mackay, LL.D. 2 vols. London: Chapman & Hall.

³⁵ "Life of a Scottish Probationer, Thomas Davidson." By James Brown. Glasgow: James Maclehose.

than Lamb's; and it would be untrue to say that, page for page, the boy's work is equal to that of the mature man. At the same time allowing *weight for age*, as the betting men have it, we believe firmly that Davidson showed promise of a style and thoughtfulness which would have won him a place near the writers whom we have named. The present biography contains those of Davidson's poems and letters that best deserve publication, and, further, an interesting view of the Church to which he belonged. On the whole, the book may fairly be compared to Mr. Smiles's "Life of a Scottish Naturalist."

We find a modest looking little book³⁶ containing a lecture on St. Patrick and another on Ireland's faith, delivered at no less remote a place than Cape Town by a Roman Catholic clergyman. The first contains the usual Romish account of the saint, about whom nothing is really known. The second lecture is a collection of the usual stories of abortive attempts made by Protestant societies to bribe poor Romanists out of their faith. Such attempts doubtless have been and are made, and we think them fit subjects for denunciation by the Romish clergy; but to effect any result, the cases should be accurately named, dated, and placed. Stories about "a poor woman during the famine" come home to no one, and can only increase vague hatred.

Sir William Cope, who has served in the Rifle Brigade, has written a very interesting account³⁷ of that distinguished corps. A regimental history is generally intended for present or past members of the regiment, and is not very often of interest or value for any one else. We have, however, seen of late one or two publications of the kind which have a distinct historical value; and this quality can be safely assigned to the present work. Sir William gives a history of all the service which the Rifle Brigade has seen, from its foundation in 1800 down to its latest achievements in Abyssinia; and we need not remind our readers how full and noble a record that must needs be. The text is amply illustrated by excellent maps. Sir William Cope has written a work which will not only ensure him the gratitude of his former comrades, but will, we venture to say, often earn him the thanks of the historian and biographer.

³⁶ "A Glance at Ireland's Apostle and Ireland's Faith." By the Rev. J. O'Haire, M.A. Dublin: Cooke, Keating, & Co.

³⁷ "The History of the Rifle Brigade." By Sir W. H. Cope, Bart. London: Chatto & Windus.

BELLES LETTRES.

MR. CHANDLER is not very favourably known to us. His last book of verse was very silly. His present work¹ is equally silly, and, into the bargain, pretentious. We do not particularly quarrel with his aristocratic characters, because all his characters are equally badly drawn. We have no doubt that there are plenty of foolish, and even vicious, characters amongst the aristocracy, but only Thackeray can draw Rawdon Crawley and Lord Steyne. To compare Mr. Chandler to Thackeray would be like comparing, as far as art goes, a satyr to Hyperion. Mr. Chandler is good enough to give us his idea of what a model newspaper should be like. Amongst its many virtues Mr. Chandler notes its leniency to novels. We certainly do not consider leniency to foolish novels a virtue. A foolish novel is not a crime, but it is in a way an offence against society, and should be punished as such. Critics cannot make either good or bad novelists, but they can warn the public against silly books, and we accordingly warn the public against wasting any time over Mr. Chandler's novel.

"More than a Million"² is spoilt by its constant straining after fine things. Its humour is founded upon that worst possible model for the novelist—Dickens; and founded, too, upon Dickens's latest and worst style. Thus, in the first page, in the description of Dorminster, the writer gives us an account of a fine old collegiate church, and "a spruce waterfall measuring eighty-four feet three inches." Now the three inches certainly do not make us laugh, but cause us to reflect to what terrible straits the writer is driven for a little humour. Then the author proceeds, in the true later Dickensian style, to make a stream speak to another. "Supposing," says this talking brook, "we astonish the inhabitants of this quiet spot by executing a few antics as we go by? Let us lay our heads together, and give them a touch of Niagara;" and so on and so on in this dreary facetious style for another page. The author's descriptions of persons are no better than those of his localities. Why was Mr. Brown respected? he asks, and then he answers in a series of jerky paragraphs, which Dickens first brought into fashion, "Why was this? It was because John Brown was rich. It was because he was particularly rich. It was because he was reputed to be even richer than he actually was." The author might go on for ever with "it was because." Now this kind of writing is a mere trick. There is neither thought nor wit in it. It is only the old Podsnap

¹ "Thrice: A Novel." By L. A. Chandler, Author of "Not to be Broken." London: E. W. Allen. 1876.

² "More than a Million; or, A Fight for Fortune." London: Daldy, Isbister, & Co. 1876.

nonsense over again. The author may perhaps some day do something, but only when he flings aside his model.

To use a hackneyed phrase, "The New Republic"³ is a very remarkable book. The author, although he has not made character-drawing a strong point, yet evidently has a very keen eye for individual foibles and individualities, as several scenes besides the sketch of Lady Ambrose very clearly prove. He is further a poet, and his descriptive passages may take their place with the best writing of the kind. These, however, are all very secondary affairs compared with the subject-matter of the novel. That the book will make a sensation we have but little doubt, for the simple reason that, being a novel, it will fall into the hands of people who have not the slightest idea of the great revolution which has been silently going on in every department of thought. In this way "The New Republic" will do an immense deal of good. We have to thank the author for introducing ideas amongst a class of people to whom they will be quite new. He will have no mean success if he succeeds in stirring up in the minds of average novel-readers some curiosity to know something about themselves and about the world in which they live, and what philosophy has to say on the matter. Of course, it will be objected that the author does not come to any conclusion; that he puts forward a number of opinions in sparkling dialogues, often masked with covert epigrams, and arrives at no conclusion. But if these opinions only awaken a desire to study Darwin or Herbert Spencer, some good will be done. A more reasonable objection might be made to a certain tone of caricature which spoils some portions of the story. We hear, too, the parodies on Mr. Matthew Arnold and Mr. Pater somewhat too much. The culture, also, is rather too much allied with blue blood. There is hardly a seat in that brilliant republic for Jesus the carpenter, Epictetus the slave, and Spinoza the lens-polisher. But we may be mistaken, and some of the speeches of the speakers may be only delicate irony, of which there is not a little in the book.

After the "New Republic" all the other novels seem tame and insipid. And yet Mr. Boyle's "Fools of Fortune"⁴ must not be confounded with the average novel. It is rather Bohemian, but full of life, movement, picturesque scenes, and brilliant talk. Literary men should certainly read it, as there is much in it which concerns them. Miss Fothergill's "Aldyth"⁵ will interest women more than men. It is the old, old story of the unwisdom—perhaps in this case a stronger word should be used—of "being on with the new love before you are off with

³ "The New Republic; or, Culture, Faith, and Philosophy in an English Country-House." London: Chatto & Windus. 1877.

⁴ "Fools of Fortune." By Frederick Boyle, Author of "Camp Notes," &c. London: Chapman & Hall. 1876.

⁵ "Aldyth; or, Let the End Try the Man." By Jessie Fothergill, Author of "Healey." London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

the old." Mr. T. A. Trollope's "A Family Party,"⁶ though in the orthodox three volumes, is not a novel at all, but a very amusing collection of tales about Italian life. "Gwynedd"⁷ possesses one great advantage over all other novels. Its pages are cut, as the pages of all books should be before they are issued from the publishers. As long as Messrs. Remington issue their novels with their pages cut we shall turn to them before any others. It is no slight trial of patience to have to cut the pages of a novel, and many a novelist has suffered for what is an omission on the part of the publishers. We wish we were able to say a few words in praise of "Gwynedd," in gratitude for the trouble we have been saved. Great pains has evidently been bestowed upon "Asylum Christi,"⁸ but we fear that they have been thrown away. Our last novel, "Unawares,"⁹ is decidedly the best, and may be recommended to all ladies for its careful shading of character and delicacy of tone.

It is, of course, perfectly useless to remonstrate with Mr. Tennyson for writing dramas. We should have imagined that "Queen Mary" must have made it clear to him that his genius is essentially lyrical and not dramatic. However, we will not pursue the subject. We are grateful to him for whatever he chooses to give us. "Harold"¹⁰ is a theme which must be for many reasons dear to his muse. Harold's heroic bearing, his patriotism, his death for his country on a greater field, though not in a nobler cause, than that of Hampden at Chalgrove, must all appeal to Mr. Tennyson's imagination in a way which they perhaps cannot do to any other living poet. He certainly is not to be blamed in the choice of so noble a subject. The poet who inscribed those lines to the Queen—

"Take, withal,
Thy poet's blessing, and his trust that Heaven
Will blow the tempest in the distance back
From thine and ours,"

must have felt a perfect delight in describing Harold's noble life and heroic death. And in Harold's own speech after the battle of Stamford Bridge—

"Many are gone—
Drink to the dead who died for us, the living
Who fought and would have died, but happier lived,

⁶ "A Family Party in the Piazza of St. Peter, and other Stories." By T. A. Trollope. London: Chatto & Windus. 1877.

⁷ "Gwynedd: A Novel." London: Remington & Co. 1877.

⁸ "Asylum Christi: A Story of the Dragonnades." By Edward Gilbert, M.A. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

⁹ "Unawares: A Story of an Old French Town." By the Author of "The Rose-Garden." London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

¹⁰ "Harold: A Drama." By Alfred Tennyson. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

If happier be to live ; they both have life
 In the large mouth of England, till her voice
 Die with the world,"

we may clearly read the same high tone of love for his country which Tennyson has elsewhere expressed in his own person. "Harold" is, of course, like everything else which Tennyson writes, full of beauties,—word-pictures, and "jewels five words long," musical blank verse, and charming lyrics. How musical is his blank verse may be seen by Wulfnoth's speech—

"Yea, and I
 Shall see the dewy kiss of dawn no more
 Make blush the maiden-white of our tall cliffs,
 Nor mark the sea-bird rouse himself and hover
 Above the windy ripple, and fill the sky
 With free sea-laughter."

How beautiful are the lyrics may be seen by the charming simplicity of Edith's song—

"Love is come with a song and a smile,
 Welcome Love with a smile and a song ;
 Love can stay but a little while.
 Why cannot he stay ? They call him away.
 Ye do him wrong, ye do him wrong ;
 Love will stay for a whole life long."

How weird they are, too, may be seen by this little mystical ballad—

"Two lovers in winter weather,
 None to guide them,
 Walked at night on the misty heather ;
 Night as black as a raven's feather.
 Both were lost and found together,
 None beside them."

Where "Night as black as a raven's feather" will remind the reader of Milton's "raven-down of darkness" in "Comus." Such beauties as these show that the Laureate's hand has lost none of its cunning, and makes us hope that we may receive many more such songs and many more such musical lines and noble thoughts as stud the pages of "Harold."

And here let us take the opportunity of calling attention to the magnificent edition of the Laureate's collected works¹¹ which is just now appearing. It is by far the finest which we have seen. The size is handy, the binding handsome, the paper good, and the print clear, forming altogether a worthy monument of this great poet, whose works

¹¹ "The Works of Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate." A New Library Edition. In Six Octavo Volumes. Vols. I. and II. "Miscellaneous Poems." London : Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

will always be a standing refutation of the assertion, so often and so foolishly made, that the nineteenth century is pre-eminently prosaic.

We should have thought that it was time for the author of "The Epic of Hades"¹² to have dropped the rather affected title of "A New Writer." In his preface he intimates his intention of renaming the poem, and we think he might also at the same time rechristen himself. This new venture has been received, like the writer's preceding volumes, with a perfect chorus of praise from the press. In one respect we are inclined to agree with our contemporaries that the present volume shows considerable advance over the preceding portions of the poem. But in this volume we are able not so much to judge the author by himself, as to take his measure by another. In this section, "A New Writer," wittingly or unwittingly, challenges comparison with the Laureate. His "Olympus" is, we might almost say, the counterpart of "Cenone." It certainly is fine, but fine only in the sense in which Ben Jonson's "Good Shepherd" is fine when compared with the "Midsummer Night's Dream." "A New Writer's" "Olympus" is by far the best thing which he has yet accomplished, and it is a pity that the splendour of three of the principal divinities should be dimmed by any comparison with Tennyson's magnificent portraits. That glorious triad of goddesses, Aphrodité, Athéné, and Héré, make their appearance as in "Cenone." Aphrodité, the most difficult to paint, is, we will not say a failure, but the least successful. As we read "A New Writer's" description of her, we are tempted to ask, Is this the

"Idalian Aphrodité beautiful,
Fresh as the foam, new bathed in Paphian wells,
With rosy slender fingers backward drew
From her warm brows and bosom her deep hair
Ambrosial, golden round her lucid throat
And shoulder" ?

Is "A New Writer's" Aphrodité

"The divine star of Heaven,
Thou in power above the Seven ;
Thou, O gentle Queen, that art
Curer of each wounded heart" ?

Is his Venus the Venus of the older parable in "The Banquet," "peace and good-will among men, calm upon the waters, repose and stillness in the storm, the balm of sleep in sadness" ? Is his the Venus, the earth's crowned beauty, for whom, as Ben Jonson said, the whole world was created ? And we must distinctly answer to each question, No. It was hardly to be expected that a great success could be obtained in any description of Athéné, coming as it must do in rivalry with Tenny-

¹² "The Epic of Hades." In Three Books. By the Author of "Songs of the Worlds." London : Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

son's matchless portrait. "A New Writer" could not possibly hope to equal, much less excel, those magnificent ethical lines—

"Self reverence, self knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead life to sovereign power,
Acting the law we live by without fear ;
And because right is right, to follow right
Were wisdom in the scorn of consequence "

If we seem to speak coldly of "A New Writer," it is from no wish to underrate his powers, but rather to counteract the lavish praise which has, in our opinion, been so unwisely and often so ignorantly, poured forth upon him. He most certainly possesses very great powers; but he is writing far too fast. We gladly repeat, however, that the present work is by far his greatest achievement, that the whole tone of it is noble, and that portions, more especially the concluding lines, are excessively beautiful.

Our notice of Mr Thorold Rogers's "Satires and Epistles"¹ comes rather late. It is essentially one of those books which it would be difficult to praise without making large limitations. Justice, however, has certainly not been done to it by our contemporaries. Its chief fault lies on the surface. It is wanting in form. Even those who might not quite approve of Georges Sand's doctrine of form, yet cannot be blind to its great power and fascination, especially in the English heroic measure. Pope brought that measure to its extreme perfection. No workman has approached him for polish and edge. To fall short of Pope is virtually to fail. Mr Thorold Rogers certainly does not approach Pope's brilliancy of style. He does not so much belong to the school of Dryden as to that of Gifford and Churchill. There is, however, rather a looseness than a coarseness in the texture of his verse, and this so far favourably distinguishes him from our two later satirists. He wants, however, Churchill's "long majestic march, and energy divine," something of which that wild Bohemian had in common with Dryden. But no poet has ever approached Pope in style on his own chosen ground. One man only, and that the most unlikely—Tennyson. The Laureate has given us one perfectly classical example, only fourteen lines long, it is true, of what the English iambic should be. No one who has once read those lines descriptive of the modern sanctimonious blackguard can ever forget them—

"With all his conscience and one eye askew
So false he partly took himself for true "

These fourteen lines are worked up to the very pitch of satiric perfec-

¹ "Epistles, Satires and Epigrams." By James E Thorold Rogers. London. Richard Bentley & Son. 1876

tion. And yet the Laureate suddenly breaks off, putting this remark into a woman's mouth,—

“ I loathe it ; he had never kindly heart,
Nor ever cared to better his own kind,
Who first wrote satire with no pity in it.”

This question of the attitude of the satirist towards mankind cannot, of course, be now discussed. We should ourselves say that, as society is at present constituted, a satirist is quite as necessary as a policeman.

“ I own I am proud, I am proud to see
Men not afraid of God afraid of me,”

was Pope's vindication of his own right to be a satirist, and yet Pope fell very far short of the ideal satirist. Having spoken so much of Mr. Rogers's want of style, we must now say a few words upon his choice of subject. He here appears in much better colours. He descends to none of those petty, miserable, literary squabbles which have from the “Dunciad” down to the days of “English Bards and Scotch Reviewers” disfigured English satire. He selects subjects worthy of satire—the Stock Exchange gambling, the gigantic frauds of trade, the idleness and vices of the aristocracy, and the political sins and weaknesses of the nation. He is moved by the spirit which should impel the satirist and which should barb his satire. If the execution had only been equal to the spirit in which the satire is written, the result would have been a masterpiece. Here and there we meet with some neatly turned couplets ; but, as a rule, the thought in vain struggles to find expression. The lines are loose, rambling, and disjointed. The result is fatal to satire, which requires the utmost concentration and the fewest words to give it effect. In addition to the “Satires and Epistles,” Mr. Rogers has added some “Epitaphs and Epigrams.” Here is a specimen of the former :—

“ Here X lies dead ; but God's forgiving,
And shows compassion to the living.”

Here is a specimen of the latter :—

“ Religio qualis tua sit dic. Est Sapientis.
Quid vero sapiens—? Id sapiens reticet.”

Both of these are certainly neat, but the latter smacks rather too much of that Scotch canniness which we have lately heard so much praised in ‘Balthasar Gracian.’ In conclusion, if Mr. Rogers intends to publish any more satires, he must learn what Pope truly said Dryden himself had never learnt, “the last and greatest art, the art to blot.” He must, to once more quote the great English master of satire, “show no mercy to an empty line.” Mr. Rogers is animated by the right spirit, and he only satirises things which are deserving of satire, and

this is more than can be said for most of our living satirists in prose, who are little else than mere libellers.

“Much is written as poetry which can only claim to be so called because it is not prose,” says the Rector of Lincoln College in his introduction to Pope’s “Essay on Man.” We are afraid that this canon of criticism applies to most of the little thin octavo volumes which reach us every quarter. Mr. T. B. Peacock dedicates “The Vendetta”¹⁴ to all readers of poetry. As readers of poetry will naturally differ in their tastes, some of them will probably appreciate Mr. Peacock’s labours. We are hardly inclined to put a very high value on such lines as—

“The owlet shrieks far down the brakes,
The frog the drowsy cricket wakes.”

As a fact in natural history, the last line is decidedly interesting, but it is no more poetry, we must inform Mr. Peacock, than “He had chambers in the King’s Bench walk.” Mr. Peacock informs us that he has carefully revised his poems. We should certainly like to know how the following lines to Chicago stood in their original form :—

“A Phoenix, in thy ashes, thou
Shall spring in glory from the now.”

The author of “Caïna”¹⁵ is so grateful to his critics for their little attentions and kindnesses to him, and for the good which they have done him on previous occasions, that he dedicates his volume entirely to them. Now, gratitude is such a rare virtue in this world, especially gratitude to critics, that we are quite puzzled how to act on such an unusual and interesting occasion. Other critics may do so, but we shall certainly not look a gift-horse in the mouth. We will merely say that Milton once thought of writing “Paradise Lost” in the form of a drama. “Caïna” is that very drama, and a poet who succeeds in a task which Milton abandoned as hopeless must indeed be no ordinary being.

Mr. Leighton¹⁶ to a certain extent touches upon the same subject-matter as the Laureate has recently done in his “Harold.” We hardly think that the admirers of Tennyson will care much for such jingle as this, however true it may be from a historical point of view—

“First the conquering Roman came,
Then the spoiling Pict and Dane,
Last the Saxon from the main
Lauded here.”

¹⁴ “The Vendetta and other Poems.” By Thomas Brower Peacock. Second Edition. Revised, with Additional Poems. Topeka: “Kansas Democrat” Printing House. 1876.

¹⁵ “Caïna and other Poems.” By the Author of “The King’s Sacrifice.” London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

¹⁶ “The Sons of Godwin: A Tragedy.” By William Leighton, jun. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincot & Co. 1877.

Mr. Doherty¹⁷ sends us a volume of the average kind. We must remind him and all other such writers, that something more is required for poetry than mere good sense, correct grammar, and accurate rhyme.

Sacred poetry¹⁸ is exempt from any criticism, as the sermons of a curate are. In both cases we are thankful that they are not worse.

From America we have a curious little volume of satirical verse,¹⁹ which will, however, from its subject, be better appreciated in the States than in England. To one piece, however, we may direct attention. "Emma, mine," is not a love poem, as it might at first sight appear, but refers to a well-known stock-exchange speculation. This poem will, we fear, find too many appreciative readers on this side of the Atlantic.

We sympathise with a great deal that the author of "Lochlère"²⁰ says in his most interesting preface on the changes which has come over the English language. But we cannot avoid the inevitable. Languages, like everything else, must change. In this case, the dead must bury their dead. However beautiful and expressive the language of our forefathers was, it is hopeless to try and revive it. The author of "Lochlère" makes a desperate and gallant attempt. He is evidently imbued, too, with the true spirit of poetry. Perhaps some of the words might by the enchantment of a great poet have new life breathed into them, but the larger part are dead. We recommend "Lochlère" to all readers who take an interest in our mother tongue.

Mr. Cayley²¹ sends us one more translation of Homer, this time in hexameters. Mr. Cayley seems to be somewhat doubtful of the success of his experiment, for he asks in his preface—

"Dons, undergraduates, essayists, and public, I ask you,
Are these hexameters true-timed, or Klopstockish uproar?"

We can only answer for ourselves; and our reply would be, that we cannot by any system of accentuation or notation do so for the present, because nobody is agreed about them, and everybody seems to write or to read English hexameters as it seems good to his own ear. Here appears to us the initial difficulty. Further, though, upon this point we should like to have the opinion of such an authority as Mr. Ellis: are these two sounds (a long - and a short ^) adequately represented in the English language? Are there not rather a whole series of sounds and tones and semitones which are represented by neither one nor the other? Mr. Cayley's efforts must, we are afraid, be classed with

¹⁷ "Legends and Poems." By F. Malcolm Doherty. London: Provost & Co 1877.

¹⁸ "King Saul and other Poems." By E. G. Punchard, M.A. London: Basil Montague Pickering. 1877.

¹⁹ "The Politicians and other Poems." By H. W. H. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1876.

²⁰ "Lochlère: A Poem." In Four Parts. London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

²¹ "The Iliad of Homer." Homometrically Translated. By C. B. Cayley. Translator of Dante's "Comedy." London: Longmans & Co. 1877.

other experiments of the same kind. Our ears have of late years been so enchanted with new melodies, with the cadences of Keats and Shelley, of Tennyson, Rosetti, Swinburne, and Morris, that, if Mr. Cayley will forgive us the expression, the very best English hexameters seem wooden. We would not for one moment wish to be dogmatic on the subject, and to say that it is impossible to write true hexameters in English, or to find true dactyl or spondees. The capabilities of the English language have not yet nearly reached their development. New metrical forms await us, and amongst them may be English hexameters. In the meanwhile, let us give due honour to Mr. Cayley as one of the pioneers who are helping to acclimatise them in England.

Amongst collections of poetry and prose, let us especially call attention to the new edition of "Chambers's Cyclopædia of English Literature."²² It has always more than held its ground against any other rival collection. The new edition, however, contains so much fresh matter as almost to make it a new work. It is this portion which especially deserves commendation for the comprehensiveness with which it has been executed. The poets of our generation are well represented. We find poems from Swinburne, Rosetti, William Morris, Mrs. Webster, and all the younger poets of the day. So comprehensive a collection has never before been made. One drawback only do we find. In common justice to Darwin and the Evolutionist School, the favourable opinions as well as the unfavourable should have been given. This is a serious blemish, and time will not diminish it.

The present issue of the English Dialect Society's works is full of interest. It contains more original matter than any of the other issues has done, and this is saying a great deal. We will first take Mr. Clough Robinson's "Dialect of Mid-Yorkshire,"²³ because it very clearly illustrates how utterly absurd is the doctrine which has been so vehemently put forward, that no glossary should contain any word which is contained in another. Mr. Clough Robinson had resolved to exclude all words which were to be found in the "Whitby Glossary." Now what would have been the result? Simply this, that a philologist comparing the two glossaries would have supposed that "keld," a spring, was used in the neighbourhood of Whitby, but not near York; that "kink," a convulsion or fit; "mauf," a companion, and a hundred more words, were peculiar to the East Coast, but were utterly unknown in the centre of Yorkshire. No plan could have been better devised for promoting the utmost confusion and the most disastrous results. A glossary compiled upon such a principle would have done far more

²² "Chambers's Cyclopædia of English Literature: A History, Critical and Biographical, of British Authors, with Specimens of their Writings." Originally edited by Robert Chambers, LL.D. Third Edition. Revised by Robert Carruthers, LL.D. In Two Volumes. Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers. 1877.

²³ "A Glossary of Words Pertaining to the Dialect of Mid-Yorkshire," &c. By C. Clough Robinson. English Dialect Society. London: Trübner & Co. 1876.

harm than good. Most fortunately Mr. Clough Robinson was prevented by Mr. Ellis and Mr. Skeat from carrying out his plan. His work, as it now stands, is admirable. Mr. Clough Robinson is already well known as the author of the "Leeds Glossary," which was compiled some five-and-thirty years ago. The present volume shows the same industry and patient research as his older work. As we turn over the pages, we are met by a number of old-world words, many of them pregnant with meaning; such as "hunger-slain" for starved; "black-avised" for black-visaged; "housen-stuff" for household furniture; "catwhelp" for kitten, and many more equally expressive and picturesque. Other words, too, have a far greater value, as explaining passages in our old writers and poets, especially Chaucer. But this field is far too large for us to enter. The reader must turn to Mr. Robinson's pages for the valuable information which it contains. Wide, however, as the net is which Mr. Robinson has thrown, he still must not imagine that he has swept the district quite clean. He has certainly done a great deal, but of making a glossary, especially of Yorkshire words, is there no end. We miss not a few, and some of them very common ones, from his pages. We find "ratch," a streak, but not the expressive "ratch-faced," applied to a horse with a blaze down its face. The housewife's "battledore" for rolling clothes is not obsolete in the district. "Beck," a bow (still used in the United States), and "beckon," to bow, may be heard almost under the shadow of York Minster. "Bodin," a bundle of sticks or stones, is used by the farmers who come to York "Saumas" Fair. "Cock-onies," cockchafers, are to be found on that Strenshal Common whose fame Mr. Robinson rightly commemorates; and "crake-feet," orchisses, and the "saal-tree" and "wilc-tree," willows, grow on the clay lands of the neighbouring village of Foston, where Sidney Smith used to say he was ten miles from a lemon. We hope, therefore, that Mr. Robinson will once more make another cast over the district, as there are still many rich hauls waiting him. As it is, however, his work is well worthy of his reputation, and is one of the most interesting which the English Dialect Society has yet issued.

The next volume²⁴ contains no less than five original glossaries of different counties. But we would first call attention to Mr. Skeat's introduction. He there lays down the true principle on which the Society's labours can alone be utilised. We are fully persuaded that there is no other plan but Mr. Skeat's which is practicable, and we most sincerely trust that collectors of provincialisms will not be led away by any arguments to the contrary, however plausible they may seem. We here see what the result would have been if Mr.

²⁴ "Original Glossaries." I. "Cleveland Words," by Rev. J. C. Atkinson. II. "An Alphabet of Kenticisms," by Rev. S. Pegge, 1736. III. "Surrey Provincialisms," by G. Leveson Gower, Esq. IV. "Oxfordshire Words," by Mrs. Parker. V. "South Warwickshire Words," by Mrs. Francis. English Dialect Society. London: Trübner & Co. 1876.

Clough Robinson had not followed Mr. Skeat's and Mr. Ellis's advice. The business of the glossarist, for the present, at all events, is to register all provincial words which come under his notice. He should adopt Cobden's political watchword, "Register, register," as his watchword. Of course it is very easy for critics to find objections. The ideal plan would be to map out all England into ethnographical divisions, and to appoint trained men to collect in each district. But, unfortunately, ideal plans are only fit for an ideal world. As it is, men must work with what tools they have, and do the best that they can. The first glossary in the present collection is by the Rev. J. C. Atkinson, the well-known author of the "Cleveland Glossary," to which the present is a supplement. And the first thing which strikes us when we look at the supplement is, that if so careful a collector as Mr. Atkinson could make so many omissions, how many must a less careful collector make. If we rightly remember, Mr. Atkinson spent ten years in collecting for his first glossary, and the work is still not finished. The other glossaries are all equally valuable, especially Pegge's "Alphabet of Kenticisms," edited by Mr. Skeat. Mr. Leveson Gower contributes a most interesting collection of Surrey words; and two ladies, Mrs. Parker and Mrs. Francis, send lists of Oxfordshire and Warwickshire pronunciations. Now to criticise these glossaries in detail is quite out of our power. They are all of them excellent. They do not pretend to be perfect collections, but simply contributions. We shall hope to see further lists from the authors of the glossaries of Surrey, Oxfordshire, and Warwickshire. Only in this way can Mr. Skeat's hope of a perfect glossary of English provincialisms be realised.

On the "Whitby Glossary,"²⁵ by Mr. F. K. Robinson, we cannot bestow too high praise. For the number of words, it may take its place beside the works of Carr and Brocket, which have hitherto, until Mr. Atkinson's work appeared, been the standard glossaries of the Northern dialects. The latter half of Mr. Robinson's original work was far better done than the first. The definitions were more precise, and the dangerous ground of etymology was avoided. On comparing the two editions, we perceive that many of the definitions have been remodelled, and all the misprints corrected. The additions are so great that the present work may be considered as an entirely new work. Under every letter the examples have been more than doubled, and in some instances trebled. Mr. Robinson's letter S actually contains more specimens than some entire glossaries. This will show how thoroughly the work has been done. A mere glance down its pages will also show how rich they are in the quality of their word-lore. Here in this district still lingers "yerb-craft," for botany, and "rainsoo," for the moaning of the wind. Here we find such expressive adjectives as "puzzom-feeac'd," looking like poison, and "sea-kindly," used of ships that sail well. Mr.

²⁵ "A Glossary of Words Used in the Neighbourhood of Whitby." By F. K. Robinson. Part II. English Dialect Society. London: Trübner & Co. 1876.

Robinson's pages are literally studded with such expressions. But, like the author of the "Mid-Yorkshire Glossary," Mr. Robinson has not exhausted the mine. He might, we think, still add very largely to the local names of flowers and birds. And here we may express a hope that some member of the English Dialect Society will deal with the provincial names of birds. They are quite as interesting as those of flowers, of which we see a glossary is being compiled. There must also be a large number of terms connected with fishing, the sale of fish, and the fishing trade generally, which have not found a place in Mr. Robinson's pages. Their omission can easily be repaired by a supplementary glossary like Mr. Atkinson's. As the book stands, it is the largest collection of North Country words which we possess, and for this the author deserves our best thanks. We trust that he will not cease collecting. As the country proverb runs, "Work is never done," and the work of collecting provincialisms is certainly never done. We always find them, too, in the most unlikely places, where we never dreamt of their existence. The saying of Autolyceus is most true with regard to provincialisms, "Every lane's end, every shop, church, session, hanging, yields a careful man work." Mr. Atkinson's supplementary glossary shows how easy it is for the most careful observer to overlook obvious examples. We hope, therefore, that Mr. Robinson will follow Mr. Atkinson's plan, and in due time give us a supplement which will make his work perfect, as far as any work can be perfect.

The last volume of the English Dialect Society is by Dr. Morris,²⁶ and plainly proves what good work the Society has already done, and how sound are the principles upon which it proceeds. Without the glossaries which the Society has published, Dr. Morris could not have written his interesting essay, or, at least, have written it half so well. We cannot go into an examination of it, but must content ourselves with saying, that, like everything Dr. Morris writes, it is thoroughly scholarly; and further, that it is as interesting as a novel. Lastly, let us call attention to the indices of the shorter glossaries, which give them so much additional value. They are by Mr. Skeat, and must have entailed a great deal of hard labour.

The "Memoir of Robert Chambers"²⁷ is interesting in many ways. It contains many curious literary anecdotes, many pleasant reminiscences of literary men, and, above all, tells how an excellent man and enterprising publisher made his way in life. The story of the early struggles of the two Chambers's is full of pathos. One of the most interesting chapters is that in which William Chambers tells how he first made his own start. By a piece of good luck he was recommended

²⁶ "On the Survival of Early English Words in our Present Dialects." By the Rev. Richard Morris, M.A., LL.D. English Dialect Society. London: Trübner & Co. 1876.

²⁷ "Memoir of Robert Chambers, with Autobiographic Reminiscences of William Chambers." New Edition. London and Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers. 1876.

to an agent to assist him in assorting some books for a trade sale. This agent took a liking to him, and allowed him to have ten pounds' worth of books on credit. William Chambers followed the plan of Lackington and the old school of booksellers, and set up a stall in Leith Walk. This was the turning-point of his life. After this, as the saying is, he never looked back. Men possessed of such indomitable perseverance and honourable principles as the two Chambers's command success.

"Shakespeare from an American Point of View"²⁸ is certainly an excellent publisher's title; it excites curiosity. There are many first-rate Shakespearean scholars, like Mr. and Mrs. Furness, Mr. Hudson, and Mr. White, in the States. The title of the book led us to expect that there might be others of whom we were ignorant. What the American point of view, now that we have read the book, really is, we cannot clearly state. We can only say that the book is, in our judgment, a mass of silliness from beginning to end, and that when the author is right, his opinion loses all weight and force by the absurd crotchets which he advances and the foolish arguments which he uses. A great portion of the book is devoted to the very superfluous task of proving that Shakespeare was not Bacon and that Bacon was not Shakespeare. No one whose opinion is worth anything ever did maintain such an insane proposition. As for Miss Bacon's opinion on the subject, it was, to use the most charitable language, the opinion of a lady who was not capable, at the time her book was produced, of forming a correct judgment on this or any other subject. As for Lord Palmerston's opinion, it was just about as valuable as his other opinion that a freeholder called Purkiss carried the remains of William Rufus in a charcoal cart to Winchester Cathedral, and that the Purkiss family have been freeholders in the New Forest ever since. But the way in which Mr. Wilkes tries to show that Shakespeare was Shakespeare is about as absurd as the proposition which he is refuting, that Shakespeare was not Shakespeare. One of his arguments, which he quotes from a Mr. King, is that Shakespeare uses Warwickshire words. But, unfortunately, all the words which he quotes as being Warwickshire provincialisms may be found as provincialisms in other counties. Thus, the intensitive "old," for "very" or "great," is found not only in Warwickshire, but in all the North-Midland and Northern counties, and is used not only by Shakespeare in this sense, but by other Elizabethan dramatists. So, too, the word "gull," for a "gosling," is used not only in Warwickshire as a provincialism, but in Surrey and Hampshire, and may be found in Wilbraham's "Cheshire Glossary" for a young bird, the sense in which it is used by Shakespeare. The epithet "pugging" in "pugging-tooth" has no connection whatever with the Warwickshire "pegging-tooth," but is allied to quite a different class of

²⁸ "Shakespeare from an American Point of View; including an Inquiry as to his Religious Faith and his Knowledge of Law; with the Baconian Theory Considered." By George Wilkes. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

words. But it is perfectly useless going through the evidence which Mr. King and Mr. Wilkes adduce. It is simply cracking rotten nuts. They have not the slightest knowledge of what they are talking about. Of the foolish stuff of which this book of nearly five hundred octavo pages is composed, we may, however, give a few examples. Mr. Wilkes states that deer-stalking was, in Shakespeare's days, a "very high crime" (p. 10). This shows how little he knows of Elizabethan literature. His statement is the reverse of the fact. He tries to prop up the preposterous idea that Shakespeare was a Roman Catholic by arguing that nobody but a Roman Catholic could have drawn the old monk in "Romeo and Juliet" (pp. 341, 342). Such a statement betrays an utter ignorance of the very first principles of criticism. Mr. Wilkes habitually confounds Shakespeare's sentiments with those which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of his characters. By this convenient method anything may be proved. There is, in short, no absurdity too great for Mr. Wilkes. He actually thinks that "by the fat weed which rots itself in ease on Lethe's wharf," Shakespeare means tobacco (p. 415). But it is useless saying anything further. We are almost tempted to think that the book is some sort of an American hoax. If so, it is a particularly foolish hoax, and particularly badly carried out.

A number of miscellaneous books still remain, which defy classification. It is difficult to see what particular end Mr. Hovenden's "Life and Character of Horace"²⁹ serves. If it is meant for English readers, more notes are required; if for scholars, the work seems a little superfluous. The translation reads fluently enough, and calls for no particular remark. One or two books seem to have been intended for Christmas reading, but will certainly do for Easter. Amongst them we may mention, "Michael Strogoff; or, The Courier of the Czar,"³⁰ and "Childhood a Hundred Years Ago."³¹ Both will be acceptable to the class for whom they are designed. Amongst books with a particular aim and a religious tendency, we may place "David Lloyd's Last Will,"³² "Tripp's Buildings,"³³ and "The Barton Experiment."³⁴

²⁹ "Horace's Life and Character: An Epitome of his Satires and Epistles." By R. M. Hovenden. London: Macmillan & Co. 1877.

³⁰ "Michael Strogoff, the Courier of the Czar." By Jules Verne. Translated by W. H. Kingston. With Numerous Illustrations. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

³¹ "Childhood a Hundred Years Ago." By Sarah Tytler. With Chronographs after Sir Joshua Reynolds. London and Belfast: Marcus Ward & Co. 1877.

³² "David Lloyd's Last Will." By Hesba Stretton. New Edition. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

³³ "Tripp's Buildings: A Study from Life." By M. Drummond. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

³⁴ "The Barton Experiment." London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

MISCELLANEA.

A REPRINT of the well-known "Colloquies" of Erasmus¹ is prefaced by an editorial note, which, at the outset, enables us to see that there has been no editing at all, for it begins with the words "Published in 1733, this translation," &c. Now Bailey's translation was not published in 1733, but in 1725, and the edition of 1733 has on the title-page the words "second edition;" so that the very simplest care and attention has been wanting. Into Bailey's second edition some mistakes had crept which were not in the first—mere printer's errors—and they are carefully retained in this reprint. Two different forms of the same Greek letter are retained in the same sentence, and the characteristic summaries which Bailey prefixed to the different discourses are omitted. There are no notes, and the whole reproduction of so well-known a book were better left undone than done so ill.

Nottingham Castle,² having been, as the author reminds us, a military fortress, a royal palace, a ducal mansion, and a blackened ruin, is now a museum and gallery of art. Mr. Hine has written and illustrated its history with the intention of devoting any profits which may accrue from the sale of his book to this museum. The work is very carefully done, and it is adorned with many excellent photographic reproductions of subjects connected with Nottingham and its castle. There is also vacant space for the insertion of many more; and the book ought to prove very useful and interesting to all Nottinghamshire people, and many archaeologists who are not connected with the town. The work is just one of those monographs which some qualified person ought to draw up for every town in the kingdom.

Messrs. Cassells & Co.³ give us an extremely beautiful book, containing views of certain picturesque portions of England, not, however, always most judiciously chosen, and with notable omissions, but yet such as those who know the places described will be glad to turn over. The writers of the letterpress have been selected with care; as, for instance, Mr. Oscar Browning has written on Eton, for which task no man is better qualified. The only disparaging remark we would venture to make on this really striking book is, that in the illustrations of places which are well known, the artists have no right whatever to sacrifice local colour and effect to picturesqueness. In two of the Eton sketches, Eton boys are represented as wearing in one place a cap, in the other a straw hat, in precisely those parts of the college in which these head-dresses respectively are most unlikely to appear.

¹ "The Whole Familiar Colloquies of Erasmus." Translated by W. Bailey. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1877.

² "Nottingham, its Castle, &c., with Notes relating to the Borough of Nottingham." By Thomas Chambers Hine, F.S.A. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1876.

³ "Picturesque Europe: The British Isles." London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. 1877.

"Art and Ornament in Dress"⁴ is one of those books which scarcely bears translation, and is, moreover, only adapted to the year in which it was originally published. It is, in fact, scarcely more than a book of fashions, to which a pretence of dignity is given by a little would-be learned talk. Merely to turn over the pages and see the exaggerated Paris toilettes of two or three years ago presented as even possible styles of permanent adornment, is enough to show that the book is without true or lasting value. Both in French and in the English translation the style verges on, if it does not actually touch, sheer nonsense. Take, for instance, the description of a woman's dress at the end of the Second Empire, and, therefore, of the present day:—

"A toilet becoming an image of the rapid movement which bears the world onward, and which threatens to carry away even the guardians of our homes. They are to be seen at this day sometimes clothed and closely buttoned like boys, sometimes adorned with braid like soldiers, walking on high heels which throw them forward, hastening their steps, cleaving the air, and hurrying their life as though to swallow up space, which in turn swallows up them."

Monsieur Blanc is good enough, also, to give his approval to the manner in which God has constructed the human form. The first figure, he thinks, that God invented was the square, by modification of which He worked up gradually to His improved and perfect form. Here, in the following passage, he is good enough to record his approval:—

"In modelling the human figure, the Supreme Designer seems, it is true, to have left some traces of the original squares, but the verticals and horizontals on which the figure is constructed have been nearly everywhere effaced, so that Nature, not being chained to rigorous laws, could freely give birth to innumerable individuals, all resembling the original type, but all differing, through the endless accidents of life. The preliminary type could only be restored in the network of the Divine geometry."

Mr. Oldfield⁵ is one of the members of the executive committee for the completion of St. Paul's. During a tour in Italy he has carefully examined as many churches as he could which afforded him any instructions for any future plans for the completion of the Metropolitan Cathedral. The committee have, it appears, £50,000 in hand, and do not quite know what to do with it. Mr. Oldfield proposes to spend £34,000 in decorating the cupola with mosaics similar in style to those of the cupola of St. Peter's. We sincerely trust, in the interests of art, that no such expenditure of money may take place while our theories of art decoration are in their present crude state.

Is anything which calls itself art more horrible than chromo-litho-

⁴ "Art and Ornament in Dress." Translated from the French of Charles Blanc. With Illustrations.

⁵ "St. Peter's and St. Paul's." By Edmund Oldfield, M.A., F.S.A. London: Longmans & Co. 1876.

graphy? We certainly are inclined to answer this question in the negative in looking at the harsh and crude imitations of some of Sir Edwin Landseer's animal pictures. Miss Tytler⁶ has tacked to them some dog stories, which, perhaps, might prove amusing to some young people; but we trust their views of art will not be nursed on the illustrations.

Mr. Melville⁷ is a Freemason, and he has discovered through Masonry and the study of the stars the key to all knowledge. He entered into correspondence with the Grand Lodges of England and Ireland, but neither of them would have anything to do with him. The book is wild and unintelligible. We have tried in vain to understand what he is driving at, and have utterly failed. The whole work, which is beautifully got up and illustrated with many well-executed woodcuts, appears to us, after careful consideration, a tissue of incoherent raving.

In a little primer⁸ of only 124 pages, Mr. Grove sets himself to tell children three things—(1.) How maps are made, and how they are to be understood; (2.) How the land and water are placed on the world, and how different countries are like and unlike each other; (3.) How the separate parts or features of the land and water are made up. And this he does extremely sensibly and well. The diagrams and maps with which the book is thickly illustrated are very clear, and it is altogether an excellent little manual. But it is totally inadequate to teach physical geography, as its author would admit; and we hope that either he or some one else qualified for the work will give us what does not now exist—a good manual of physical geography.

Mr. Peile's primer⁹ on philology attempts a great deal too much, and brings only a sense of crowding and confusion. We doubt the advisability and possibility of teaching the elements of philology except *viva voce*, and no master or mistress would find this primer at all a sufficient apparatus from which to give a lesson. But admitting the extreme difficulty, and that such a book is not wanted, we still doubt whether Mr. Peile has done the best that could be done under the circumstances.

If children must learn to translate¹⁰ into a foreign language by the aid of detached sentences, then these are well selected, and not so entirely stupid and nonsensical as are those in the great majority of exercise-books. But we believe that it might be possible to find better passages from good authors both in English and German for translation and retranslation, which might include nearly all difficulties of construction and necessitate extremely few of these fragmentary sentences which are at once irritating and uninteresting.

⁶ "Landseer's Dogs and their Stories." By Sarah Tytler. London: Marcus Ward & Co.

⁷ "Veritas: A Revelation of Mysteries, Biblical, Historical, and Social." By Henry Melville. Second Edition. London: Charing Cross Publishing Co. 1877.

⁸ "Geography." By George Grove, F.R.G.S. With Maps and Diagrams. London: Macmillan & Co. 1877.

⁹ "Philology." By John Peile. London: Macmillan & Co. 1877.

¹⁰ "First German Exercises." By E. F. Grenfell, M.A. London: Rivington 1877.

INDEX.

* * *All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- ABNEY, Captain, R.E., F.R.S., "Sound and Music," 252
- Ackers, R. St. J., "Deaf and Dumb," 541
- Africa, Slavery in, 394-423; popular opinion on, 394; slavery in early times, 395; quotations from Livingstone, 396; evidence of Captain Sullivan, 397; of Sir Samuel Baker, 398; other evidence, 398; of Sir Bartle Frere, 399; the Khedive, 400; evidence of Commander Cameron, 401; the Portuguese, 402; the Sultan of Zanzibar, 403; Sir Samuel Baker's account, 404; quotation from, 409; the Makololo, 406; the Boers and slavery, 407; quotation from M. Berlioux, 408; the Matabele, 409, 410; remarks by Baker and Livingstone, 411; quotation from Livingstone, 412; quotation from Baker, 413; the emancipation question, 414; how emancipation should be carried out, 415; considerations with regard to Africa, 416; African commerce, 417; the state of Egypt, 418; the Sultan of Zanzibar, 419; Liberia and Sierra Leone, 420; quotation from Hutchinson, 421; Sir Samuel Baker's conclusions, 422; the conversion of the negro, 423; the future, 423
- Aleot, L. M., "Rose in Bloom," 289
- "America, United States of, The Public Libraries of the," 550
- Amy, "In Search of Truth," 220
- "Arabian Nights' Entertainments," 298
- Ashby-Storry, J., "Boudoir Ballads," 291
- Atkinson, Rev. J. C., *see* "English Dialect Society"
- BAAS, J. H., "Grundriss der Geschichte der Medicin," 267
- Bahr, W., "Der Nebel-Bilder Apparat," 254
- Bailey, W., "Colloquies of Erasmus," 600
- Baldwin, Captain J. H., "The Game of Bengal," &c., 562
- Ball, Rev. T. J., "The Orthodox Doctrines of the Church of England," 525
- Barclay, R., "The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth," 527
- Barrow, G. S., M.A., "The Mystery of Christ," 219
- "Barton Experiment, The," 599
- Battye, R. F., "What is Vital Force?" 563
- Baumgarten, Dr. M., "Der Kampf um das Reichscivilstandsgesetz in der deutschen protestantischen Kirche," 245
- Baur, F., "Introduction to Greek and Latin," 301
- Baxter, M., "St. Christopher, with Psalm and Song," 291
- Beckett, Sir E., "A Book on Building," 299
- Beesley, A. H., "The Gracchi, Marius, and Sulla," 575
- Bennet, J. H., M.D., "Nutrition in Health and Disease," 266
- Bennett, G. L., "Easy Latin Stories," 301
- Bentham, Jeremy, "An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation," 224
- Bessel, F. W., "Abhandlungen," 251
- Bisset, A., "History of the Struggle for Parliamentary Government in England," 571
- Blake, J. F., "Astronomical Myths," 558
- Blanc, C., "Art and Ornament in Dress," 606
- Blandford, H. F., "Indian Meteorological Memoirs," 552
- Blaserna, Professor, "The Theory of Sound in its Relation to Music," 251

- Blew, J. W., M.A., "The Altar Service of the Church of England," 527
- Blewet, Mrs. O., "The Rose and the Lily," 297
- Boyle, F., "The Savage Life," 547
"Fools of Fortune," 506
- Bradley, F. H., "Mr. Sidgwick's Hedonism," 531
- Brassey, T., M.P., "British Seamen," 536
- Bristowe, J. S., M.D., "Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Medicine," 262
- Brodhurst, B., "Lectures on Surgery," 264
- Brodribb, Rev. W. J., "Demosthenes," 577
- Bronn, Dr. H. G., "Klassen und Ordnungen des Thier-Reichs," 256, 565
- Brown, Barrington, "Canoe and Camp Life in British Guiana," 545
J., "Life of Thomas Davidson," 583
- Bryant, W. C., and S. H. Gay, "Popular History of the United States," 572
- Buchlein, C. A., "Goethe's Prosa," 580
- Buchholz, Dr. R., "Land und Leute in West-Afrika," 245
- Budapest, Report of Archæological Congress, &c., at, 565
- Burke, E., "Essays," 581
- Burnaby, Captain F., "A Ride to Khiva," 548
- Burton, R. F., "Etruscan Bologna," 274
- "CAÏNA," 592
- Campbell, Lord G., "Log Letters from the 'Challenger,'" 537
- "Cameos from English History," 570
- Carpenter, W. R., M.D., "Principles of Mental Physiology," 226
- Cartwright, W. C., "The Jesuits; their Constitution and Teaching," 574
- Cayley, C. B., "The Iliad of Homer," 593
- "Chambers's Cyclopædia of English Literature," 594
- "Chambers, Robert, Memoir of," 597
- Chandler, L. A., "Thrice," 585
- Chatfield, A. W., "Songs of the Earliest Greek Christian Poets," 290
- "Civilised Christianity," 220
- Claretie, J., "Camille Desmoulins and his Wife," 277
- Clebsch, A., "Vorlesungen über Geometrie," 243
- Cleland, J., M.D., "A Directory for the Dissection of the Human Body," 567
- Clergyman, A., "The Satan of Scripture," 217
- "Coffin, Levi, Reminiscences of," 283
- Cohn, G., "Vertheurung des Lebensunterhaltes in der Gegenwart," 541
- Collyer, R., "The Life that Now is," 523
- Consort, Life of the Prince, 59-93; general character of the book, 59; his early years, 60, 61; Count Stockmar, 61; Prince Albert at Brussels and Bonn, 62; views on marriage, 63, 64; Queen Victoria, 64; their marriage, 64, 65; Prince Albert's position, 65; his income, 66; other matters, 66, 67; the late Lord Derby on the Prince's position, 68; the Regency Bill, 69, 70; the Prince as Lord Warden of the Stannaries of Cornwall and Devon, 70, 71; as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, 72, 73; the Prince and Dr. Whewell, 75; the Prince on bishops, 75, 76; on the political position of the sovereign, 77; comparison with Lord Beaconsfield's speech, 78; remarks on, 79; further comments, 80; the Prince's want of practical knowledge of English politics, 81; illustrations of, 81, 82; the Prince on the Papal aggression, 83; Lord Palmerston and the Prince Consort, 84; Earl Russell, 85; "the Queen's angry memorandum," 86; interview between Lord Palmerston and the Prince Consort, 87; Lord Palmerston and foreign affairs, 88, 89; Lord Palmerston's dismissal, 90; the second volume of the Life of the Prince Consort, 91; the Prince's memorandum on the Crimean War, 91, 92
- Cook, D., "A Book of the Play," 298
- Cooper, E., "History of England," 570
- Cope, Sir W., Bart., "The Rifle Brigade," 584
- Corkran, A., "Bessie Lang," 287
- Cormack, Sir J. R., M.D., "Clinical Studies," 265
- Cox, E. W., "The Principles of Punishment," 539
- Creasy, Sir E. S., "First Platform of International Law," 538
- Crompton, Henry, "Industrial Conciliation," 240
- Cumming, L., "An Introduction to the Theory of Electricity," 555
- Curteis, A. M., "Rise of the Macedonian Empire," 574

- DARWIN, Charles, M.A., F.R.S., "Geological Observations on the Volcanic Islands and Parts of South America," 258
 ——— "The Effects of Cross and Self-Fertilisation," 261
 Davidson, S., D.D., "The Canon of the Bible," 520
 Davies, Rev. J., M.A., "Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius," 275
 "Debrett's Peerage and Baronetage," &c., 552
 Delaborde, Le Comte, "Eléonore de Roye, Princesse de Condé," 276
 Dennis, J., "Studies in English Literature," 293
 Dennys, N. B., "China and her Apologist," 547
 Dickenson, W. H., "Diseases of the Kidney," 567
 Dodge, R. J., "The Hunting Grounds of the Great West," 238
 Doherty, M., "Legends and Poems," 593
 Döllinger, J. I., "Hippolytus and Callistus," 271
 Dowden, E., "Poems," 291
 Drew, F., "The Northern Barrier of India," 546
 Drummond, M., "Tripp's Buildings," 599
- EDWARDS, M. Betham, "A Year in Western France," 543
 ——— A. B., "A Thousand Miles up the Nile," 545
 Elam, C., M.D., "Winds of Doctrine: An Examination of Automatism," &c. 225
 Elmendorf, J. J., "Outlines of Lectures on the History of Philosophy," 531
 Emerson, R. W., "Parnassus," 292
 ——— "Letters and Social Aims," 297
 "Encyclopædia Britannica," 302
 English Dialect Society, Works of, Glossaries of Mid-Yorkshire (Robinson), Cleveland (Atkinson), 594, 595; of Surrey (Gower), Oxfordshire (Mrs. Parker), South Warwickshire (Mrs. Francis), 595, 596; Whitby (F. Robinson), Survival of Early English Words (R. Morris, M.A.), 597
 Enneper, Dr. A., "Elliptische Functionen," 247
 "Epochs of Ancient and Modern History," by various writers, 269
 "Europe, Picturesque," 600
- FACTORY and Workshop Acts, The, 36-58 (first article); the Duke of Argyle on national and moral law, 36; the question of individual freedom, 37; "Mammon against Mercy," 38; confusion in the matter, 39; double meaning of the word "labour," 39; the results of the victory, 40; extracts from Mr. Notcutt, 40, 41; factory inspectors, 42; Royal Commission, 43; Herr Edler von Plener's work, 45; the original design of the English factory system, 44, 45; the various Factory Acts, 45, 46; omissions and confusion in, 47, 48; further considerations on, 48, 49; the Factory Act of 1867, 51; views of The O'Connor Don, 52; remarks on, 53; further remarks on the Royal Commission, 54; the dangers of centralisation, 55; proposals, 56, 57; conclusion, 58
 Factory and Workshop Acts, The, 462-492 (second article); reference to the former article, 462; its general argument detailed, 463; its general conclusion, 464; the functions of the State considered, 465, 466; what the Factory Acts have accomplished, 466, 467; comments on, 468, 469; State encroachments on individual liberty, 470, 471; justification of, in the case of children and women, 471, 472; the case of Miss Faithful, 472; the Kidderminster carpet-weavers, 473; the case of young children, 474, 475; the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners considered, 476, 477; criticisms on, 477; sweating in the tailoring trade, 478, 479 (footnote); why should not distributors be as well protected as producers? 479, 480; the case of domestic servants, 481; other cases considered, 482, 483; where the line must be drawn, 484, 485; general summary, 486; recommendations and suggestions, 487, 488; further criticisms on the Royal Commission, 488, 489; sanitary recommendations of the Royal Commissioners, 490, 491; conclusion, 491, 492
 "Famiglia, La, lo Stato, la Chiesa et la libera Scuola," 536
 Fechner, G. T., "Vorschule der Aesthetik," 533
 "Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai," 277
 Ferrier, D., M.D., F.R.S., "The Functions of the Brain," 266
 Ferris, H. W., "Poems," 291

- Fisher, W. M., "The Californians," 236
- Fitzgerald, P., M.A., "Life and Letters of Charles Lamb," 581
- Fitzmaurice, Lord E., "Life of William, Earl of Shelburne," 277
- Fleming, W., D.D., "The Vocabulary of Philosophy, Mental, Moral, and Metaphysical," &c., 227
- Fliedner, Dr. C., "Lehrbuch der Physik," 253
- Forster, W., "The Weirwolf," 290
- Fothergil, J., "Aldyth," 586
- Fowler, R. N., M.A., "A Visit to Japan, China, and India," 546
- France: Courtship and Marriage in, 337-382; man and wife, 338; the wife in France, 339; French marriages, 340; quotation from Taine, 340-346; the French girl, 346; Prévost Paradol on religion, duty, honour, 346; the power of conventionality in France, 348; of ridicule, 349; further quotation, 350; a French young man of the period, 351, 352; purity, its true meaning, 352; French schools, 353; French marriages, 354; quotation from Octave Feuillet, 355-359; French courtship, 360; quotation from "Monsieur, Madame, et Bôbé," 361-365; French married life, 366; further quotation, 367; the French wife in the middle classes, 368; the reason of unhappy marriages in France, 369, 370; French mothers, 370, 371; a picture of French married life, 371, 372; purity amongst men, 372, 373; infidelity, 373; separation, 374; extract from Dumas, 375; marriage as a mere speculation, and its results, 376, 377; French opinion about mothers, 378; picture of a French gentleman, 379, 380; picture of a Frenchwoman, 381; conclusion, 382
- Francis, Mrs., *see* "English Dialect Society"
- Freeman, E. A., M.A., "The History of Europe," 273
- Frey, Professor H., "Compendium of Histology," 565
- Frohschammer, Professor J., "Die Phantasie als Grund-Princip des Weltprocesses," 229
- GARRETT, R. and A., "Suggestions for House Decoration," 300
- Geikie, J., F.R.S., "The Great Ice Age," 259
- "Science Lectures," 561
- Geiser, Dr. C. F., "Die Theorie der Kegelschnitte," 249.
- Gibbs, W. A., "The Battle of the Standard," 290
- Gilbert, E., "Asylum Christi," 587
- Ginsberg, H., Ph.D., "Der Briefwechsel des Spinoza im Urtexte," 277
- Gizycki, Dr. G. von, "Philosophische Consequenzen der Lamarck-Darwin'sohen Entwicklungstheorie," 226
- "Die Philosophie Shaftesbury's," 227
- Goering, W., "Raum und Stoff," 228
- Goldziher, J., "Mythology among the Hebrews," 519
- Government, Popular Fallacies Concerning the Functions of, 305-337; the working classes, 305; importance of their political power, 306, 307; views held on democracy, 307; the aim of the present article, 308; the French Revolution, 308, 309; the conditions in England and France contrasted, 309; the grievances of the working classes, 310; speculative opinion of the day, 311; the feelings of the working classes towards the Government, 311, 312; other feelings of a different character, 314; quotation from Mr. Thomas Wright, 314; further quotation, 315; from Gladstone, 316; exaggerated view as to the power of Government, 317; dangers and difficulties, 318; quotation from Herbert Spencer, 318, 319; the function of Government, 319, 320; what both the lower and higher classes must do, 320; our English law of compromise, 320, 321; ideal strong government, 322; ignorance of political economy, 323; Herbert Spencer's theories gaining ground, 324; Wilhelm von Humboldt's views on government, 325; a government of coercion, 326; over-legislation, 327; quotation from Herbert Spencer, 327, 328; governmental agency, 328; the end of government, 329; objection against limited government, 330; Wilhelm von Humboldt, 330; Mr. Matthew Arnold, 331; perfect men require no government, 331, 332; the case of the post-office, 332; Mill on the functions of Government, 332, 333; quotation from Buckle, 333; individualism 334; quotation from a new political association, 335, 336; its aim, 336; quotation from Herbert Spencer, 337

- Goulburn, E. M., D.D., "The Gospel of the Childhood," 528
- Gower, F. Levison, *see* "English Dialect Society"
- Graeme, E., "Beethoven," 279
- "Grave, The Life Beyond the," 528
- Green, H. W., "Walter Lee," 287
- Grenfel, E. F., "First German Exercises," 602
- Griffith, T., "Behind the Veil: An Outline of Bible Metaphysics," 217
- Grote, John, B.D., "A Treatise on the Moral Ideas," 223
- Grove, G., F.R.G.S., "Geography," 602
- Guillemin, A., "The Applications of Physical Forces," 555
- Guizot, M., "History of France," 572
- Günther, Dr. S., "Der Einfluss der Himmelskörper auf Witterungsverhältnisse," 254
- "Gwynedd," 587
- H. W. H., "The Politicians, and other Poems," 593
- "Hades, The Epic of," 589
- Harms, Professor F., "Die Philosophie seit Kant," 229
- Hart, J. M., "Goethe," 301
- Hartmann, E. von, "Gesammelte Studien," 231
- Haswell, D. O., "The Social Condition of the Blind," 541
- Hachett, H., D.D., "A Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles," 219
- Haweis, Rev. H. R., M.A., "Current Coin," 241
- Mrs., "Chancer for Children," 297
- Hayter, H. H., "Victoria Year-Book for 1875," 551
- "Hegel e Machiavelli," 536
- Heer, Professor, "The Primeval World of Switzerland," 259
- Heule, Dr. J., "Anthropologische Vorträge," 564
- "Anatomischer Hand-Atlas," 264
- Herzog, E. A., "Kosmologisches," 534
- Dr. J. J., "Abriss der gesamten Kirchengeschichte," 271
- Heyer, Dr. F., "Canossa und Venedig," 573
- Heygate, Rev. W. E., M.A., "The Good Shepherd," 220
- Hibbs, Rev. R., "Prussia and the Poor," 540
- Hine, T. C., F.S.A., "Nottingham and its Castle," 600
- Hirsch, F., "Byzantinische Studien,"
- "Historical Biographies," by various writers," 270
- "Historical Handbooks," by various writers, 269
- Holst, Dr. von, "The Constitutional and Political Histories of the United States," 572
- Hope, A. R., "The Pampas," 297
- Horne, W., M.A., "Reason and Revelation," 218
- Horwicz, A., "Wesen und Aufgabe der Philosophie," 535
- Hovenden, R. M., "Horace's Life and Character," 599
- Hozier, Captain H. M., "The Invasion of England," 568
- INCHBOLD, J. W., "Annus Amoris," 289
- India, Financial Difficulties of the Government of, 196-213; Professor Fawcett's motion, 196; causes of the present financial difficulties, 197; Professor Fawcett on, 197; Parliament and its control over the administration of India, 198; the effect of these financial difficulties on the Government of India, 199; land-tax, how its payments are enforced, 200; instances of, 200, 201; Bill with regard to the land revenue, 201; the state of matters in Northern India, 202; the new Civil Procedure Bill, 203; its proposed enactments, 204; land settlements in the Madras Presidency, 204; Mr. Auckland Colvin on, in Northern India, 205; in the Punjab, 205; present and past administration, 206; preamble to Regulation II. (1793), 206, 207; general character of the legislation of 1793, 208; illegal seizures of private estates, 209; the Koth succession case, 209; another case, 210; a third case, 211; what the effects of the financial embarrassments are on the administration of the Government of India, 212; summary of, 212, 213; suggestions, 213
- Italy, "Annali del Ministro di Agricoltura," &c., 245
- "Relazione della Commissione sul progetto di legge presentato del Ministro di Agricoltura," 245
- Italy, various pamphlets on Italian Shipping, 552
- JACOB, G. L., "The Rajah of Sarawak," 581
- Jacobson, J., "Ueber die Auffindung der Apriori," 229

- Jennings, Mrs. V., "Rahel: Her Life and Letters," 278
- Jukes, J. B., F.R.S., "The School Manual of Geology," 258
- Justice, A Ministry of, 1-19; the science of jurisprudence, 1; the *ius gentium*, 2; *ius civile*, 2; the fall of Rome, 3; forms attached to bargains in early times, 3, 4; prætors, 4; *responsa prudentum*, 5; the Institutes of Justinian, 6; Roman power in England, 7; Scottish statutes, 8; law in Scotland, 8; the Lord Advocates of Scotland, 9; the Anglo-Saxon character, 9, 10; Parliament and law, 10; the *Parliamentum indoctum*, 11; general character of the law of England, 12; Hallam on, 12, 13; general comments on, 13; the blunders committed by our laws, 14; suggestions for a remedy, 14, 15; Lord Shand's opinion, 15; the English County Court system, 16; the drawing of Acts, 16; the Master and Servant Acts, 17; a Department of Justice required, 18, 19
- Justum, "England and China," 546
- KAUFMANN, "Der Kampf der Französischen und Deutschen Schulorganisation und seine neueste Phase in Elsass-Lothringen," 542
- Kavanah, B. and J., "The Pearl Fountain, and Other Tales," 297
- Kemble, J. M., M.A., "The Saxons in England," 567
- Kennedy, Professor, "The Kinematics of Machinery," 252
- "Kingsley, Charles, his Letters, and Memoirs of his Life," 281
- Kingsley, Charles, 382-393; his popularity, 382, 383; his character, 383; his biography, 384; criticism on, 384; his politics, 385; his theology, 386; as a novelist, 387, 388; as a poet, 389; "The Saint's Tragedy," 390; his dramatic power, 391; Lord Coleridge and "Yeast," 392; last days, 393
- Kirchmann, J. H., "Immanuel Kant's Prolegomena," 232
- "Aristotle's Kategorien," 232
- Kirkadec, Vicomtesse de, "Madeleine," 288
- Knox, Hon. Mrs., "Sonnets and other Poems," 288
- Krause, A., "Die Gesetze des menschlichen Herzens," 532
- LANCASTER, H. H., "Essays and Reviews," 298
- Landauer, J., "Die Löthrohranalyse," 254
- Laspeyres, Dr. E., "Das Alter der deutschen Professoren," 245
- Laun, H. V., "History of French Literature," 275
- "Laurel Bush, The," 286
- Leighton, W., "The Sons of Godwin," 592
- Liesegang, Dr. P., "Der Kohle-Druck," 253
- "Ferrotypic," 253
- "Ueber das Erlangen brillanter Negative," 253
- "Die Projections-Kunst," 253
- "Das Sciopicon," 253
- Liversidge, A., "Transactions of the Royal Society of New South Wales," 257
- "Lochlère: A Poem," 593
- Locke, John, 163-195; the age in which he lived, 163, 164; Mr. Bourne's life of Locke, 165; Locke's early years, 166; at Oxford, 167; Descartes the true teacher of Locke, 168; Locke and medicine, 168, 169; as secretary to Sir Walter Vane, 169; his connection with the Earl of Shaftesbury, 171; Mr. Christie on Shaftesbury's character, 172; Locke's appointment as secretary to the Council of Trade and Foreign Plantations, 173; Locke in France, 174; thoughts of emigration, 175; political movements, 176; Dr. Fell, 177; Locke in Holland, 177; Le Clerc, 178; Locke as Commissioner of Appeals, 179; his "Two Treatises on Government," 180; William Molyneux, 181; Locke as Commissioner of Trade, 182; Locke and the Bible, 183; Collins, 184; anecdote of Locke, 185; Locke as a philosopher, 186; his sensation doctrine, 187; his origin of ideas, 187; his description of the innate theory, 187; his love and cultivation of truth for its own sake, 188; extracts from Locke, 189; on faith and reason, 190; his "Reasonableness of Christianity," 190; his "Letter on Toleration," 191; extracts from "Study," 192, 193; why his "Treatises on Government" fail, 193; the value of antagonistic modes of thought, 194; Locke's place in philosophy, 195
- Loftie, W. J., "A Plea for Art in the House," 300
- Long, Colonel C. C., "Central Africa," 236

- Lord, J., "The Vatican and St. James's," 244
 ——— "The Roman Pontiffs," &c., &c., 244
 ——— "A Ramble with the Cardinal," 244
 Lovel, E., "The Owl's Nest," 287
- MACAULAY, Lord, as an historian, 424-462; critics on, 424; Mr. Lancaster on, 425; Macaulay on Fox and Mackintosh as historians, 425; Guizot and Macaulay in Westminster Abbey, 427; Macaulay on Tacitus, 428; Macaulay's own style, 429; Macaulay on the delineation of character, 430, 431; Macaulay on Horace Walpole, 431, 432; Mr. Trevelyan on Macaulay, 433; Taine on Macaulay, 434; Macaulay on himself, 435; Macaulay's idea of how history should be written, 436; his description of the currency in the seventeenth century, 436, 437; his aim, 438; his description of the manners of the seventeenth century, 439; on the different elements of society, 440, 441; his description of the country gentleman of the seventeenth century, 442; of the houses of the seventeenth century, 443; on the advantages of the present day, 444; Macaulay on Peel, 445, 446; further observations on Peel, 447; Gladstone on Macaulay, 448; his criticisms on, 449, 450; the justice of his criticisms considered, 451; further comments on, 452, 453; the other accusations by Mr. Gladstone 454, 455; the Penn question, 456, 457; comments on Mr. Gladstone's criticisms, 458, 459; further comments, 460, 461; Newman and Macaulay compared, 461, 462
- Mackay, C., "Forty Years' Recollections," 583
- Maclagan, T., M.D., "The Germ Theory of Disease," 263
- Maclaren, J., "The Indian Exchange: Thoughts Suggested by the Fall in the Value of Silver," 243
- MacLennan, J. F., "Studies in Ancient History," 270
- Macquoid, Mrs., "Lost Rose," 284
- Magnan, Dr. V., "On Alcoholism," 264
- Mahaffy, J. P., M.A., "Rambles and Studies in Greece," 273
 ——— "Old Greek Life," 273
- Mahan, A., "History of the Late American War," 569
- "Manchester Literary Club Papers," 581
- Mansfield, R. B., "Aerial Navigation," 557
- Mario, A., "Fasti e Figure," 578
- Marquardt, J., "Römische Staatsverwaltung," 574
- Martineau, J., I.L.D., "Hours of Thought on Scripture Things," 522
- Mary, M., "Marks upon the Door," 288
- Mason, A. J., "The Persecution of Diocletian," 575
 "Maude Maynard," 287
- Medem, R., "Grundzüge einer Exakten Psychologie," 531
- Melville, H., "Veritas," 602
- Menteth, D. P. Stuart, "The Silver Question, and how to Raise Exchange," 242
- Moberly, Rev. C. E., "King Lear," 296
- Möhl, H., "Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge," 245
- Molineux, R. F., M.A., "The Reconciliation of Reason and Faith," 527
- Montelius, O., "Führer durch das Museum vaterländischer Alterthümer in Stockholm," 274
 "More than a Million," 535
- Morley, H., "Shorter English Poems," 293
- Morris, Rev. R., M.A., see "English Dialect Society"
- Mozley, J. B., D.D., "Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford," 214
- Münter, Dr. J., "Ueber Muscheln, Schnecken und verwandte Weichtiere," 565
- NAGEL, Dr. von, "Geometrische Analysis," 249
- Narjoux, F., "Notes and Sketches of an Architect," 544
 "National Portrait Gallery," 284
- Neumann, Dr. C., "Vorlesungen über die mechanische Theorie der Wärme," 250
- Nicholl, A. C., and A. J. Flaxman, "The Law of Parliamentary and Municipal Registration," 241
- Nichol, J., I.L.D., "Tables of European Literature and History," 270
 ——— "Tables of Ancient Literature and History," 577
- Nicol, Arthur, "The Puzzle of Life," 562
- Noack, L., "Johannes Scotus Erigena," 231
- Nöggerath, G. A., "Die Achat-Industrie

- im Oldenburgischen Fürstenthum Birkenfeld," 542
- O'HAIRE, Rev. J., "A Glance at Ireland's Apostle and Ireland's Faith," 584
- Oldfield, E., M.A., "St. Peter's and St. Paul's," 601
- Oliphant, Mrs., "The Makers of Florence," 275
- O'Meara, K., "Frederic Ozanam," 279
- Owen, H., "The Elementary Education Acts," 239
- Oxenham, H. N., M.A., "Catholic Eschatology and Universalism," 216
- PAGE, D., LL.D., "Advanced Text-Book of Geology," 257
- Palgrave, W. G., "Dutch Guiana," 234
- Parker, J. W., "Sermons on the Church's Seasons," 219
- J. H., "The Forum Romanum," 274
- Parkes, E. A., M.D., "Public Health," 507
- Parker, Mrs., *see* "English Dialect Society"
- Payer, J., "The Lands within the Arctic Circle," 232
- Payne, J., "A Visit to German Schools," 239
- Peacocke, G., "Rays from the Southern Cross," 290
- T. B., "The Vendetta, and other Poems," 592
- Peile, J., "Philology," 602
- Peschel, O., "The Races of Man," 256
- Petersen, Dr. J., "Hauptmomente in der geschichtlichen Entwicklung der medicinischen Therapie," 269
- Phillip, C. J., "The New Forest Handbook," 294
- Philippson, Dr. M., "Heinrich IV. und Philipp III.," 272
- Pickering, Professor E. C., "Elements of Physical Manipulation," 553
- Piddington, H., "The Sailor's Hornbook," 560
- Pole, W., F.R.S., "Life of Sir W. Fairbairn, Bart.," 582
- Price, Major Sir R. L., "The Two Americas," 551
- Punchard, E. G., "King Saul," 593
- QUERFURTH, G., "Weisbach's Ingenieur," herausgegeben von, 560
- "Question, The Northern; or, Russia's Policy in Turkey Unmasked," 548
- RADENHASUEN, C., "O siris," 567
- Rae, John, M.A., "Railways of New South Wales," 551
- Reid, G. H., "An Essay on New South Wales," 550
- Renny, Dr. M., "Goethe's Erscheinen in Weimar," 580
- Renton, W., "Oils and Water Colours," 290
- "Republic, The New," 586
- Reumont, A. von, "Lorenzo the Magnificent," 276
- Riemann, B., "Schwere, Electricität und Magnetismus," 251
- Robertson, Rev. F. W., "Notes on Genesis," 524
- Robinson, Clough, *see* "English Dialect Society"
- Robinson, F. K., *see* "English Dialect Society"
- Rochholz, E. L., "Tell und Gessler," 272
- Roe, Rev. E. P., "Near to Nature's Heart," 283
- Rogers, J. E. T., "Epistles and Satires," 590
- Ross, Major W. A., "Pyrology," 560
- Routledge, J., "Chapters in the History of Popular Progress," 241
- Russia, 492-518; our knowledge of, 492; nature of, 493; writers upon, 494; Mr. Wallace's book, 495; criticisms on, 496; the Oriental characteristics of Russia, 496, 497; the advances and aggressions of Russia, 498; Russian reforms, 499; religion of, 499; social condition, 500; creeds, 501; want of unity, 501; industrial life, 502; village communities, 502, 503; the land question, 504; the peasants, 505; Mr. Wallace on "serfage," 506; consequences of emancipation, 507; the commune, 508; territorial advancement and the Eastern Question, 509; the future policy of Russia, 510; Mr. Wallace's views on, 510, 511; further considerations on Russian policy, 512, 513; our road to India and Russian interests, 514; the aggressive tendencies of Russia, 514; the author of "Savage and Civilised Russia," his opinion considered, 514, 515; war between Turkey and Russia, considerations on, 516; Russia's chances of success weighed, 517; Major Russell's opinion, 517; the outlook for the future, 517, 518
- SADEBECK, M., "Entwicklungsgang der Gradmessungs-Arbeiten," 556

- Sagemann, Dr. E., "Die Stellung der Niederdeutschen," 573
- Samter, A., "Gesellschaftliches und Privat-Eigenthum als Grundlage der Socialpolitik," 542
- Say, J., "The Battle of Harlem Plains," 573
- Schellwein, R., "Das Gesetz der Causalität in der Natur," 225
- Schlegel, V., "Die Elemente der modernen Geometrie und Algebra," 247
- Schmidt, Dr. J., "Schiller und Rousseau," 278
- Schwarz, J., "Die Democratic," 543
- Science, The Warfare of, 19 36; the general indifference of mankind, 19, 20; the character of Dr. White's book, 20, 21; opposition of religion to science, 21, 22; the case of Sir James Simpson, 22; cases in France, 23; the story of Galileo, 24; Eusebius, Lactantius, and St. Augustine on science, 25; the Church on science, 26; the story of Columbus, 27; general reflections, 28; Luther and Melancthon on science and the Bible, 29; the nebular theory, 30; the spectrum analysis, 30; Lord Bacon, 31; Francis Bacon, 31; the Dominicans and Franciscans on science, 32; the Church on usury, 33; the power of the Church in the present day, 34, 35; conclusion, 35
- Scott, R. II., M.A., F.R.S., "Weather Charts and Storm Warnings," 255
- Sellar, W. Y., M.A., "The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age," 577
- Shadwell, J. L., "A System of Political Economy," 538
- Shekerry, The Old, "Sport in Many Lands," 547
- Shore, Rev. T., "Some Difficulties of Belief," 522
- Shute, R., M.A., "A Discourse on Truth," 523
- Smart, H., "Courtship in 1720 and 1860," 286
- Smiles, S., "The Huguenots," 273
'Life of a Scotch Naturalist,' 283
- Smith, R. P., "The Symbolical Languages of Ancient Art and Mythology," 230
— J. M., "The Prince of Argolis," 297
- Sparschuh, Dr. N., "Kelten, Griechen, Germanen," 534
- Spooner, E., "Historical Scenes," 273
- Spry, W. J., R.N., "The Cruise of H.M.S. 'Challenger,'" 537
- Stephen, Leslie, "History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century," 221
- Stern, A., "Milton," 276
- Stevens, Rev. G. T., M.A., "Domestic Economy for Girls," 540
- Stillman, W. J., "Herzegovina and the Late Uprising," 549
- Stokes, Professor, "Science Lectures," 556
- Stretton, H., "David Lloyd's Last Will," 599
- Stricker, Dr. W., "Goethe und Frankfurt am Main," 580
- Stone, Dr. W. H., "Sound and Music," 252
- Stubbs, W., "History of the Bengal Artillery," 539
- Studnitz, A. von, "Gold," abridged by Mrs. Brewer, 242
- Sutton, F., "Volunetric Analysis," 560
- Sweet, H., M.A., "An Anglo-Saxon Reader," 302
- Syme, D., "Outlines of an Industrial Science," 240
- TAYLOR, J. E., "The Aquarium," 257
- Tennyson, A., "Harold," 587
— "Works of," 588
- Theobald, H. S., "A Concise Treatise on the Construction of Wills," 539
- "Thirlwall, Bishop, Remains of," 521
- Thompson, J., "Public and Private Life of Animals," 298
- "Ticknor, Life, Letters, and Journals of George," 279
- Todhunter, J., "Laurella," 289
- Tollin, H., "Charakterbild Michael Servet's," 276
- Tozer, H. F., M.A., "Classical Geography," 574
- "Travancore, Report on the Administration of," &c., 244
- Trollope, T. A., "The Papal Conclaves as they were and as they are," 271
— "Family Party in the Piazza of St. Peter," 587
- Turkish Question, The: Russian Designs and English Promoters of them, 93-163; the condition of European Turkey, 93; Russian aggression, 94; Lord Palmerston on, 94, 95; the Queen and Lord Clarendon on, 95, 96; the Conservative party and the Crimean War, 96; the Treaty of Paris, 96, 97; extract from the "Times," 97, 98; the Panclavic plan, 98; the events of 1870 and Russia, 99; Russian aggressions, 100; Lord Stratford de Redcliffe's letter to the "Times," 101; Sir H.

- Elliott and Lord Derby, 102; Sir A. Buchanan's warning, 103; Sir H. Elliott on the Servian movement, 104; further reports, 104, 105; the British Parliament, 105, 106; Lord Loftus's report, 107; movements of Russia, 107, 108; murder of the French and German consuls at Salonica, 108; the Berlin Memorandum, 109; the request of the Russian Chancellor, 110; Bulgarian outrages, 111; Sir H. Elliott, 112; extract from the "Cologne Gazette," 113; from the "Journal des Débats," 114; the next move of Russia, 115; the British representative at St. Petersburg, 116; Count Beust and Lord Derby, 117; invasion of Turkey by Servia, 118; Lord Derby's explanation of the policy of the Government, 119; Mr. Gladstone, 120, 121; the Servian insurrection, 121; the condition of Turkey, 122; public meeting at Willis's Rooms, 123; the Hackney meeting, 123; Manchester meeting, 124; Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, 124, 125; remarks on, 126, 127; criticisms on Mr. Gladstone, 127-129; views held with regard to the Turks, 128, 129; cruelties committed by both sides, 130, 131; further examination of Mr. Gladstone's arguments, 132, 133; further criticisms on, 133, 134; English newspapers, 135; Mr. Rocbuck, 135; the "Golos," 136; Mr. Lowe, 137; Mansion House meeting, 138; Mr. Baring's report on the Bulgarian outrages, 139; feeling in Germany, 140; Lord Derby and the Mansion House deputation, 141; the action of Servia, 143; Russian war literature, 143; Russian volunteers, 144; extract from the "Cologne Gazette," 144, 145; "Journal des Débats," 145; from Dr. Arminius Vambery, 145, 146; the Duke of Argyll's Glasgow speech, 146; the Duke of Somerset's, 147; criticisms on Mr. Gladstone, 148; reform in Turkey, 149; Dr. Braun on the English meetings, 150; the English Bishops, 151; the Bishop of Bombay, 152; Mr. Gladstone in the "Contemporary Review," 153; speech in the Hungarian Parliament, 154; occurrences in Servia and Constantinople, 154, 155; the movements of Russia, 156, 157; Mr. Gladstone's invitation to the Greeks, 157, 158; St. James's Hall meeting, 158, 159; Mr. Freeman, Mr. Fawcett, &c., 160, 161; Sir G. Campbell's work, 161; conclusion, 162, 163
- Tyler, Charles, "The Faggot," 540
- Tytler, S., "What She Came Through," 283
- "Landsecr's Dogs," 602
- "Childhood a Hundred Years Ago," 599
- "ULTIMATE GENERALISATION," 231
- "UNAWARCS," 587
- VEQUERAY, J. W. J., "A German Accidence," 580
- Verne, J., "Michael Strogoff," 599
- Viardot, L., "A Brief History of the Painters of all Schools," 301
- "Victoria, Report of the Minister of Public Instruction," 240
- Vilmar, "Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur," 580
- WALCKER, Dr. K., "Die Silber-Entwerthungs-Frage," 542
- Waltenhofen, Dr. A. von, "Grundriss der allgemeinen mechanischen Physik," 250
- Westal, W., "Tales and Legends of Gascony," 297
- Wickham, Captain E. H. R.A., "The Influence of Firearms upon Tactics," 539
- Wigand, Dr. A., "Der Darwinismus und die Naturforschung Newtons und Cuviers," 565
- Wilkes, G., "Shakespeare from an American Point of View," 598
- Will, Dr. H., "Tafeln zur qualitativen chemischen Analyse," 254
- Williamson, Professor W. C., F.R.S., "The Manchester Science Lectures," 561
- Wilson, J. G., "The Poets and Poetry of Scotland," 293
- Withrow, Rev. W. H., M.A., "The Catacombs of Rome," 576
- Wood, Rev. J. G., M.A., "Nature's Teachings," 260
- J. T., "Discoveries at Ephesus," 274
- "ZEALAND NEW, Statistics of the Colony of," 244

