

THE
SCOTTISH REVIEW.

JULY AND OCTOBER,

1892.

VOL. XX.

ALEXANDER GARDNER,
Publisher to Her Majesty the Queen,
PAISLEY; AND 26 PATERNOSTER SQUARE, LONDON.

MDCCCXCII.

INDEX TO VOLUME XX.

A.	
Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie, ...	210
Ainslie, Hew, A Pilgrimage to the Land of Burns, etc., ...	461
Aiziewood, J. W., LL.B., Warbeck, ...	464
Anthropological History of Europe, Second and Third Rhind Lectures for 1891, by John Beddoe, LL.D., ...	146, 362
Archivio Storico Italiano, ...	198, 430
Archivio Storico per le Province Napolitane, ...	197, 430
Armitt, Annie, The Story of Mary Shelley, ...	254
Athens, ...	198, 434
B.	
Baden-Powell, B. H., Land Systems of British India, ...	220
Barrow, Rev. Edwin Pinder, M.A., Regni Evangelium, ...	214
Beddoe, John, LL.D., The Anthropological History of Europe, Rhind Lectures, ...	146, 362
Bernard, J. H., D.D., Kant's Kritik of Judgment, ...	456
Bernard, Canon, T. D., The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ, ...	466
Bibliothèque Universelle, ...	204, 443
Blake, Buchanan, B.D., How to Read Isaiah, ...	467
Blind, Karl, Kossuth and Klapka, ...	379
Booth, Charles, Pauperism and the Endowment of Old Age, ...	225
Bose, William Porcher du, M.A., S.T.D., The Soteriology of the New Testament, ...	212
Bouchot, Henri, Les Clouet et Corneille de Lyon, ...	228
Bury, J. B., Coming of the Hungarians, ...	29
Freeman's Sicily, Vol. III., ...	300
Buxton, Mrs. Sydney, Side Lights upon Bible History, ...	453
C.	
Cameron, Rev. Alexander, LL.D., Reliquiæ Celticae, Edited by Alexander MacBain, M.A., and Rev. John Kennedy, ...	222
Coming of the Hungarians, The, by J. B. Bury, ...	29
Conder, Major C. R., etc., The Natural Basis of Speech, ...	338
Crawford, J. H., Forfarshire, ...	276
Critical Review, The, ...	468
Cromarty, Deas, Scottish Ministerial Miniatures, ...	227
D.	
Deutsche Rundschau, ...	180, 421
Dods, Professor Marcus, D.D., The Gospel of S. John, Vol. II., ...	452
Douglas, George, Tib, ...	468
Downie, John, How the Scottish Union was Effected, ...	163
How the Scottish Union has Worked, ...	397
Duplessis, Georges, Les Andran, ...	228
E.	
España Moderna, La, ...	205, 444
Eyre-Todd, George, Scottish Poetry of the Sixteenth Century, ...	463
F.	
Farrar, Ven. F. W., etc., New Edition of Works, ...	226, 467
Forfarshire, by J. H. Crawford, ...	276
Fowler, W. Warde, M.A., Julius Caesar and the Foundation of the Roman Empire, ...	220
Freeman's History of Sicily, Vol. III., by J. B. Bury, ...	300
Fyfe, A. Hamilton, Annals of Our Own Time, Vol. III., Part 2, ...	230
G.	
Gids, De, ...	208, 447
Grant, Arthur, Scottish Origin of the Merlin Myth, ...	321

- Green, J. R., M.A., Short History of the English People. Illustrated Edition, edited by Mrs. Green and Miss Kate Norgate, Vol. I., ... 457
- H.
- Hatherly, Very Rev. S. G., Mus. B. Oxon., etc., A Treatise on Byzantine Music, ... 466
- Hill, George Birkbeck. D.C.L., Letters of Samuel Johnston, LL.D., ... 218
- Hill-a-Hoy, O, by A Country Cousin, ... 463
- Hosken, James Dryden, Phaon and Sappho, and Nimrod, ... 228
- How the Scottish Union was Effected, by John Downie, ... 163
- How the Scottish Union has Worked, by the same, ... 397
- Huxley, Thomas H., F.R.S., Essays on Some Controverted Questions, ... 453
- I, J.
- Igdrasil, Vol. III., ... 230
- Innea, A. Taylor, Studies in Scottish History, ... 227
- Jenkinson, Rev. Arthur, M.A., A Modern Disciple, ... 226
- Johns Hopkins University Studies, ... 467
- Jowett, B., M.A., The Dialogues of Plato, third edition, ... 455
- K.
- Kossuth and Klapka, by Karl Blind, ... 379
- L.
- Lamond, Robert Peel, The Scottish Poor Laws, ... 465
- Laurie, Prof. S. S., Teachers' and Guild Addresses, ... 229
- Leaf, Walter Litt, D.D., A Companion to the Iliad for English Readers, ... 462
- Lees, Very Rev. J. Cameron, D.D., LL.D., Life and Conduct, ... 467
- Legend of Orendel, The, ... 124
- Lhomme, F., Charlet, ... 468
- Femmes Ecrivains, ... 227
- Raffet, ... 228
- Lindsay, James, B.D., Progressiveness of Christian Thought, ... 226
- Lovett, Richard, James Gilmour of Mongolia, ... 219
- M.
- Marshall, Alfred, Elements of Economics of Industry, ... 229
- Mary Shelley, The Story of, by Annie Armit, ... 254
- Mather, James, Poems, ... 463
- Maurice, F. D., Christmas Day ... 467
- M'Kendrick, Prof. J. G., M.D., Life in Motion, ... 229
- Merlin Myth, Scottish Origin of, by Arthur Grant, ... 321
- Merriman, Henry Seton, The Slave of the Lamp, ... 230
- Michel Emile, Les Van de Velde, ... 468
- Morris, W. O'Connor, The Reminiscences of Marshal Macdonald, ... 67
- N.
- Natural Basis of Speech, The, by Major C. R. Conder, ... 338
- Nichol, John, M.A., LL.D., Carlyle, ... 459
- Nicol, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Recent Explorations in Bible Lands, ... 226
- Nicolson, Rev. W., M.A., Myth and Religion, ... 227
- Normand, Ch., J. B. Greuze, ... 468
- Nuova Antologia, ... 195, 430
- O.
- Omond, G. W., The Porteous Riot, ... 52
- Orendel, Legend of, ... 124
- P.
- Parkin, George R., Imperial Federation, ... 464
- Patrick, John, B.D., The Apology of Origen, ... 215
- Paul, J. Balfour, Scottish Heraldry, ... 233
- Pensiero Italiano, ... 198
- Pike, Warburton, The Barren Ground of Northern Canada, ... 224
- Porteous Riot, The, by G. W. Omond, ... 52
- Preussische Jahrbücher, ... 182, 423
- Professor, The, and other Poems, ... 464
- R.
- Rae-Brown, Colin, The Dawn of Love, etc., ... 229
- Ramsay, Sir James H., Lancaster and York, ... 218
- Rassegna Nazionale, ... 192, 433
- Recreations of a Country Parson, the Author of, Twenty-

THE
SCOTTISH REVIEW.

JULY, 1892.

ART. I.—THE SOCIAL CONDITION OF THE POOR
IN GLASGOW.

1. *First Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners for inquiry into the Housing of the Working Classes.* (Presented to both Houses of Parliament.) London. 1889.
2. *Presbytery of Glasgow: Report of Commission on the Housing of the Poor in Relation to their Social Condition.* Glasgow. 1891.

IT is an old and often repeated forecast that social subjects are coming to the front; to-day it has fulfilled itself; they have come to the front; for good or evil we stand face to face with them. They have laid hold of the public mind; they are discussed in Parliament; they are discussed in General Assemblies; they are discussed in Labour Congresses.

Some problems are ripening for settlement, others as yet are in the inchoate and nebulous state. Whether the settlement will issue in weal or woe depends upon the spirit of reason and common sense and common justice on the basis of which they are settled.

In some respects the temper of the times is not favourable to a rational settlement of complicated and difficult problems; in other respects it is. It is an age of doubt and uncertainty in spheres economic as well as theological. Fixed principles which guided men's actions in old days have been cast to the winds. The

laws of political economy, we are told, are banished to Saturn, and responsible statesmen are prepared with a light heart to venture upon the rashest experiments, little knowing to what goal they may lead. Economic as well as moral law is fixed and inexorable, and if infringed will return from Saturn to avenge itself on the transgressors. Statecraft to-day is marked by a disregard of principle which is little short of immoral. Leaders of all parties are seemingly guided not by what they believe to be right, but by what they believe to be politic; they have ceased to be men of light and leading; their mission seems to be to follow rather than to lead. Instead of educating the popular mind, they are beseeching the popular mind to educate them; they each in turn find salvation by yielding a blind adherence to some popular fad. They are educated, not by the voice of the people, which in the main is a true voice, but by the voice of interested agitators who arrogate to themselves the right to speak in the people's name. The power of legislative enactments is enormously exaggerated, and the power of individual effort is correspondingly underrated. Ecclesiastics dream that by persuading men to change their opinions they will regenerate the world; politicians dream that by framing a new social creed they will cure the ills which afflict the commonwealth. All that churchmen can do is to put men in a position to be helped by a higher power to work out their own salvation. All that statesmen can accomplish is to remove any obstacle which hinders the progress of the race. All progress is, and cannot be aught else than, the work of individual effort.

Social problems are so intricate and far reaching in their issues, that the greatest caution is requisite to guide any movements connected with them towards even their partial solution. There is always the grave risk, that in trying to remedy one set of evils other evils may be developed or exaggerated. In other respects the temper of the times is favourable to social reform. There is the growth of the humanitarian spirit; a deeper sympathy towards the distressed and miserable is stirring in men's minds; and even the dissolute are regarded more with pity than loathing. Parliament, democratic in its tone, is quick to give a careful consideration to any proposals, which are reasonable in

themselves and likely to improve the social condition of the people. Corporations and churches, and the public at large, are showing a better disposition to carry out reformatory schemes.

It would serve no good or immediate practical purpose to refer to social problems in regard to which there is much divergence of opinion; such as the distribution of wealth, the relation between capital and labour, the restriction of labour hours, and others, which are only vaguely shaping themselves into form. The air is full of proposals and schemes, crude in their conception and loose in their definition, which by dreamers of dreams are regarded as the means of restoring an earthly paradise, and constitute the gospel of the socialist. We do not propose to enter the homes or refer to the social conditions of the skilled and intelligent workman; to do so might reasonably be resented as an impertinent intrusion. Such may safely be left to conduct their own affairs and to protect their own interests. The position of the upper circles of the industrial classes has vastly improved during the last half century. The workman is better educated, more intelligent and more self-reliant; he reaps a larger share of the fruits of his labour, is better housed, better clothed and better fed. Wages were never so high, the cost of living was never so low. It is pleasant to find signs of culture and refinement in his house, in furniture, pictures and books. The accumulated savings of the working classes are very large. The Friendly Societies are possessed of vast capital, the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows alone having a capital of upwards of seven and a half millions. This is not to be wondered at when the undernoted facts are considered.

In 1876 only 36 per cent. of persons who died in Glasgow were enrolled in Friendly Societies, but the proportion has risen year by year without interruption, until in 1885 it was fifty-two per cent. There are now 160,881 Depositors in the Glasgow Savings Bank, besides 80,000 in the Penny Banks, making an aggregate of 240,881 persons who directly or indirectly are depositing their savings in this Institution. Estimating the population of the city and suburbs at 762,000, this number gives an average of 1 Depositor for every $3\frac{1}{2}$ of the population. In 1850 the average was only 1 in 12, affording a remarkable evidence of the growth

of thrifty habits in the community.—(Glasgow Savings Bank Report, 1890.)

A considerable portion of these savings are being invested in productive labour. The Co-operative Societies, wholesale and retail, are on the whole flourishing; in many instances they are highly successful. The Report of the Scottish Wholesale Co-operative Society shows that during the last quarter the turnover amounted to £714,314 8s. 4d., or about £3,000,000 a year. Still more gratifying is the public spirit and the generous sympathy with refinement and culture exhibited at their meetings. When the Report referred to was submitted, the chairman brought up a message from the Board of Directors recommending that a grant of £1000 be made to the Glasgow Art Gallery Scheme, to which we shall afterwards refer. The discussion which followed turned, not on the question whether the grant should be agreed to, but whether it should be one of £1000 or £2000. A hopeful picture this of growth and progress; showing an advance amongst the industrial classes not merely in material comfort, but also in culture and refinement. In sharp contrast with it, the Presbytery's Report presents us with a mass of depressing details, describing in strong but unexaggerated language, the mean, sordid housing and debased social condition of the lowest class of unskilled workmen. The picture is truly distressing and pathetic.

Poor souls, they have fallen to so low a level, that there need be no fear of intrusion in entering their dwellings, to observe their habits and scan their surroundings. Their lives, though very black, many of them, and very repulsive, are very sombre and joyless, and will respond to kindly words of human sympathy, and possibly grasp a helping hand.

In all cities there are quarters, sometimes, as in Westminster, abutting on stately residences, where are lodged the very poor and unfortunate; the thriftless and dissolute; the abandoned and criminal. The general aspect is gloomy and depressing; the tenements densely packed; the houses overcrowded; types of the race who inhabit them may be seen lounging at alley entrances and doorways.

It is the same the world over. The most advanced civilization has its blots, and there is no blot blacker than a population of

wretched stricken lives, dragging out their days amidst squalor and penury in cities full of signs of great wealth and material prosperity, adorned with splendid monuments, and full of stately cathedrals and imposing churches. Anyone who has the courage to penetrate these regions will come in touch, amidst much and loud profanity, with much pathetic sorrow, and see played out before his eyes many a sad tragedy.

In the following pages we propose to confine our attention to the City of Glasgow, partly because it seems to us to be a fair type of a great commercial and manufacturing city, and partly because the information to hand in connection with its poor is, so far as we are acquainted with the subject, more easily accessible and abundant.

The Royal Commission practically, and the Commission appointed by the Presbytery of Glasgow avowedly, restricted their enquiry to the housing and social condition of working men and women whose wages are under 20s. As to the first point the latter body of Commissioners at an early stage of their inquiry arrived at the opinion, which was afterwards fully confirmed on evidence submitted, that for workmen whose wages are over 20s., there is, at least in Glasgow, a full supply of good houses at moderate rents.

It is difficult to estimate with accuracy the number of workers whose wages are *under* 20s. There are in Glasgow 122,600 dwelling-houses, of which 8,000 are unoccupied. There are 35,892 houses of only one apartment, of which 2,118 are unoccupied. Of these houses, 23,228 are 'ticketed houses,'—16,413 of one room, and 6,875 of two rooms. 'Ticketed house' is a technical term which is thus defined by Dr. Russell (*Evidence*, p. 4):—

'Any house that does not exceed three rooms, and does not exceed as to the conjoint capacity of the whole house 2,000 cubic feet, may be measured, and the total cubic contents inscribed upon a ticket on the door or lintel, with the number of inmates who may legally occupy that house, at the rate of 300 cubic feet per adult or child over eight years. That is a ticketed house.'

The average rent of 'ticketed houses' of one room is 7s. 11d. a month, or £4 15s. a year; and of two rooms, 10s. 3d. a month,

or £7 16s. a year. Of this class of house, according to the last return, 11 per cent. are unoccupied.

These houses are under the 'special supervision of the Sanitary Department.' They are occupied by 75,000 people; 46,296 living in one room, and 28,700 in two rooms. Rather less than one-half of the one-room houses are ticketed. It may be assumed that about 120,000 persons live in one-room houses (ticketed or not) and in two-room ticketed houses.

The subject of our enquiry will lead us to consider, (1) The overcrowding which exists in the congested districts of the town, and the structural condition of overcrowded tenements; (2) the social condition and habits of those who lodge in these tenements.

Glasgow compares favourably with London in these respects. The overcrowding in the latter is much more dense, and the rents much higher. The following instances of overcrowding are taken from the Report of the Royal Commission. They might be multiplied indefinitely. In Clerkenwell, at 15 St. Helena Place, a house was described containing six rooms, which were occupied at that time by six families, and as many as *eight persons* inhabited one room. At 1 Wilmington Place, there were eleven families in eleven rooms, seven persons occupying one room. At 30 Noble Street, five families, of twenty-six persons in all, were found inhabiting six rooms. A small house in Allen Street was occupied by thirty-eight persons, seven of whom lived in one room. In Northampton Court there were twelve persons in a two-roomed house, eight of whom inhabited one room. In Swan Alley, in an old, partly wooden, and decayed house, there were seventeen persons inhabiting three rooms. In Tilney Court, St. Luke's, nine members of a family, five of them being grown up, inhabited one room, 10 feet by 8. In Lion Row there was a room 12 feet by 6, and only 7 feet high, in which seven persons slept. At 9 Portpool Lane, there were six persons in one small back room. At 1 Half Moon Court, in a three-roomed house, were found nineteen persons, eight adults and eleven children, and the witness, who has had much experience in the neighbourhood, said that he could hardly call that house over-crowded, as he knew of a case of twelve persons in one room in Robin Hood Yard, Holborn.

The rents of the houses are higher in London :—

‘ Mr. Marchant Williams, Inspector of Schools for the London School Board, has given valuable evidence on this point. From personal investigation of parts of the parishes of Clerkenwell, St. Luke’s, St. Giles, Marylebone, and other poor quarters of London, he finds that 88 per cent. of the poor population pay more than one-fifth of their income in rent ; 46 per cent. pay from one-fourth to one-half ; 42 per cent pay from one-fourth to one-fifth ; and only 12 per cent. pay less than one-fifth of their weekly wages in rent. These figures are gathered from an inquiry extending over nearly 1,000 dwellings taken at random in different poor parts of the metropolis. Among them 4s.10½d. is the average rent of one room let as a separate tenement, 6s. of two-roomed tenements, and 7s. 5½d. of three-roomed tenements. Rents in the congested districts of London are getting gradually higher, and wages are not rising, and there is a prospect, therefore, of the disproportion between rent and wages growing still greater.’

The rents given above are weekly rents ; the weekly rents in ticketed houses in Glasgow are 1/11½ for one room, and 2/6½ for two rooms. The value of ground in London is much costlier, and overcrowding apparently is not so efficiently dealt with.

Glasgow has won for herself a good repute for the efforts made by the Corporation to improve the housing and ameliorate the social condition of the poor ; she has led the way in this movement. The Improvement Trust, constituted by Act of Parliament, began its operations about 1866. Streets were driven through the congested districts, back tenements pulled down, light and air admitted. The city railways have worked in the same direction ; they have removed tenements of the worst description which covered acres of ground. The results have been beneficial in a high degree, as will be seen from the following remarkable statement made by Dr. Russell, the Medical Officer of Health :—

‘ The mean annual number of deaths in Glasgow was as follows in the three successive periods of the last fifteen years, viz. :—

Mean annual deaths, 5 years, 1871-75=	15,400
Do. 5 ,, 1876-80=	13,451
Do. 5 ,, 1881-85=	13,531

It is unquestionable, therefore, that in the five years 1876-80, as compared with the five years 1871-75, there was a mean *annual decrease* of 1,949 deaths, and in the five years 1881-85, as compared with the same five years, a mean *annual decrease* of 1,869 deaths. In other words, in the last ten

years 19,000 lives have been saved as compared with the preceding five years.'

The erection of lodging-houses by the Corporation—well devised and conducted—has vastly improved the provision made for the comfort of those who were formerly driven into common lodging-houses of the meanest and most debased sort. It has also reduced overcrowding in private houses to a remarkable extent. The percentage of houses where there were strange lodgers has fallen from 70 per cent. in 1871 to 29 in 1888. 'It has fallen *pari passu* with the increase of these lodging-houses.'—(*Russell, Evidence*, p. 5.)

That there is room for further ameliorative measures, and that these will issue in happy results, there is no reason to doubt—

'In Aberdeen the density, that is to say the number of persons who live on an acre of ground, is 18?—Yes. The average number of rooms to a house is 3·42, and the percentage of the population who live in one-apartment houses is 13·6?—Yes. And the death-rate in Aberdeen is 21·7 over the ten years 1871-80?—Yes. Then, to take Edinburgh, the density there is 55, average number of rooms to the house is 4·19, the percentage of the population who live in houses of one apartment is 16·8, and the death-rate is 23·2?—That is so. Then in Glasgow the density is 84, the number of rooms to the house is 2·34, the percentage of the population living in houses of one-apartment is 24·7, and the death-rate is 28·6?—Yes. So that the death-rate in Glasgow was 5·4 higher than in Edinburgh?'—(*Dr. Russell, Evidence*, p. 2.)

In Aberdeen the death-rate is lowest, the density is lowest, and the percentage of the population living in one-room houses lowest.

The citizens of Aberdeen and Edinburgh live, apart from their better housing, under circumstances more favourable to health and long life than the citizens of Glasgow; but that does not fully account for the disparity in the rate of mortality.

The disparity between different districts within the city is much greater, and very startling. Contrast the best district with the worst:—

'The best district (the most favoured of all) is the Blythswood district. There the density is 101, the mean number of rooms per house is 4, and the death-rate is 16·1?—Yes, the average death-rate in the three years 1880-1-2. The mean number of persons per room is 1·2? In Cowcaddens

district the density is 249, the mean number of rooms per house is 1·7, the mean number of persons per room is 2·6, and the death-rate is 32 ?—Yes. Now take the worst district, which is the Bridgegate. The density there in 1881 was 223, having fallen from 428 to 223 during the ten years, 1871-81, owing to the railway as well as the Improvement Trust operations. Well the mean number of rooms per house is 1·8, the mean number of persons living in each room is 2·9 (just about 3, in short), and the death-rate on the average of three years is 38·3 ?—(*Dr. Russell, Evidence, page 3.*)

‘We have received the actual comparative death-rate of children. As *Dr. Russell* said, it was a very delicate comparison. The death-rate for one year is 38 per 1,000 ?—That is in the Bridgegate. And in the districts of larger houses it is only 16 or 17, while of the children who die in Glasgow before they complete their fifth year, 32 per cent. are in one apartment, and not 2 per cent. in houses of five apartments ?—That is so.’—*Dr. Russell, Evidence, p. 13.*

After making every allowance for differences in the occupations, habits, and social surroundings of the inhabitants, there seems a wide enough margin left to encourage efforts to lift Bridgegate a little nearer to the level of Blythswood.

Mr. Wood, one of the night inspectors attached to the Sanitary Office, presented a realistic picture of the social condition and surroundings of the people, good and bad, decent and dissolute, who inhabit ticketed houses. He read before the Presbytery’s Commission the chronicle of a visitation tour, commencing on the evening of December 17th, at 11 o’clock, and terminating on the morning of the 18th, at 3 a.m. It presents strange glimpses of how the poor live.

‘Now, tell us something about the first house visited.—The first house visited (No. 1) was that of a labourer, with his wife, two children, aged respectively 2 years, 3 months, and the wife’s brother. The husband, his wife, and the two children lay on an old mattress on the floor of a recessed bed-space, while the wife’s brother lay in a corner of the house, with an old sack covering him. There was very little furniture in the house—an old table, a form, and a few dishes. An old butter-butt stood at the door, full of dirty water. Then the cubic contents of this house were measured to accommodate 2½ persons ?—Yes, 761 cubic feet. And there were four persons in that house—Yes ; and they seemed to have been drinking. You next visited the house opposite ?—Yes. It (No. 2) was the house of a blind man, who lived with his wife and two children, both under five years of age. His wife is employed in a hair factory, and he himself ekes out a living by selling laces at the street corners. There

were no furnishings in the house save a broken box and a few old pieces of delf. There was a bed recess, without bearers or bottoms, and these people all lay there, on the floor, with very little to cover them. The house, altogether, was very dirty. The rent was 7s. a month. There were no lodgers, and no overcrowding in this house, and the people were sober. The next house (No. 3) was that of a labourer and his wife and two children, aged seven and two years respectively. They were in bed, with no covering but a shawl. An old table was the only article of furniture in the house. That would be a reputable family?—Yes. The next house (No. 4) was occupied by a widow and her son, twenty-three years of age. The widow goes out to wash and clean, and the son is a labourer in an engineer's shop. There was a bed in this house, the apartment was fairly well furnished, and the shelves were decorated with dishes. The woman said she made a shake-down for her son sometimes, but the weather being cold they slept together. The cubic space was 800 feet, capacity for 2½ persons, but only two were found living there. No. 5 house was occupied by a blacksmith and his wife, who lay in bed with very little covering over them. A small barrel, with a board on the top, served as a table; and a broken chair and a few dishes were the only articles visible in the house. The wife explained that her husband had been ill for a time, and unable to work. There was no overcrowding here. That, again, I take it, is the house of a poor but industrious man?—Yes, but with a blacksmith's wage he might have had a better. No. 6 house was occupied by a carter and his wife, who lay in the recess of the bed, with nothing to cover them but an old mat. The only articles in the house (which was fairly clean), were two old boxes and a few dishes. The wife explained that she had been ill for a time, and unable to keep it tidy. There was no overcrowding in this house. Then I take it again that poverty was the cause of the lack of furniture and the discomfort in which this family lived?—That is so. . . . Then you went to South Coburg Street?—Yes. In that tenement (No. 16 Coburg Street) there are 12 one-room houses and 3 two-room houses. That is one tenement out of six, the total number of one room houses in the block being 77 and of two-room houses 19?—Yes; that block is the worst for overcrowding in the city. I have found as many as thirty-three persons there in excess of the standard in one night. The Chairman—Well, give us details. Witness (continuing) said the first house was occupied by a woman and two children, the husband being presently on a voyage to Algiers. The house was almost devoid of furniture, only a few dishes being on the shelf. The apartment was remarkably clean. That seems also a case of decent poverty?—Yes; it was not overcrowded. In the next house a carter and his wife were lying in bed, the man under the influence of drink. Their two children lay on the floor in front of the bed on a shake-down, along with an aunt (their mother's sister), a young woman of twenty-three. The mother does washing and cleaning in a model-lodging-house. The house was overcrowded, four being found, when the capacity (713 cubic feet) only allowed two. Rent, 9s. 6d. a month.—(*Wood, Evidence*, pp. 46, 47, 48.)

Overcrowding is dangerous to health and destructive to morals. It consists of two kinds : either too many tenements are crowded into a given area, excluding light and air, or too many persons of both sexes, and of mature years, are crowded into single rooms. There seems at first sight no insuperable difficulty in ameliorating this condition of life. Powers may be, and in many cases are, conferred on Corporations to open up air spaces, by pulling down back lands; and to prevent over-crowding of houses, by stringent regulations, enforced by penalties. Still the remedy may aggravate the evil : to pull down houses without removing the population is to drive them into fewer houses, more crowded than ever, and to enhance the rents of those which remain.

Then if the houses be visited as they have been visited by the Sanitary Officer whose evidence we have quoted, they will be found, at least many of them, dilapidated, ill lit and dark, rain creeping down from the patched roof, the walls mouldy, lacking in the necessary conveniences of life. Touching glimpses of old-world life are sometimes met with in these dens; remains of faded splendour, carved banisters, marble mantel-pieces, recalling the days when high-born dames trod, where now squalid poverty crouches.

Here is an official document which gives a grim picture of what, in irony, are called homes :—

‘(1) The provision made for the disposal of the excrement of the inhabitants of these tenements demands immediate attention. Several places are noted where there is no provision whatever, but in our opinion the privy is in no case a sufficient provision for flatted tenements. It is never used, and cannot in the nature of the case be used by females, and seldom by children. The result is that every sink is practically a water-closet, and the stairs and courts and roofs of outhouses are littered with deposits or filth cast from the windows. Some form of wash-out closet, in the proportion of one to every two or, at most, three families, ought to be provided, as far as possible, in a back jamb. As to ashpit accommodation, where this does not exist it ought to be provided, or a bell-cart service instituted—the extra cost of which ought to be defrayed by the proprietors of the defective property.

‘(2) The necessity of supervision by resident caretakers, responsible for the upkeep of the property, for the selection and supervision of the tenants, and the collection of rents, was strongly impressed upon the committee. They found everywhere either tenants of the most reckless and

profligate description in entire possession, and signs of neglect and destruction on every hand, or poor but respectable tenants, struggling under leaking roofs, and without the conveniences of civilisation to maintain cleanliness, or mixed on the same landing with neighbours whose riotous outbreaks and bad language and conduct penetrated the thin partitions, and made their lives miserable. All this would be remedied by resident caretakers in each block, and the proper use of the water-closets would also be secured.'—*Fyfe Evidence*, p. 37, (*Memorandum of Health Committee, Glasgow.*)

This is a sample of the worst; the others bear a kindred resemblance. To remedy these evils, it seems a simple matter to demand that Corporations be armed with powers to shut up insanitary houses till they are reconstructed. To shut up tenements, however bad, without providing better, is to aggravate the evil elsewhere. Where are the evicted families to migrate to? Shelter, however miserable, is preferable to none. It has been seriously proposed that, to meet this difficulty, Corporations should be empowered to acquire land, and erect tenements to receive the evicted tenants. The proposed solution of the problem would simply aggravate the evil. Either Corporations must build and let their houses to secure a reasonable return, or they must let them at unremunerative rents, sacrificing the capital expenditure. The argument against this project seems irresistible. If the tenements are to yield a remunerative return, private enterprise will erect them. If they are to be let at unremunerative rates, then the Corporation, by their action, will drive away capital which, otherwise, might find its way into this channel. Unless, therefore, they are prepared, at the cost of the ratepayers, to provide houses for all this class of tenants, an enterprise clearly beyond the reach of the most wealthy Corporation, such a reckless interference with private enterprise would end in disaster.

The reason why capital is not attracted by this form of investment is obvious. The rents which these poor people can afford to pay out of their slender earnings (£4 10s. for one room and £8 for two rooms) are not remunerative in cities where ground is costly. Moreover, even though the rents were remunerative, the habits of the tenants, the amount of wilful and wasteful dilapidation of property enhancing the charges for repairs, would make them unremunerative. Not only are the

costs of repair increased, but the rents are irregularly paid by the dissolute, the drunken and worthless. The character and fashion of life of the tenant require as urgently to be reconstructed as his dwelling. His character is often more dilapidated than his house. A partial remedy may be applied with some measure of confidence by making provision for the well-doing, struggling, but honest poor.

Herding amongst the depraved and disorderly, are to be found families of decent folk, struggling to keep up a respectable appearance, whilst driven to seek lodging amongst so uncongenial a company by the hard necessities of poverty. The fate of such is pathetic, and not less perilous than pathetic; like just Lot in the doomed city, they are vexed by the filthy conversation of the wicked. They may have come to the city fresh from country scenes, with children innocent and, as yet, unstained; work scarce, wages slender, they drift into these squalid dens. Pitiful it is to think of little children breathing an atmosphere morally and physically tainted; growing familiar with obscene words, and prematurely forced into contact with riotous living of the lowest sort. Not less pitiful is it to think of the many decent, hard-working women, left fatherless or widowed, who are forced to earn their poor pittance amid daily recurring scenes of infamy. To those familiar with these haunts and their dwellers, it is pathetic to witness their quiet, patient struggle, striving to keep their bits of houses clean and bright amidst general squalor and depression; tending a flower or herb in the window, or treasuring in their barely furnished garret the relics of happier days. Happily this condition of things admits of being ameliorated, without detriment to anyone, with wonderful gain of happiness to the respectable poor.

It has been suggested that Associations might be formed to purchase insanitary property, especially tenements compulsorily closed by authority, and reconstruct them. These properties, it is maintained, could be reconstructed; sanitary appliances provided; light and air freely admitted; the general surroundings brightened and improved; and the houses let to selected tenants, at the rent presently paid, and that such purchases would still prove a remunerative investment. This calculation is based on the

assumption that the selected tenants, being well-behaved and industrious, the rents would be regularly paid, and the cost of repairs reduced. And certainly if such Associations, conducted on commercial principles, could demonstrate that it is practicable to provide, for decent tenants, superior houses at the rent of dilapidated dens, and yet shew a fair return on the investment, there would, in a short time, be as many houses reconstructed and improved by private enterprise as there are respectable tenants to fill them. But by some this is doubted. For instance, one of the witnesses examined before the Glasgow Commission, when alluding to this said :—

‘Philanthropic effort may set an example, but I do not think it could be so widely applied as to supply all, or anything like all, the houses that are required. In Glasgow, according to Mr. Henry, there are 35,892 houses of one apartment, 54,960 of two apartments, and by calculation I find that these represent a capital of about £8,000,000. It is vain, I think, to look to philanthropic effort to supply even a large percentage of such a large matter.’—(*Binnie, Evidence*, p. 153.)

But on the other hand, it may fairly be replied that the ordinary operation of the law of supply and demand would, if the experiment of philanthropists proved successful, produce the desired result. The formation of such associations in Glasgow would, at the present juncture be of immense importance, and go to strengthen the hands of the corporation. Extensive powers have by recent legislation been conferred on that body. They are authorised to require owners of property to put them in a sanitary condition: to provide an effective arrangement of sanitary appliances: and in the event of their orders not being carried out forthwith, they are farther authorised, subject to a summary form of appeal, to declare such tenements uninhabitable and to close them compulsorily.

It would be little short of a calamity to the poor if many tenements, standing on sites most convenient to the tenants were to be closed. The results indicated above would follow. If associations were ready to step in and purchase these properties, when thrown on the market, and renovate them, they would assist the corporation in proceeding with the work, without inflicting any hardship. There would then be no evictions: the

same number of tenements would remain: only sanitary houses would be substituted for insanitary ones. Whether such investments would be remunerative or not, there is no question as to the good which would be effected; for no greater boon can be conferred on the decent and industrious poor than to remove them from commerce with the depraved, drunken, and criminal, and to provide for them quiet resting places, where they can dwell apart. It is one of the saddest burdens of a sad lot, to be driven by grim necessity to lodge in dwellings where the air surrounding them is full of sounds of drunken ribaldry; their souls vexed with unrighteous deeds; and the fresh lives of young children polluted by too early contact with vice in its grossest forms. They might happily be rescued from perdition. Families drifting into these regions of sorrow and death are perilously apt to adapt themselves to the demoralizing surroundings with which they are forced into familiarity, and which at first they regard with loathing and disgust. If the operations suggested were carried forward on a considerable scale, the result would be that disorderly and abandoned tenants would be crushed out. No association or landlord would admit them to reconstructed or improved dwellings; if they did, the improvements would soon disappear. This class would be driven from renovated tenements to those not overtaken by the sanitary authorities. In this there would be an advantage; they would congregate by themselves in certain blocks or areas, where they could be more readily placed under police supervision and control.

The residuum which remains, after separating the industrious, may be divided into two groups: (1) those who still work, though their work is precarious, partly due to their vicious habits and partly to the class of work at which they are employed; people whose sins have found them out, and whose lives are very hard and very miserable; and (2) the criminal and lazy, who do not work, and doggedly decline to work; who prefer to live on the fruits of vice and pillage. It is hopelessly impracticable to find decent dwellings for such a class. They are violent, disorderly, reckless; they pillage and destroy the houses in which they live; they pull down the skirting and tear up and burn the very planking of the floors. No sane landlord will provide renovated houses for such tenants. Dilapidated, dark and

airless though the dwellings be, they are better than the tenants who lodge in them. The only remedy seems to be the natural process of selection; the decent will be decently lodged, the dissipated will be crushed out. Lodged somewhere they must be; shelter they must have; common humanity demands this much. As improvements are carried on they will be driven into the worst and lowest dens. There they must be placed under stricter and sterner control, and the stringency of police supervision increased. The most merciful fate which can befall them is to be coerced by the strong arm of the law, to reform their habits and moderate their drunken violence.

In a free country, so long as people stand unconvicted, they must be left to the freedom of their will, but when men or women are convicted of drunkenness or assault, of thieving or petty robbery, or of importuning, their lives have become a peril and menace to the peace and comfort of the citizens. There is then no injustice in dealing with them sharply with a strong hand and in an uncompromising manner. Tainted lives, which propagate immorality, must be dealt with after the fashion of infectious diseases, they must be stamped out by being secluded.

The present system of short imprisonments is fatuous to a degree. Women charged with drunkenness or dissoluteness are sent to prison for ten days or sixty. When liberated they return to their old haunts and ply their old trade. They are again charged, again convicted, and again liberated, to repeat the same round indefinitely. To send men or women to prison for ten days or sixty days, indeed to send them to prison at all, does not mend their morals or their manners. The only salvation possible for them is the wholesome discipline of work. State labour reformatories are as urgently required for dissolute men and women as for neglected children. They should be founded in the country; labour colonies not prisons; women and men forced to work; in the house, at a trade, if they have one, or in the garden or farm. Persons convicted more than a certain number of times should be sent there, without remorse, for a term of years. It is the only chance left of redeeming their lives. Separated from their miserable surroundings and dissolute associates, they might learn to live clean, decent lives; and return

to the world, after a time, clothed and in their right mind. The streets, at all events, would be swept clean of noisome pests. Public opinion must be educated to demand such salutary reforms.

There is another class akin in character to those just referred to, the class of vagrants and tramps. The facts stated in the report of the Presbytery Commission with regard to it, founded on evidence submitted to them, are startling and fitted to arouse grave apprehensions. Few persons are aware of the extent to which vagrancy prevails. Mr. Edmiston, the Inspector of Poor, Rutherglen, emitted the following statement:—

‘Then, in reference to vagrancy, I have a printed letter submitted by you to your Board, I think in 1888. The figures are very startling; in the year 1885 the number of vagrants was 91,567—I think there were 59,214 males and 21,513 females, and 10,840 children, that makes up the total; then in the year 1886 the gross number had risen to 106,661. Of that number 60,755 were males, and 23,015 females, 12,892 being children. Then have you any idea how that enormous army of vagrants live?—I think, as a rule, they live fairly well. I think the greatest number of these vagrants work none. It is simply a great army quartered upon and maintained by the industrious population of this country. How much do you think it takes to keep them in the luxurious way they live?—Well, I have seen them enter lodging-houses in the city with considerable sums of money in their possession, obtained in the country under the most varied falsehoods. A great deal of the money is wasted in drink. The vagrant must find sufficient means of existence, and I allowed a sum of 4s. per week for each individual, which makes the total cost £1,442,979 per annum.’ (*Edmiston, Evidence*, p. 170.)

‘The growth in the number of vagrants is alarming—in 1885, 91,567, and in 1887, 138,748.’ (*Edmiston, Letter.*)

In winter they crowd into cities, and fill the Refuges, Shelters, and Poorhouse wards, and in summer they spread out over the country. Sordid and tattered, with women and children dragging after them, tramps are met with in every country lane. They live by plunder, and on alms often extorted by menace. The race perpetuates itself; ever bringing children into the world, neglected and unattended, trained only in the arts of the tramp and vagrant. It is a grave fact that in Scotland alone 12,892 children are at this moment growing up ignorant and uneducated.

The only lesson they learn is how to whine most pitifully for alms and how most artfully to plunder.

The Presbytery Commission are of opinion that this class ought to be resolutely dealt with. They are unfit for the occupations of city life. Labour Colonies in the country are required, where suitable occupations—such as fishing, basket-making, and other simple industries—might be provided for them in return for food and shelter; and where their children might be cared for and trained in industrious habits. Reared to a roving life, most of them doubtless would in all likelihood refuse to enter the Shelter or Colony. But as in the case of the dissolute classes in cities, if they refused the offer made them to work for their support, the same Commission advise that they should be compelled to do so. And there can be no question as to the wisdom of the course they suggest. It is not to be tolerated that, in a civilised community, so vast a number of dissolute, lazy idlers should be permitted to overflow the country and live on alms and the fruits of plunder.

These methods of dealing with the depraved and vagrant classes would be just and reasonable, if—but only if—all the remedial proposals suggested were carried out in their entirety, including the organizing of labour centres in town and labour colonies in the country. The subject of labour colonies is much too large a one to be handled within the limits of this article. They have been organised on a small scale on the Continent, and carried on with varying measures of success. Mr. Booth's projects have brought them into prominent notice in this country. Here they are novelties and have hardly entered on the experimental stage: casual wards in Poorhouses are the nearest approach to them. The idea is excellent if it can be worked out. The advocates of labour colonies do not propose to provide permanent employment. They are designed as refuges or shelters, where workers may find the means of subsistence, till they are drafted back to the regular ranks of labour. The initial difficulty, it seems to us, is to find suitable occupations for a promiscuous class of labourers. To run factories or workshops with gangs of unskilled workmen, perpetually shifting is impracticable. If it were practicable, to do so would be mischievous. Either the workshops and factories

would be remunerative or not: if remunerative, they are simply doing what private enterprise is doing and prepared to do; if carried on at a loss, then the promoters are unfairly competing with organised labour, helped by the contributions of the generous. The result would, in the long run, be mischievous; such attempts would aggravate the evils meant to be remedied, they would lower wages or close workshops carried on on an independent footing. The difficulty of the task may prove not insuperable: temporary occupation may be found for the unemployed in ways not opposed to sound economic principles. If labour colonies were successfully organised it is more than probable that many of the class referred to would not take advantage of them, or submit to the description of work. If work is provided for all who will work, irrespective of character, and men and women sullenly refuse to work; if they continue drunken and dissolute, and are convicted again and again; no wrong is done, no injustice inflicted, if they are sent to State labour reformatories, where they will be compelled to work. If the difficulties which must necessarily beset the organizing of these free labour centres or colonies are successfully overcome by determined and capable men, then it may reasonably be demanded that the State should give effect to the measures suggested. The condition of these classes is so fraught with danger to the community, the fate of their children is so pitiful and distressing, that it is high time that these proposals were not merely discussed, but tested on a considerable scale.

The serious and complicated question presses for an answer: What are the elements which constitute the residuum class? how have they reached their present low level? Some of them, no doubt, were born into it. The saddest sign of the old warning fulfilling itself, 'the sins of the fathers shall be visited on the children,' is to be found in the stern fact—thieves breed thieves; prostitutes, prostitutes; tramps, tramps. A most forcible argument this for dealing, if need be with relentless rigour, with those who belong to these classes, in order, if possible, to break the continuity of the miserable doom which dogs the steps of their children. The ranks of these classes, however, are constantly being recruited by others fallen from a higher estate.

Dens of infamy and pollution are filled with the wreckage of once hopeful lives. No class of men, least of all the industrial, can be classified like stratified rocks, into distinct orders; one class or section shades into the other. There is no great gulf fixed between class and class which none may cross. Strong, venturesome souls sometimes cross the stream and reach in safety the farther shore, passing from a lower to a higher life. These, however, are few in number. Unfortunately a great throng are ceaselessly climbing down, day and night, from the gate of heaven to the lowest pit.

Setting aside those born to a life of shameless sorrow, what causes, if any, are at work which lure persons, born under more favourable circumstances, belonging to almost every sphere of life, as if by some fatal spell, to gravitate downwards, and end their days in so low an estate.

We have alluded, with gratification, to the fact that the upper circle of workers have in every way improved their position. Between the best educated and most intelligent of skilled workmen, and the unskilled who lodge in single rooms and 'ticketed houses,' there are various grades, and ranks, and classes. If the causes which in their case work evil can be detected and are preventible, then by removing them the disastrous results will, according to the measure in which they are removed, cease.

Labour is a workman's capital. If by sickness or accident his strength is crippled, he is practically bankrupt. The breadwinner struck down by death, the wife and children are destitute. Times of commercial depression occur at intervals; then labour is an unmarketable commodity, and penury and want stare the workman in the face. Then begins the downward career. The oft-told tale, familiar in the experience of workmen and those interested in them, is marked by a dreary and sorry sameness. Bit by bit their little gatherings go to the pawn shop to buy food for hungry children; then comes depression and downheartedness. Courage droops and resolution slackens, and slowly but surely they drift down and lose themselves in the great gulf—that sea of sorrow which moans restlessly day and night in the regions where dwell the submerged. Women of exceptional strength of character, and endowed with a masterful spirit, may make a bold

struggle, and pull their husbands through, when stricken with long illness; or in the event of his death, manage to maintain themselves and their children; to clothe them decently; and to send them forth into the world, very fairly equipped for the battle of life. Their lives are often lives of heroism and endurance worthy to be chronicled. The average woman is not possessed of exceptional strength of character, otherwise it would cease to be exceptional, nor is she possessed of a masterful spirit.

All sickness is not preventible; all deaths are not premature; but much sickness is preventible and many deaths are premature; and much disaster may be averted. Living under conditions adverse to health, sleeping in rooms badly ventilated, where the air is fetid, the tone of the system, becomes imperceptibly but surely lowered, and the body susceptible to the subtle touch of disease. Food badly selected and ill-cooked, or which fails to nourish the body, tends to the same result. The fact may be noted, that when the springs of life are low, and the system relaxed, then follows the craving for stimulants, to spur the flagging energies and to nerve for work.

All sickness is not preventible; and death is certain; but under healthy conditions, on the average, death should not overtake the workman, till his children are grown and able to fend for themselves. Any way, sickness and death may be provided for and insured against. The benefits conferred on workmen by Friendly Societies, organised and conducted by themselves, are incalculable. How many households, which in despair and sorrow would have trodden the downward path, have been arrested by their helpful hand, and to this hour maintain their position and retain their self-respect, no man can number. All workmen, unfortunately, are not insured against sickness and death.

The healthiness and brightness of a house depend not so much on the structure as on the persons who live in it; especially on the woman who presides over it. Whether a man is able, out of a slender wage, to insure himself against sickness depends on his domestic economy. The expenditure of a man's wages is in the hands of his wife. The housewife who keeps her home bright and cheery, serves up for her husband nourishing meals, well

cooked and savoury, tempting to an appetite often jaded by severe toil in an oppressive atmosphere, is the thrifty goddess who lays out her husband's earnings to the best advantage. Such homes are least likely to be visited by sickness and death, and the heads of such households are best able, financially, to make provision against them if they do enter. Lamentable is the fact that the average workman's wife is not a good housewife, is not managing; is not thrifty; does not turn his earnings to good account. In justice let it be frankly admitted that much is demanded of her. To keep a house tidy; to cook victuals; to wash and dress children; to mend her husband's clothing, to make and mend her own and the children's; to sort up the litter of the day, that the hearth may be clean, the fire ruddy, the room orderly and quiet, awaiting her husband's return, wearied with work and craving rest, is a heavy call, taxing a woman's energies to the very utmost. It demands exact method and unceasing work. Small wonder that many fail, and that depressed by failure, they become listless and despondent, fretful and impatient. When they do, all is lost. Even when sufficiently trained for her vocation she is apt to fail; how much more apt when she has had little or no training?

A girl, touched by the tender passion of love, enters the estate of matrimony; she vows to be a faithful wife, and honestly purposes to pay her vow. At first things go smoothly; the wedded life of a workman's wife is not a holiday march. Fresh from a mill or warehouse, she has no experience often of the household work required of her; she cannot cook, or wash, or dress; she cannot shape, or sew, or mend; she knows little of the comparative value of foods; children come, more work, more expense; then follow the distracting cares of debt; recriminations, often sullen discontent; and love cannot linger amidst disquiet and sordid cares. If sickness enters the household 'poverty cometh as one that travelleth, and want as an armed man.' Then follows the downward journey towards the dismal swamps. A spectre, more ominous than sickness or death, crosses the threshold—the demon of drink—which, for the moment, lulls care, and puts to sleep unquiet thoughts. The fact is patent beyond challenge, that indulgence in strong drink raises the fierce tornado which

strews the earth with social wreckage. Its beginnings are insidious, veiled under the guise of good cheer and hearty fellowship; its endings are tragic, loathsome, cruel. What instigates men, gifted with powers of reason and observation, before the fatal habit has grown into a passion, to indulge in intoxicants? An intricate question, hard to answer. Drink has its victims in every class, from the cultured and gentle to the ignorant and rude.

The lures of the tempter are baited to suit the tastes and conditions of the prey he seeks to trap. We have at present only to deal with the causes which lead workmen to the public house, and how these causes may be removed. Two causes seem to stand out in bold relief—(1) discomfort at home; (2) the monotony and dullness of life in the gloomy regions of manufacturing towns. Stiff, strenuous work calls for good nourishment to repair wasted tissue; when the body is underfed the nerves are apt to get the upper hand, the temper becomes irascible. Returning for his mid-day meal the worker in many instances finds his food badly served and badly cooked; the surroundings untidy and comfortless; then wrangling ensues, and wrangling embitters the temper. ‘Man goeth forth to his work, and labour until the evening’—the evening which should bring rest to the jaded mind and weary body; but unfortunately, man often returneth, with temper already embittered, to his home at sunset; finds the fire dull, the air heavy and close; the children noisy, and the wife, with her nerves overstrained, peevish and fretful; all things restless and unquiet; no shelter or peace. Then, the tempter dangles the vision of the public house; its floor clean sanded; the fire ruddy, the surroundings bright; companionship cheery; the steaming tumbler exhilarating to weary muscle and tingling nerve; he is attracted by the lure, swallows the bait, and yields to the tempter. This experience repeats itself; he becomes an habitual frequenter of the house. One night he returns, noisy and riotous; and then is the beginning of the end—poverty, anxiety, divided lives; work neglected; wages lost; the first step is taken on the down grade which leads to the heritage of the slums. Home cheery; wife pleasant-spoken; household well ordered, is the surest refuge from the public house.

In other classes, when a man is disturbed, anxious, sore at heart; hit by the arrows of adversity, he seeks rest, soothing, peace at home; kindly eyes lighten on him; soothing words cheer him; in restfulness and quiet he heals him of his grievous wounds. The root of the matter is to provide for the worker a helpmate fit and capable. A house roomy and convenient, well lit, well aired, is much; but whether it be a hell or a heaven; a shelter merely or a home, depends on the mood, the manners of its dwellers. The race of capable housewives, shrewd, kindly, managing, seems to be dying out; in cities, under pressure of civilisation, the race seems deteriorating, dwarfed in frame, feeble in character; housewifery and cooking are lost arts. How to rear a race of women, healthy in body and mind, fitly trained for household work, that is the problem. Something is being attempted. Domestic Economy is taught in schools; it is taught in theory, out of a twopenny handbook, and counts for nothing. Sewing is better done, and cookery is more efficiently taught. But the period during which girls ought to be trained for housewives is that, which intervenes between the close of a school life and the entrance on married life. The best school of Domestic Economy is the home, and the best teacher is the mother, if she herself be fit and trained. In many homes the mother is not apt to train. When she is not, substitutes must be found. In many a workman's family, too, the daughters are sent out to the mills, and when the work is done there, they have neither the strength nor the spirit to address themselves to household duties. The consequence is that many young girls grow up in almost absolute ignorance of what is required in a workman's wife. That every effort should be directed to the household training of women is obvious. Once a generation is reared quick to practice the homely virtues of domestic life, the problem of how to raise the submerged is practically solved, the goal is reached, the race will perpetuate itself.

Churches may do much in their missions. Classes for womanly work, sewing and cooking and washing, are quite as necessary and profitable, and no less pleasing to our Father in Heaven, than Bible classes and prayer meetings. Schools of Domestic Economy may be founded. The experiment, we understand, is about to be tried in Glasgow. Under a scheme of the Commissioners, the Logan and

Johnston School of Domestic Economy is being organised. Its success or failure will depend largely on the woman placed at its head. A Technical College for women would be a fitter designation for it. What mechanics, chemistry, electricity, are to the crafts; cooking, sewing, washing, ironing, are to women; each fits each for their after vocation; and let the 'wild women' orate as they may, the vocation of women is the charge of a household, and a high vocation it is. The school must be made a pleasant haunt, free from irksome restraint and buckram rule; grown girls must be attracted, not driven; the intelligence appealed to, their sympathies enlisted. Our hope of the workman's future depends greatly on the success of movements such as this.

The other cause which undoubtedly leads to drunkenness and worse evils, is the sad and dull monotony of the life of labour in great cities—it lacks colour. A man's home should be to him the centre of attraction. It should be his to fill it, so far as his means permit, with things of excellence and objects of beauty. Where a man's treasure is, there will his heart be also. Art is noiselessly penetrating many homes, bringing with it the blessing of refinement, and multiplying its joys; decorative wall-hangings, art furniture, pictures, books, are enriching them. The upper circles of labour it has already reached. But much land still remains to be possessed. Dull, grey and sombre is many a man's home; the walls bare, the furniture ugly, the colour grim; everything depressing, nothing exhilarating. In northern climes brightness within should counter-balance the gloom without. Beauty is no costlier than ugliness, nor a warm colour than a cold one. The modest home of a day labourer might be tricked out with coloured prints, beautiful in colour and refined in subject, and enriched with a shelf of choice books, if only he had the open eye. The cost would be trifling, trifling indeed compared with the cost of his drink. But the fruits of education are slow to ripen. Yet he who loves books can never find life dull and monotonous. He can transport himself at will to the fairest regions and hold converse with the choicest wits. It may seem to many an idle and witless dream to suggest such things in relation to a day labourer's life. But if education, on which we expend countless treasure, leads not up to this, what is the good of it? Lettered

and cultured men enjoy music, and song and play; they lend variety to life; how much more do the unlettered and uncultured stand in need of such helps to enjoyment. Our lives in these northern latitudes are altogether too dull and gray. We cannot compete with the gay out-door life of the sunny south, but we may, at least, make the most of what we have, which certainly we do not.

Not much can be done in the way of providing wholesome recreation during the gloomy months of winter, with nights cold and raw. An occasional concert, or entertainment, or play is good, but a man's home should be his chief sanctuary. For the homeless—music-halls, concerts, meetings, are preferable to the street corner, and preferable to the public house. There, if there is nothing else, there is shelter and warmth, light and colour, free from temptation. The aim of social reformers must be to strive that no man is homeless, that all are provided with a place of rest he may call his own. To toil all day and live a vagabond life at night is not a high ideal. Till the aim just indicated is reached, makeshifts must be resorted to. Much may be done in this way; reading and recreation rooms; halls in which good music is played; places where men may be at their ease to smoke and talk, and be provided with light refreshment; all such are good; rungs in the ladder leading up to higher things. When the days lengthen, and the warmth of spring softens the rigour of winter; when summer sunshine and summer blooms adorn the earth—then is the time for pleasant outdoor life and enjoyment. Much in this direction is being done—much remains to be done. Corporations are taking broader views of their responsibilities and of the possibilities of corporate life. Parks and gardens and halls are being provided at the cities' charge, music is played in the parks. Other amenities will follow. Rich men are presenting parks and galleries. The Exhibition of 1888 in Glasgow, demonstrated what might be done in the face of capricious weather and chilly summer skies. It came on the citizens as a revelation, a new possibility; it is within the truth to say that its sights and music and gardens enriched and brightened the people's life for one brief summer, as it had never been enriched before. Since then the city has returned to its dull, gayless ways.

An effort is now being made to resuscitate in a permanent form all that was pleasant and quickening in the Exhibition show. Picture galleries and museums spreading round a Central Music Hall are about to be built on the spot where the Exhibition buildings stood. For the first time an attempt is being made on a considerable scale, to wed the art of music with the arts of painting, sculpture, and with the no less beautiful and refining art of gardening. The faded glory of the past will be revived, it is hoped, never again to vanish out of sight, but to remain a permanent institution in the city. The buildings, when completed, will be transferred, we understand, to the corporation, so that the scheme will become a municipal institution with all the elements of permanency. The project seems a sagacious one, especially in a commercial city. The galleries and museums will foster a love and appreciation of art, not only as embodied in pictures, but in furniture, textiles, pottery; which love of art will be of an economic value to the manufacturers of the city; and of a social value tending to the encouragement of art in the home. Moreover, the outdoor life of innocent and light-hearted gaiety, and pleasant companionship which its gardens and music will create, will enliven the otherwise monotonous summer life of the city, and break the dull routine of toil to the worker. The surest preventative of drunkenness and vice and sordid ways is to beget a generous sympathy with and warm love of things pure, excellent and beautiful, which in turn will beget a hatred and loathing for things sordid, coarse, and ugly. He who loves beauty, whether in character, life, or art, will turn to no meaner object for his joy. *Will a man leave the snows of Lebanon and forsake the cold flowing water?* The signs of the times, are in some ways, propitious; the clouds are lifting, the sky is brightening, and the future is fuller of hope.

The schemes of social reform we have referred to are of a material kind, devised to ameliorate the physical and social condition of the people. They seem to us reasonable and practical; moreover they are projects which can be initiated at once, independently of state aid or law amendment; legislative reform will follow, when the necessity for it has been shown. We are far from intending to imply that these are by any means the only

schemes urgently called for: many agencies, devised by many minds, must play their part in effecting the social reformation of the people; but these carry the obvious advantage that they represent the work which lies nearest at hand, about the value of which all sensible people are agreed: and in the promotion of which all patriotic citizens may take part whatever their opinions in regard to other subjects still under discussion. It is impossible to separate by a sharp line the material and the spiritual. The one acts and reacts on the other. A low social and material condition deadens the soul; a reviving of the soul helps to improve the social surroundings. We have not referred to the Church; not because we underrate her mission, or would lighten the burden of her responsibility for the social condition of the people. The Church is awakening to a broader conception of her mission, a conception we venture to think more practical and more beneficent than that vulgarly held. She is set to found a kingdom of God on earth; her mission, like that for which the Son of Man was manifested, is to destroy the works of the devil; to free men's souls and bodies from the debasing thralldom of selfishness, passion and lust. The burden is laid on her, by all means within her reach, to improve the social condition of the people, to soften and gladden their lives. This function does not call on her, as a corporate body, to build or reconstruct dwellings for the decent poor; to provide healthful recreation; or to amend the criminal law in the interests of the criminal. But unquestionably it is her duty to sanction such efforts and to lend them such help and countenance as she can. It is the vocation of her members, to co-operate with others like minded, to carry forward to a successful issue every branch of reformatory work. It is the function of the Church, when this work is done, to bring the influences of the Spirit to bear on men's characters and ways, so as to get them to enter on the possession and enjoyment of these gifts and turn them to good account. The fact is lamentable but not less a fact, that many must first be humanized before they can be converted to a knowledge of the truth. The work of the Church and the work of the social reformer are each helpful to the other, and must proceed simultaneously.

The movements of the good Spirit are not straitened. Mortal man cannot forecast at what hour, or by what subtle path, a gleam of light may flash on the darkened mind; or when a seed hidden away, buried in some dark corner of the heart, may, by quickening of the Spirit, unexpectedly break into life; or when the divine voice may awaken a responsive echo in the vacant chamber of memory. Some dim vision of a forgotten past—a past of innocence and purity—may stir up within the prodigal's heart a wistful yearning to turn his steps homeward to the Father's house. Improved social surroundings, the encouragement of tender woman and upright men in the work of reform, may restore many to that genial and trustful fellowship with their kind, which they have forfeited by their errors, and multiply the chances of such blessed conversions from darkness to light.

It is well, we may add, that the work of social reform should be carried on irrespective of Churches and creeds. Men of all churches and creeds; even men of no church and no creed, all moved by a common love of humanity and pity for the fallen, may well work in common concert to help to build up a new and fairer social fabric. Social work will smooth the way of all Churches; and each, according to its own methods and creed, may work up to and help the achievement.

United action in a common cause would soften asperities, lead to kindlier judgments and more tolerant views, sweeten the springs of religious life, and unfold the blessed truth that within all Churches, however diverse their creed or worship, by the help of that same creed and worship, fine characters are being fashioned, and blameless lives, full of goodness and pity, are being lived, to the glory of God and the comfort of their fellows.

ART. II.—THE COMING OF THE HUNGARIANS:
THEIR ORIGIN AND EARLY HOMES.

1. Hunfalvy Pál.—*Magyarország Ethnographidája.* Budapest, 1876.
2. Hunfalvy P.—*Die Ungern oder Magyaren.* Wien and Teschen, 1881.

3. Vámbéry A.—*A Magyarok eredete. Ethnologiai tanulmány.* (A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtár-hivatala). Budapest, 1882.
4. Salamon Ferencz.—*A magyar hadi történethez a vezérek korában.* Budapest, 1877.
5. Grot, C.—*Moravia i Madiari s'polovini ix do nachala x vieka.* Warsaw.

I HAD almost written at the head of this paper 'The Coming of the Ogres.' But such a title might have misled those who are acquainted with the newest derivation of 'ogre' into supposing that my paper dealt with dolorous fields and Stygian darkness. Much as one might like not to believe that the ogres are derived from hell, much as one might like to think that the original Ogres were the ancestors of the people of Hungary, I am afraid that we can hardly get out of the comparison of Spanish *ogro*, Old Spanish *huergo*, *huerco*, and Italian *orco*. The philologist, I fear, cannot congratulate the ogres on the repute of their original home. But though the deduction from *Orcus* is right, the deduction from *Ugrian* ought to be right. The idea that the Ugrians were the original ogres was a brilliant one, full of historical truth; and it is really deplorable to find that it is not a fact. There was something very interesting in observing that the Avars furnished Eastern Europe with a word for hobgoblins—*obr*; and that the Ugrians, Ungrians, or Hungarians, who stepped into the heritage of the Avars, furnished Western Europe with a name of like import. Thus I was almost tempted to introduce 'ogres' into my title, as a mark of homage to a false etymology which history must surrender with a pang. It is somewhat the same with the explanation of Andalusia as the land of the Vandals, an explanation which, the philologist says, can hardly be right, but which, the historian thinks, ought to be right. The Hungarians themselves are, of course, pleased to find that they did not give us one of our *μορμολόκεια*, just as the Slaves would be well pleased if they could by any means shew that they did not give us our word for bondmen.

I do not intend to speak here of the manner in which the Magyars took possession of their final homes on the Danube

and the Theiss. I propose to enter into the question of their origin, the circumstances of their first appearance in Europe, and the temporary abodes which they occupied before they entered into their kingdom. But it may be well first to remind the reader how the coming of the Magyars utterly changed the course of European history. In the ninth century it seemed as if the Slavonic race had a great future before it in Central Europe. There was an unbroken serried array of Slavonic peoples from the peninsula of the Cimbri to the peninsula of Pelops,—from the Abodrites at the mouth of the Elbe, to the Melings and Ezerites of Mount Taygetus. In the seventh century, Samo had attempted to found a Slavonic empire, but his creation had not been abiding; and at the beginning of the ninth, Liudewit had again essayed the same task, but in vain. Yet, in all probability, the enterprise would at some later period have been undertaken once more and succeeded; and if a Slavonic power had been established in Central Europe, the eastward advance of the Germans might have been checked, and all Europe beyond the Elbe might have remained Slavonic under masters of its own. But the Magyars dissipated such hopes, which a Slave of wide vision might have cherished in the days of the early Karlings. They forced themselves in, like a wedge, between the Slaves of the north and the Slaves of the south, whom they disunited for ever. They separated the southern Croatians from their brethren of White Croatia, as the western part of the present Galicia was then called. Thus the intrusion of the Hungarians favoured the growth of Germania, and injured the growth of Slavonia; and the formation of the kingdom of Hungary made possible the development of that curious state, the Austrian empire, remarkable chiefly for the random way in which it came to be what it is, and for its policy of oppressing the Slaves.

Every nation, I suppose, takes a certain pride in its history, but history and pedigree assume a larger importance for lesser nations than for greater. This is perfectly natural. When a nation is not strong, it feels that a distinguished history and a noble pedigree are a sort of substitute for strength, and give it a title to independent existence. Unluckily it is not always easy

to trace a pedigree beyond suspicion, or to establish a historical record which is quite to one's liking. There are usually a host of weaker points which enemies or cavillers are sure to seize on. And thus it is that in the histories of most of the smaller peoples of Europe there is some point on which each is specially sensitive. It is the pride of a Greek to believe that he and his countrymen are the descendants of men who fought at Salamis and Plataea. He has as strong an antipathy to the thought that a 'Hellene' could be a Slave as an Englishman has to the thought that a 'Briton' could be a slave; but in fact he is in all likelihood as little a Hellene as the Englishman is a Briton. You will make him very angry if you tell him that there is probably more Slavonic than Hellenic blood among the inhabitants of modern Greece. Dr. Fallmerayer went further and said that they had not a single drop of Hellenic blood to share among them. He went too far; but one cannot help sympathising with him. The wicked Doctor must have found it great fun to bait a whole nation, conscious as he was that he had at his command an apparatus of learning, in the face of which all the Greeks of his day were helpless. But when one is at Athens it is just as well not to declare the praises of Fallmerayer on the housetops. They cannot forget that he pointed his finger at them and said 'thou Slave!' If Fallmerayer is anathema to the Greeks, Roesler is maranatha to the 'Romans.' The first article of belief on which the salvation of a Roumanian depends is that his ancestors settled in the lands of Walachia and Siebenbürgen, at the time when Trajan added a province beyond the Danube to the Roman Empire. The Emperor Aurelius abandoned the trans-Danubian Dacia which Trajan had annexed; but the fate of its inhabitants and the internal history of those districts in the subsequent centuries are wrapt in obscurity. We suddenly find them inhabited by Vlachs or Romans in the late Middle Ages. Here was a delightful opportunity to tease the Roumanians, and it was seized on by Roesler, a German scholar, learned and acute like Fallmerayer, and armed at all points. He declared that the ancestors of the modern Roumanians did not enter into their inheritance until the

thirteenth century, when they migrated northward from the Balkan peninsula. Then indeed there was raging and gnashing of teeth in the streets of Bucharest. People whose names end in *escu* and *ilu* wrote strong denunciations of the assailant of their traditions, and mustered weak arguments. But they might have done better to hold their peace;—

μη κινει Καμάρωα, ἀκίρητος γὰρ ἀμείρων.

Since then indeed the Romans of the East have got *Pic*, just as the Greeks have got *Sathas*; and the extreme views of the two German assailants must be modified. But Fallmerayer and Roesler had each his fun.

It is not surprising to find that the Magyars too have a great difficulty about their pedigree and many open problems about their early history. Although the kingdom of Hungary is much stronger than either the kingdom of Roumania or the kingdom of Greece, the Hungarians are in one respect in a more delicate position than either Greeks or Roumanians. For the Greeks, whether Hellenes as they want to be, or Slaves as they want not to be, belong in any case to the Indo-Germanic family; and the same is true of the Romans or Vlachs whether they crossed the Danube with Trajan or not. Those who hold that Europe should belong exclusively to Europeans will be applauded as loudly at Athens and at Bucharest as anywhere else. But such a doctrine could not be preached at Pest. The Magyars are not of the Indo-European family; *οὐ γὰρ ὁμοῖοι ἑσβίοι οὐδ' ἴα γήρως.* Judged by this rule they are aliens in Europe, like the Turks. It is generally allowed, perhaps even by those who, like so many English Prime Ministers, worship as a sort of fetish 'the integrity of the Turkish Empire,' that the Turk has no business on the Bosphorus. It might also be asked what business the Ogre has on the Danube. From a general ethnographical point of view Magyars and Ottomans are in the same boat. But while at the present moment Constantinople is in Asia, it would be unfair to say that Pest is in Asia too. The men who fell at Varna and Mohacz, fell fighting for the cause of Christ against the cause of Mohammed. The Magyars since the eleventh

century have been champions of Europe against Asia; and much of the work which had been formerly done by the Eastern Roman Empire fell upon them when that Empire was broken up. Nor can it be said that the land of Kossuth, Petöfi and Jókai has not kept abreast of Western civilization. He would be an austere taskmaster who did not admit that the history of the Hungarians since the days of Stephen, the king and saint, has given them a title to the lands which they originally occupied with no other title than that of the sword.

But at the same time one can imagine that the Magyar would prefer not to have to regard himself as merely a redeemed Turk. It is natural that he should like to be certified that he is no first cousin of the infidels who cut down his ancestors at Varna and in the first battle of Mohacz. So the Hungarians have always been delighted to acquiesce in the theory which connects them very closely with the Finns, and removes them as far as possible from the Turks. The Finns are the one other nation in Europe which occupies the exceptional position of being Christian and yet not Aryan. And the Hungarians are satisfied to belong to a small group of Turanian peoples who have been able to establish a position for themselves among the Aryan races of Europe. This group is called Ugrofinnic, and includes, besides Finns and Magyars, Voguls, Ostjaks and Samoieds.

The chief exponents of the orthodox creed that the Hungarians are kinsmen not of the Turk but of the Finn, are, on the historical side, the late Paul Hunfalvy, and, on the linguistic, Joseph Budenz. But it cannot be said that they have it all their own way. An apostate has arisen in their own land in the person of the eastern traveller and student of the Turkish languages, A. Vámbéry. He maintains that the Magyars are Turks, and he is not ashamed of it. Perhaps he is impartial. One never knows whether a man with a Magyar name is really a Magyar; names are so cleverly disguised. When the hero of Jókai's novel, *Szerelem Bolondjai*, made himself into Szives, who would have guessed that his father's name was Harter?

What we know of the early history of the Magyars is mainly derived from Greek writers of the Eastern Roman

Empire, and of these our chief informant is the Emperor Constantine VII., in his treatise 'Concerning the administration of the Empire,' a sort of handbook to diplomacy designed for the use of his son. When Constantine wrote, in 948 A.D., the Magyars had been settled about half a century in the lands of the Theiss and the Danube, which they occupy at the present day. They were separated from the Eastern Empire by the Bulgarian kingdom. The present kingdom of Roumania and the north coast of the Black Sea, as far as the Dnieper, were at this time in the possession of a people called the Patzinaks. East of the Patzinaks was the great kingdom of the Khazars stretching to the Lower Volga, and beyond the Khazars dwelled the Uzes or Guzes, or Kuns or Kumans, as they have been variously called, destined at a later date to appear on the scene of European history and take the place of the Patzinaks.

In his zeal to assure the pedigree of the Magyars, Hunfalvy has attempted to bring several other peoples as well, and among them the Patzinaks, into the Ugro-Finnic fold. But there can be little doubt that the Patzinaks—or Petschenegs as the German and Slaves call them, or Besenyök as the Hungarians call them—were a Turkish people. Anna Comnena states that the Patzinaks and the Kuns spoke the same tongue, and there is no doubt whatever as to the ethnical position of the Kuns. The Codex Cumanicus of Petrarch, which preserves a considerable Kun vocabulary, assures us of that. We need not feel much difficulty in accepting the conclusion of Vámbéry (cap. vi.) that the Patzinaks belonged to that branch of the Turkish race which in the eleventh and twelfth centuries appeared as Kuns, two centuries later as Nogais and Turcomans in the land which extends north of the Caspian to the Volga. They are the same as the Polovetzi of the Russian chronicle which goes by the name of Nestor.

A great object of the Roman Empire was to preserve peace with the Patzinaks, who were conveniently situated between the Slaves of the Dnieper on the north, the Magyars on the West, and the Bulgarians on the south, so that if a quarrel broke out with any of these peoples, the Emperor could threaten them

with the Patzinaks. As for the Khazars, he had other checks on them. He cultivated peace with the Alans, who bordered the Khazars on the Caucasian side, with the Uzes who girded them on the east, and with Black Bulgaria on the north frontier of Khazaria, where the Volga and the Kama meet. This Bulgaria must be distinguished from White Bulgaria on the Danube. While the Bulgarians who had moved west had come under the influence of the conquered Slaves and were ultimately merged in them, the remnant who stayed behind in the east remained Turanian; and while the western branch embraced Christianity, the eastern embraced Islam.

Such was the general grouping of the peoples with whom the sovereigns of East Rome had to deal in war and commerce in the tenth century. But this grouping, partly at least, was of recent date. In the latter half of the ninth century it had been something very different; at the beginning of the ninth century it had perhaps been something different still. Under the reign of Constantine's grandfather, Basil, the Magyars had only advanced as far west as the Patzinaks had advanced in his own day; and the Patzinaks were in the remote distance. It is certain that in the reigns of Irene and Nicephorus the Magyars themselves had not yet appeared on the political horizon of Eastern Rome. The following account is given by Constantine of their history. It is to be observed that in his day they were commonly called *Turks* in Constantinople,—a circumstance which might seem to make for Vámbéry's view, and we shall see that he does not neglect to make use of it.

The first home of the 'Turks,' according to Constantine, was close to the realm of the Khazars in a district named *Lebedia*, which is irrigated by the river Chidmas or Chingylús.* He goes on to say that in this first stage of their history they were not called Turks, but 'for some reason or other' *Sabartoas-phaloi*. They were divided into seven tribes, and had no ruler over them, but each tribe had a 'voevode' of its own. The

* In *Die Ungern*, p. 19, Hunfalvy seems to mistranslate Constantine by assuming two rivers; yet he renders the Greek rightly in his *Magyarország Ethn.*, p. 213.

tribes seem to have been arrayed in some order of precedence, for Lebedias, chief of one of the tribes, was the 'first' voevode, and gave his name to the whole district. For three years they dwelled with the Khazars, performing military service for them. And the Chagan of the Khazars rewarded the bravery of Lebedias by giving him a noble Khazar lady in marriage, hoping for a vigorous progeny. But there were no children.

Then the Patzinaks—at the end of the three years apparently—appear upon the scene. Where they dwelled at the time is not specified by Constantine, but they, like the Magyars, bore in their eastern home a strange name. They were called Kangar.* They engaged in war with the Khazars, who proved more powerful than they and drove them out of their former territory. Expelled, they were obliged to seek new homes elsewhere, and they invaded and occupied Lebedia, treating the Magyars as they had themselves been treated by the Khazars. The Magyars in their turn had to migrate. Some of them went to the borders of Persia—clearly to the north shores of the Caspian Sea—and there continued to dwell under the name of Sabartoasphaloi. But the rest bent their steps westward and entered the lands on the coast of the Euxine between the Dnieper and the Danube, where in the ninth century they became known to the East Romans as 'Turks.'

This new home of the Magyars was called by them *Atelkuzu*. But it was not destined, any more than Lebedia, to be their abiding home. The Magyars were doomed to be chased by the Patzinaks, and the Patzinaks were doomed to be chased by the Khazars. About fifty years before Constantine wrote, that is, about the end of the ninth century, the Khazars and

* In one place Constantine gives *Kάγγαρ*, in another *Kάγκαρ*; and explains it as *brave and noble*. Vámbéry in his *Besenyő névlejstrom* (p. 444) suggests two Turkish derivations: (1) connection with a word meaning 'to go in quest of adventures,' (2) a compound=blackblooded. Hunfalvy explains it (p. 404) men or children of the *Káma*; so too *Bolgar*, children of the Volga; the second part of the words, *gar*, being same as in *gyerek*, *gyermek*, child. But in his later work (*Die Ungern*, p. 81) he explains it by the Vogulic *kant-kar*, warrior.

the Uzes combined to drive the Patzinaks out of their land, which then passed into the possession of the Uzes. Some indeed of the conquered nation were allowed to remain in their old country and dwell in subjection to the Uzes (who, as we have seen, were of the same race and language), but the greater part went westward on the path which the Magyars had traced before them. They entered the land of Atelkuzu, and drove the Magyars out of their new home as they had driven them out of the old one,—under what circumstances, we shall presently see.

The chief Lebedias accompanied the Magyars into Atelkuzu and then the king of the Khazars, to whom the Magyars at this time stood in some loose relation of fealty or dependence, proposed to make this tribal chief Lebed ruler of the whole seven tribes, and thus give some unity to the people. But Lebed declined the dignity and suggested that either Salmutzes, another tribal chieftain, or his son Arpad should be chosen to this new dignity. The Magyars preferred the son to the father, and Arpad was made king and raised on the shield 'according to the law of the Khazars.' It was to Arpad then in Atelkuzu, founder of the Arpadian dynasty, and it was to the act of a Khazar sovran that we have to trace back the institution which gives the 'Emperor of Austria' the chief of his complex of prerogatives. This event is a significant instance of the authority possessed by the Khazars over the neighbouring peoples—the Uzes, Patzinaks, Magyars, and Black Bulgarians. The important position of the Khazar empire has been well brought out by Vámbéry (p. 65). They maintained a lively intercourse with Constantinople, with the Sassanid monarchs, and after the fall of the Persian kingdom with the courts of the caliphs. They held the great commercial routes connecting the north and south. Their realm was bounded on the north by the Black Bulgarians, who were tributary to them, on the east by the Patzinaks, until they moved westward; on the south it reached deep into the Caucasian region, to the gate of Derbend and the shore of Rhion, on the west to the Dnieper and the Crimea. The question has been raised by Hunfalvy (p. 215): why did not the Khazars, who appear as

the overlords and friends of the Magyars, protect them in Lebedia from the attack of the Patzinaks? The answer seems to be that they could not help it. When the Magyars lived in Lebedia, the power of the Khazars was on the wane,* and they had perhaps enough to do to guard their own land from the Patzinaks. When they expelled them at a later period, they did so with the help, and chiefly for the sake of the Uzes.

There is no question as to the land meant by Atelkuzu; the more difficult question as to Lebedia will occupy us presently. Constantine tells us that Atelkuzu was the same which the Patzinaks held in his own day. He also says that five rivers flowed through it, and gives strange names, of which we can recognize the Pruth and the Seret, and possibly the Dniester. The name of the land itself seems to be compounded of the names of two rivers—Atel and Kuzu, of which we may guess that one is the Danube and the other the Dnieper.†

The circumstances under which the Magyars left Atelkuzu were as follows. In the year 895 war broke out between the Roman Empire, then ruled by Leo the Wise, son of Basil the Macedonian, and the kingdom of Bulgaria, which under the great Tzar Simeon, was then reaching the height of its power. Leo called in the help of the 'Turks,' who readily consented to invade Bulgaria. They defeated Simeon, marched up to the walls of his capital Peristhlava, and shut him up in the fort of Mundraga. At this time Arpad was dead and his son Liuntin‡ had succeeded. After peace had been made with the Empire, Simeon sent a message to the Patzinaks to stir them up against the Hungarians. So when the Hungarian warriors had gone forth on some expedition of plunder, the Patzinaks seized their country and drove out the population which had remained behind. The Hungarians did not attempt to drive out the invaders, but moved westward into the land where they dwell to the present day. This story must be supple-

* So Vámbéry, p. 128.

† Roesler, *Romänische Studien*, p. 154, would amend 'Uzu,' a Turkish name for the Dnieper.

‡ It has been thought that the name Liuntin is the same name as Lebedia, and equivalent to Leventa.

mented by the statement made in another place that the Patzinaks had been driven out of their former home by the Khazars and Uzes; that they groped about to find a new abode, and finally came to Atelkuzu, the Hungary of the ninth century. Simeon, learning that they were seeking a new home, thought it a good opportunity to requite his troublesome neighbours. One wonders whether the Patzinaks would have invaded Atelkuzu, if Simeon had not urged them. If not, his invitation was destined to prove a fatal mistake in Slavonic history, in which he himself holds such a high place. For if the Patzinaks had not for the second time robbed the Hungarians of their home, the Hungarians might never have crossed the mountains, might not have severed the belt of Slavonic peoples which then girded Europe from the northern to the southern sea.

Neither Constantine nor anyone else mentions the duration of this intermediate Hungary—or Turkey as it was called by the Rômaioi—which extended from the Dnieper to the Danube and perhaps took in Walachia. But we have some data which enable us to infer approximately the length of this period. It included the whole reign of Arpad and the succession of his son Leventa; but then we know not whether Arpad reigned a long or a short time. There is however an important piece of evidence which shows that the Magyars were in Atelkuzu in the reign of Theophilus, as early as the year 836. In the reign of Leo V. the Bulgarian prince Crum had transplanted 10,000 Macedonians beyond the Danube. In the reign of Theophilus, these Macedonians determined to return to Romania with the help of the Emperor. Some fought their way through Bulgaria; others were to be taken up by vessels sent by the Emperor. As these were about to depart, a large body of Hungarians appeared. A battle ensued, and the strangers, who had been summoned by the Bulgarians, were defeated. This passage* has a special interest because the Magyars are called by their special name *Οὐγγροι*—*Ungarn, Hungarians*—as well as by the general name *Turks*, which the Emperor Leo and his son

* George Monachus, p. 818, ed. Bonn.

Constantine always give them, and also by the name *Οἱ Ἕννοι*, *Huns*, which was constantly given to them in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the Greek historians, lovers of antiquity, wishing to identify them with the people of Attila. The passage also enables us to determine approximately the date of the Hungarian occupation of Atelkuzu. Allowing Arpad a long reign, and supposing that his son had been in power a good while before the collision with Simeon in 895, we see that they cannot have been long in that land when they attacked the Macedonian exiles in 836. If we said that the migration from Lebedia must have taken place about 830, we might not be far astray.

We may now see what further light, by way of expansion or correction, may be obtained from Arabic writers. Ibn Dasta, a Persian, writing in Arabic according to the prevailing custom, composed a work before 913 A.D., in which he gives a valuable account of the Khazars, the Bulgarians, the Magyars, and other peoples of those regions.* It is to be observed that he knows the Magyars by that name—*Mazgars*,—unlike Constantine. Five of his statements have a special importance for us: (1) The first district of the Magyars lay between the Patzinaks and the Eszezel Bulgarians,—as the Arabs called the Bulgarians of the Volga. They were bounded by the ‘Roman Sea’ and two rivers. (2) They reign over Slaves, and the Khazars fear them. They bring Slavonic slaves for sale to the Roman town of Kerch. (3) They are Turks. (4) They are fireworshippers. (5) They have two rulers over them, a *kende* and a *dsila*.

It is clear that Ibn Dasta is describing the Magyars in their second home, Atelkuzu, not in Lebedia. For they live on the Black Sea, and have relations with the Empire, and are in a Slavonic country, ruling over Slaves. The rivers are conjectured by Hunfalvy to be the Dnieper and the Bug. ‘The tributary of the Magyars,’ he writes (*Magyarország ethnographiája*, p. 203),

* All students of early Magyar and Bulgarian history are deeply indebted to the work of Chwolson entitled *Izvestiya o Chozarach, Burtasach, Bolgarach, Madyarach, Slavanyach i Rusach*, which contains a translation of the important evidence of Ibn Dasta.

'might be Slaves dwelling on the banks of the Bug and Dniester, or perhaps still further west, of the Pruth and Seret, or even in Siebenbürgen.' Vámbéry thinks that one river is the Dnieper or Don and the other the Danube.

The first statement of Ibn Dasta is most important for determining the whereabouts of Lebedia; in fact it is the only distinct evidence that we have. If the *first*, clearly the most north-easterly, *district** of the Magyars of Atelkuzu marched on the land of the Patzinaks, who had succeeded the Magyars in Lebedia, it is clear that Lebedia was west of the Volga. This is confirmed by the circumstance that in the reign of Theophilus, as Greek historians record, the Khazars built the fort of Sarkel on the Don as an outpost against the Patzinaks. We may guess that Lebedia corresponded partly to the western part of the province of Kazan, and that its boundaries were on the north-east, Black Bulgaria, on the south-east, the Khazar territory.

In Constantine, however, we find something which seems inconsistent with this conclusion. We have seen that in his account of the Magyars he does not say where Lebedia is. But in his chapter on the Patzinaks he states that their old dwelling, before they came to Atelkuzu, was between the rivers Itil and Geêch. There is no doubt whatever that the Itil is the Volga, and that the Geêch is the Jaik or Ural. This statement, then, does not agree with our conclusion that Lebedia was west of the Volga. It seems likely that Constantine here † mixed up the land which the Patzinaks occupied before they entered Lebedia with Lebedia itself, the land which they held during most of the ninth century. This mistake was the easier as there is no doubt that a portion of the Patzinaks had remained behind in their eastern home. In fact, as Vámbéry has well shown, the split of the Patzinak race began before the end of the ninth century (p. 84). It is significant that Constantine does not mention Lebedia in his special

* Vámbéry (p. 105) says simply 'a Magyarok földje'; Hunfalvy more accurately 'a Magyarok első vidéke' (p. 201).

† The expression he uses (cap. 37 *in il.*), τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς 'originally' suggest this.

chapter on the Patzinaks. This is characteristic of the whole treatise. He makes statements in one place which do not tally with statements in another, and the difficulty of reconciling them never seems to occur to him. The question arises, where did he get information about these barbarian peoples of Eastern Europe? It seems evident to me that he got some of it at least from Slavonic sources, perhaps from Slavonic interpreters. This comes out undesignedly, without the intention of the imperial writer. When he speaks of the voevodes of the 'Turks,' it is clear that he is using the words of an informant to whom it was as natural to use the Slavonic 'voevode' as for a Greek to say 'archon.' For the Magyars themselves did not call their chieftains voevodes. Again, when he tells us that the Patzinaks took oaths according to their *zakona*, one must suspect some Slavonic mediation. But it is clear that he did not get all his knowledge from the same source. His accounts of the Patzinaks and his accounts of the Turks seem to be founded on different stories—not necessarily incompatible, but he at least did not combine them. We have had an instance of this in the matter of Lebedia, but there is another still more striking instance in the same connexion. In his chapter on the Hungarians, he knows them only by the name of Turks and the 'older' name Sabartoasphaloi; but in the chapter on the Patzinaks, he states that this people, in their old home, were neighbours of the Uzes and the 'Magyars,' without apparently having the slightest notion that *Μάδαροι*, *Madyars*, was the true name of the people whom he calls Turks.* These Magyars were, of course, those who had migrated eastward after the Patzinak conquest of Lebedia, and became neighbours of the eastern Patzinaks.

The likelihood that Constantine used Slavonic sources will support an acute guess of Zeuss as to the strange name Sabartoasphaloi. He thought that the word is nothing else than *Svarte Falen*, that is *schwarze Falen*, 'swart Falians.'† The

* There can be no doubt, I think with Vámbéry, that the *Μάδαροι* are the Magyars of the East. Otherwise Roesler and Hunfalvy (who thinks it a mistake for *Khazars*).

† Approved by Roesler and Hunfalvy, rejected by Vámbéry.

Germans in their Latin chronicles used the name *Fali* to designate the Kumans in later times, and it seems to be the same word as *Polovtzi*, by which they go in the Russian Chronicle. May not the Scandinavians have used that name in the tenth century to designate the Magyars? May they not have called the Magyars in the east the 'swarthy *Falians*,' as opposed to the Magyars of the west, who would be the White *Falians*, just as Black and White Bulgaria are distinguished? *Sabartoasphaloi* would thus be a Graecized form of a Teutonic appellation, and Constantine would have been mistaken in regarding it as the name which the 'Turks' had themselves applied to the whole people before they split. He could easily have heard the name from Slavonic subjects of the Scandinavian princes of Kiev, or perhaps from Varangian guards.

But it is time now to consider the question, whence the Magyars originally came and who they were. For though *Lebedia* is their first recorded dwelling-place, it is clear from the record itself that it was not their original home. In fact, Constantine's narrative seems almost to imply that they abode only three years in that country. However this may be, no written record has come down to us of an earlier habitation. There is, however, certain evidence which makes it highly probable that the original country of the Magyars was in a north-easterly direction from *Lebedia*, beyond the *Volga Bulgarians*, north of the *Kama*. This evidence is the Hungarian language, which, whatever theory we hold as to its origin, points to a time when the Hungarians lived in close communion with *Ugro-Finnic* peoples. For, if we hold with *Budenz* and *Hunfalvy* that the Hungarians are themselves an *Ugrian* people, and that the *Ugro-Finnic* element in their language is the original basis of it, we must seek their first home in the *Ugro-Finnic*, and more narrowly in the *Ugrian*, circle. If, on the other hand, we accept the view of *Vámbéry*, that the Hungarians are of Turkish race, and that the basis of their language is Turkish, we have to account for the *Ugro-Finnic* element which was afterwards blended in their tongue, and we can only explain it by supposing that they lived in the neighbourhood of the *Ostjaks*, or the *Voguls*, for a considerable period.

According to Vámbéry, the great plain spreading from the Lower Jaxartes along the north shores of the Aral and Caspian, over the source-lands of the Ural, and beyond the Don, Dnieper, and Dniester to the confines of Hungary, was inhabited by one and the same branch of the Turk stock, divided into different groups. Of these the most northerly was the Magyar division, which coming in contact with Ugrian peoples north of the Kama, absorbed a new element into their language. In the same way he explains the origin of the Čsuvas tongue. The Bulgarian people split up into two parts towards the end of the fifth century, just as the Hungarians and the Patzinaks split in the ninth. That part which remained in the east was pushed northward by the Khazars to the Kama-Volga region about 650, and there came in contact with a Finnic or Ugrian people, perhaps the Cseremiszes. Through mixture with them the Bulgarians lost their physical peculiarities, and their tongue was transformed. Such is the origin of the Čsuvas language, according to the ingenious guess of Vámbéry, who holds that the Bulgarians were a Turkish people, and not Ugrian, as Hunfalvy tries to make out.

But whether we go with Vámbéry or with Hunfalvy, in either case the original home of the Magyars must have been in the same regions, north of the Kama. Hunfalvy thinks that memories of this ancient home survived among the Magyars even after they had reached their abiding home on the Danube, and are to be found in their oldest chronicle, that of the anonymous notary of King Béla IV., which was pulled to pieces by the merciless pen of Roesler.* The Anonymous says that the Magyars originally lived in Scythia, a large country of which the eastern part is called Dentu-moger. Hunfalvy identifies *moger* with *Magyar*, and *dentu* with *Tangat*, which he tries to show might have been a name of the river Irtish; and

* There is a special work on this chronicle by J. Vass, entitled *Béla Király névtelen jegyzőjének kora* (1865), but it is practically worthless. Jászay's work on early Hungarian history (*a Magyar Nemzet napjai a legrégibb időtől az arany hulláig*) is quite uncritical, and in its earlier part a mere reproduction of the Anonymous. The first pages of Szalay's great Hungarian history, *Magyarország történelme*, have also very little value.

he supports this guess by a statement in the chronicle of Kézai, that the old country of the Magyars was watered by the rivers Togata and Etul. The Etul is, of course, the Volga; but Vámbéry has shown that Togora, not the Togata, is the right reading, and that the Ural is meant.* But it is highly probable that the second part *moger* is really the same as magyar, and we have it also in *hetu-moger*, 'seven magyars,' as the Anonymus calls the seven chiefs of the Hungarian tribes, and in the land of *Magoria*, one of the three parts in which Scythia is divided in Kézai. What then is the meaning of Magyar? Hunfalvy and Roesler explain it as *ma-ger* or *mo-ger*, 'men of the land,' from *ma*, which means 'land' in the Vogulic tongue (cf. Finn *maa*), and *ger*, 'man,' corresponding to the Vogulic *kár*, and preserved in a diminutive form in the Hungarian *gyerek*, *gyermek*, 'child.' Vámbéry rejects this Ugrian etymology and proposes a Turkish one. He considers that Magyar stands for *madsar*, and that the original form was *majar*, meaning 'hero' or 'chief.' This would explain *Μουδάριπς*, occurring in Theophanes † as the name of a Hun noble.

But the derivation of proper names is almost always uncertain and arbitrary, and in an inquiry touching the origin of a people it will generally be wise to seek for other evidence first, and only admit the testimony of proper names as confirmatory of conclusions otherwise arrived at. The proofs which Vámbéry brings forward of his Turkish theory may be divided into three chief heads; (1) the testimony of Greek and Arabic writers; (2) ethnological and sociological considerations; (3) the character of Magyar civilisation, so far as we know it. Under the third head come the names of persons, offices, dignities, etc.; military tactics and customs.

(1) Both Leo the Wise and his son, Constantine VII., as we have already seen, knew the Magyars by the name of Turks. It may seem strange that this generic name should have been specially associated with the Magyars, while the Khazars, Pat-

* It is stated in the chronicle that the Togora flows into the *mare Aquilonis*, which is the Caspian, not as Hunfalvy thought the Arctic Sea.

† P. 176, ed. de Boor.

zinaks, and other neighbouring nations were designated by their own names. Vámbéry's solution of this difficulty is that the Magyars were only newcomers. Having been, of all the Scythian Turks, the most remote from the borders of the Empire, they did not appear on the scene of European history until the ninth century, and then the Greeks unfamiliar with their special name called them generally Turks. There may be some truth in this; but would not the same thing apply to the Patzinaks, who came westward later than the Magyars? It must be also remembered that the name *Οὐγγροι* seems to have been known at Constantinople. But in any case the fact that the Greeks called the Magyars Turks, does not even raise a presumption, much less prove that the Magyars are a Turkish race. With Leo and Constantine and their contemporaries 'Turks' had no more precise significance than 'Scythians.' They had no idea of the distinction between Turks and Ugrians. And in any case the Magyars had come under Turkish influence, and had partly Turkized their language before they set up their abode in Atelkuzu, so that even a competent and discriminating observer might easily have taken them for Turks. And for the same reason it seems to me that the statement of Ibn Dasta that they were a Turkish race has no independent value. Thus Vámbéry's first argument falls to the ground, as the facts are explicable on the other hypothesis.

(2) Vámbéry asserts the principle that all the nomads who marched against Europe, from Attila to Timur, belonged to the Tartar, and not to the Finnic family. Therefore, he concludes, the Magyars must, like Huns and Avars, like Bulgarians and Kumans, be Tartars or Turks, and not Ugrians or Finns. This is a very dangerous sort of argument—plausible at first sight as a bold generalisation, but carrying no conviction when one comes to look into it. There is nothing in the nature of the case to prevent our supposing that the Magyars were an exception to the rule. Whether the Bulgarians were also an exception it is beyond my scope to consider here; Hunfalvy holds that they were. It is quite conceivable that the Magyars, as the most southerly of the Ugrian peoples, and in constant communication with Turkish races, might have

been infected with the nomadic habit of the Turk. Vámbéry's rule proves nothing until it be otherwise shown that the Magyars conform to it.

(3) Vámbéry tries to show, in support of his theory, that the Magyar proper names mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenetos are Turkish and not Ugrian. The etymologies which he proposes are in some cases very ingenious, and I should be very sorry to say that some of them may not be right. *Zaltas*, for example, might well be the Arab 'sultan,' but an Arabic word might reach Ugrians, through Turkish mediation, as well as the Turks themselves. *Bultzus* again looks very much like the Magyar *bölcs*, 'wise,' which is a Turkish word. On the other hand, his derivation of Arpad and other names seem far-fetched and improbable. But what I would insist on is that even if some of these guesses were demonstrated to be right, they would not prove his case. For proper names may have been imported from abroad. It would require a very strong array of very sure cases to found a serious and solid argument on proper names. As for the names of the two rulers, the *gylas* and the *karchas*, mentioned by Constantine, we may readily admit that they are Turkish, borrowed by the Magyars from their neighbours. The *gylas* of Constantine is clearly the same as the *dsila* of Ibn Dasta. He was probably the general of the army, while the *karchas* was the judge. Ibn Dasta states that the King of the Magyars was called the *kundu*. This is clearly the same word as *kender*, by which, according to Ibn Fozlan, the Khazars designated the dignitary in their realm who was next in rank to the chagan. As we learn from Constantine that the institution of monarchy was introduced among the Magyars by Khazar influence, it does not surprise us to find that the title of the new dignity was borrowed from the Khazar vocabulary. Nor is there any difficulty, as Vámbéry and others seem to imagine, in the circumstance that while the Magyar *kundu* was the sovereign, the Khazar *kender* was only the under-king. On the contrary, this is just what we should expect, for it is clear that at the time of the election of Arpad, the Magyars were in a dependent relation to the Khazars. It is clear that the chagan would never have pro-

posed the institution of monarchy to the Magyars if he did not intend to be himself the overlord of their kings. And this relation of overlordship might easily have been expressed by giving to the new lord of the Magyars the same title as that borne by the under-king of the Khazars. A kundu or kender or kende, or whatever the exact form of the name was, stood, we may suppose, in the same relation to the chagan, as a *πῆ* to the βασιλεύς, or a King to the Emperor.

In his work on *Tactics* Leo VI. gives some account of the mode of warfare of the Magyars, or as he calls them the Turks.* Vámbéry points out that the details mentioned by the Emperor correspond to practices existing at the present day among Tartar people in the east. Turkomans, Kirgizes, Özbégs are accustomed to sleep, eat, and drink on horseback, just as the Magyars did according to Leo. The same writer mentions that felt was used by the 'Turks' for the clothing both of the warrior and of his steed, and that each soldier carried with him on military expeditions a piece of iron of crescent shape for shoeing his horse. Vámbéry can 'cap' these details by instances from the habits of the Oriental Turks whom he knows so well. But all this does not prove his case nor overthrow the position of Hunfalvy. These customs and others like them were doubtless among the many things which the false 'Turks' learned from the true Turks; and Vámbéry can certainly not show that such customs could not be borrowed.

Vámbéry does not omit to summon to his aid the anonymous scribe of King Béla, whose untrustworthy chronicle has already been mentioned. But untrustworthy though it be as history, it

* In cap. xviii. Salamon (F.) has written a valuable little work on Leo's *Tactics*, of which I have noted the title at the head of this article. He tries to show that the *Strategic* of the Emperor Maurice was not really Maurice's work, but dates from the reign of Basil I., Leo's father. In arguing this thesis he falls into a strange mistake when he says (p. 6) 'hogy a ix. század előtt nem kelhetett oly görög könyv, mely turkokról beszél.' He has evidently never read Menander, who lived in the reign of Maurice. Vámbéry makes a much queerer mistake in speaking of Salamon's book. He writes of 'Leo the Wise, or his father Maurice' (*Bölcs Leo vagy atyja Maurikios*)—a curious jumble.

may yet have some value. For it rests on the basis of tradition and *népmondák* or folk lore, and may therefore preserve dim memories of a past otherwise forgotten. The Hungarian scholar pertinently asks those who denounce the anonymous scribe as absolutely worthless,—whence did he get his proper names? For he did not get them from Dares Phrygius or from Regino, whom he uses so liberally in other matters. We may fairly suppose that the names of persons and places mentioned in the chronicle rest on popular tradition. Vámbéry accordingly proceeds to deal with them, as he dealt with the names recorded by Constantine Porphyrogennetos. He interprets, for example, *Esküllö*, 'the place of the oath,' by the Turkish *ecskilik*. But I have already spoken of the value of arguments from proper names.

The battle between Ugrians and Turks for the possession of the Magyars must be fought on the field of language. And may I venture to suggest that Turanian philology will have to establish itself on a far surer footing and set up for itself a higher standard of exactitude, before we can have much confidence in its results. At present it is in that stage in which vowels count for nothing and consonants for very little,—a stage which Indo-germanic philology has fortunately passed. When we remember how much ingenuity has been thrown away, even in recent years, on attempts to connect Aryan with Hebrew words, we naturally think how easy it might be to make a Tartar vocabulary appear to be Ugrian or a Ugrian vocabulary appear to be Tartar. For while the genius of Aryan and the genius of Semitic tongues are totally different, the genius of Vogul and Ostjak and that of Turkish languages are alike—both, as we say, 'Turanian.' But though one must feel diffident in approaching a subject, which is still, I fear, at the mercy of punsters and guessers, there is one capital and obvious fact which raises a very strong presumption in favour of Budenz and Hunfalvy. In the comparison of languages, almost the first thing that one looks at is the numbers. If the Magyars were a Turkish people they would surely have kept the Turkish words for one, two, three; if a Ugrian people, the Ugrian. One's own words for the simple numbers are the last part of the vocabulary one is likely to replace by the words of strangers. In the case of a higher number, borrowing is con-

ceivable. Thus the Russians got their word for 40, *sorok*, from the Greek (τεσσεράκοντα. But in the first numbers it is certainly unlikely. The following table will show that the numbers from 1 to 7 correspond in Magyar, Vogul and Finnic, and differ in the Altaic group of the Turk race.*

	MAGYAR.	VOGUL (northern).	FINN.	TURK.
1,	- egy,	äkve,	yhte,	pir.
2,	- két (kettö),	kit,	kahte,	eki.
3,	- három,	kórom,	kolme,	üc.
4,	- négy,	nile (neljä)	n'ilä,	tört.
5,	- öt,	ät,	viite,	pes.
6,	- hat,	kat,	kuute,	alti.
7,	- hét,	sát,	seitse.	jetti.

The Magyar *tíz*, 10, differs from the Vogul *lau*, but then *lau* also differs from the Finnish *kymmen*. The numbers 8 and 9 are expressed in all three languages † as 10—2, 10—1 (just as 18 and 19 are expressed in Latin and Greek); and this points to a period when the Ugro-Finnic race counted by sevens. Hunfalvy supposes that there were two periods in the early history of the Hungarians; the first in which the Finns and Ugrians lived all together and counted on a septenary system; the second in which the Hungarians had separated, and lived far away from the Finns, but in the neighbourhood of the Voguls and Ostjaks. However this may be, it is very hard to get over the elementary arithmetic. It would be unprofitable here to go into the comparisons of other words, both nouns and verbs, which have been proposed by Budenz on the one hand and Vámbéry on the other. There are many names for which a plausible kinsword can be found in Turkish; but then an equally plausible kinsword can also be found in Vogul or Ostjak. And there are other cases where Hungarian has two words for the same thing, of which one is clearly Ugrian and the other clearly Turkish. Thus *atya* 'father' is Turkish *ata*, but then *is* is the same as Vogul *jis*; *anya* 'mother' is Turkish *ana*, but *em* is Finnic *emä*. It is instructive to com-

* See Vámbéry, p. 468.

† Certainly in Vogul and Finnic; probably in Magyar.

pare the list of prepositions given by Hunfalvy with that given by Vámbéry; * the one cancels the other.

So far then it seems to me that the hypothesis of the Ugrian origin of the Hungarians holds the field. The Hungarians are Ogres and not Turks. But I cannot agree with Hunfalvy in his view that the influence which their Turkish neighbours exerted on both the language and the character of the Magyars began in the Atelkuzu period.† On the contrary, it must have begun very early indeed, even before the Lebedia period. It also deserves remark that there are evidences of Persian influence on Magyar civilisation, which Vámbéry has done well to emphasize; and this may go to explain the statement of Ibn Dasta that the Magyars were fireworshippers.

This paper may be fitly concluded by a reference to the death of Hunfalvy Pál—to write his name in Magyar fashion—which took place a few months ago. The Hungarians have lost in him one of their soundest scholars and most careful workers. He was not always sure of his Greek accents—the Magyars never are—and, strange to say, he thought that the Ἀγάρροι of the Greek chroniclers meant the Avars. He made mistakes of this kind; but he did much to raise the level of Hungarian scholarship near that of other European countries, and his writings will for many years to come be indispensable to every student of early Hungarian history.

J. B. BURY.

ART. II.—THE PORTEOUS RIOT.

(From Original MSS. in the Record Office.)

THE best accounts of the Porteous Riot, which, though not an important event in Scottish History, was one of the strangest incidents which took place in Scotland during last

* *Die Ungern*, p. 33, and *A magyarok eredete*, p. 471.

† I quite agree with Vámbéry's criticisms (p. 142) on Hunfalvy's Kabar hypothesis.

century, are those given by Sir Walter Scott in the *Heart of Midlothian* and in the *Tales of a Grandfather*. In addition to the ordinary sources of information, and those oral traditions which he had heard in his youth, Scott was in possession of a manuscript, 'Memorial concerning the Murder of Captain Porteous,' which is printed in the Notes to the *Heart of Midlothian*. The original of this interesting document, which consists of an account of the attempts made by the Crown Council in Scotland to discover the murderers of Porteous, is preserved in the Public Record Office, along with a number of other papers relating to this mysterious affair. The most important of these papers are, in addition to the Memorial of which Scott had a copy, a 'Narrative' of the Riot, drawn up, apparently, by an Edinburgh magistrate, and differing somewhat from Sir Walter Scott's account; the petition of Porteous, praying for a reprieve, to which his signature, written in a clear, though rather shaky, hand, is appended; a petition in his favour signed by a number of peers and gentlemen of position; and, most valuable of all, a collection of letters by the Lord Justice Clerk of Scotland, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Ilay, General Moyle, who was in command of a regiment in Edinburgh at the time of the Riot, General Wade, and others. From the documents some additional facts may be learned regarding that extraordinary outrage, which so highly irritated the Government of the day, and the authors of which were never discovered in spite of the strenuous and long continued exertions which were made for the purpose of bringing them to justice.

The facts which led to the Porteous Riot may be shortly stated. Two criminals, Wilson and Robertson by name, who had been sentenced to death for robbery, were, on the Sunday before the day fixed for their execution, taken to hear service; and Robertson, by the help of his fellow-prisoner, succeeded in making his escape from the Church. The building was crowded; but no attempt was made by any of the congregation to stop the fugitive. 'Not a person,' Provost Wilson of Edinburgh writes to Mr. Lindsay, member for the city, 'put out their hand to stop Robertson. On the contrary, everybody made way for him.'

This refusal to support the officers of the law did not merely arise from unwillingness to interfere with a man who was flying for his life, but was also occasioned by the fact that the robbery of which he had been convicted, was the robbery of a collector of customs, an offence which, at that time, was regarded in Scotland as venial, if not actually praiseworthy. The feeling which had prompted the onlookers to connive at the escape of Robertson rendered Wilson an object of sympathy; and the authorities feared that an attempt would be made to rescue him from the hands of the hangman. To prevent this, the scaffold was surrounded by an armed band of the city-guard, under the command of Captain John Porteous. What took place is well known. A rescue was not attempted; but after the execution the mob became excited, and stones were thrown at Porteous and his men, who retaliated by firing on the people. Several persons were killed, and many were wounded. Among those slain on the spot, or who soon after died of their wounds, were shopkeepers, domestic servants, both men and women, and respectable working men, who were present merely as peaceable spectators of the execution. The conduct of Porteous was bitterly resented; and the anger of the citizens increased, as day by day they heard of persons dying from the wounds which they had received. The execution of Wilson took place on the 14th of April 1736; and on the 19th of July Porteous was arraigned, on a charge of murder, before the High Court of Justiciary, the supreme criminal tribunal in Scotland. The charge against him was twofold; first, causing the men under his command to fire upon the crowd, and secondly, firing with his own hand and killing one of the crowd, a man named Charles Husband. His defence was that he had neither ordered his men to fire, nor fired himself, but had merely threatened the people when they became unruly. Twenty-eight witnesses were examined for the prosecution, merchants of the city, professional men, servants, and young men of fashion, who had witnessed the scene from the windows of the lofty tenements of the Grassmarket, at that time an aristocratic quarter of Edinburgh. The effect of this evidence was to prove that Porteous had urged

his men to fire. 'Fire, and be damned to you,' were the words which several witnesses swore they had heard him use. There was also strong evidence to the effect that he had snatched a firelock from one of the guard and discharged it at Husband. The testimony of the witnesses for the defence, sixteen in number, was mainly that they had not heard any orders to fire, and had not seen Porteous himself discharge a musket. The jury brought in a verdict of guilty, and Porteous was sentenced to be hanged on Wednesday, the 8th of September.

The sentence was heard with immense satisfaction in Edinburgh, for the citizens regarded Porteous simply as a brutal murderer. But he was advised to appeal to Queen Caroline, who, owing to the King's absence on the Continent, represented the Crown at this time. The petition which Porteous addressed to Her Majesty might have been disregarded, but it was backed up by another and more influential application for mercy. It is perhaps unnecessary to mention that, in 1736, Walpole was struggling against that powerful combination which, a few years later, succeeded in driving him from office; but the events which led to the respite of Porteous, as disclosed in the official papers in the Record Office, can hardly be understood without some explanation of the position of the Ministry in Scotland. The chief adviser of Walpole regarding Scottish affairs was Archibald Campbell, Earl of Ilay and brother of John, Duke of Argyle and Greenwich. Andrew Fletcher of Milton, the Lord Justice Clerk of Scotland, an acute lawyer and an able politician, acted as the confidential correspondent of Lord Ilay. The Lord Advocate was Duncan Forbes of Culloden, and the Solicitor General was Charles Erskine of Tinwald. These four politicians practically controlled the administration of Scotland. But they had to contend against a vigorous opposition, especially from the Scottish peers, which had been growing in strength ever since the General Election of 1734. In that year, at the election of the sixteen representative peers, a riot had been expected, and a regiment of soldiers was drawn up in the courtyard of Holyrood Palace, to the great indignation of the opposition candidates, who protested that an attempt was being made to

intimidate them by military force. The Ministerial candidates were all chosen, but months after, when Parliament met, the feeling was as bitter as ever, and long debates took place regarding illegal methods which were said to have been employed at the election. 'The eyes of all England,' says Tindal, 'and, indeed, of a great part of Europe, were now fixed upon the proceedings of the House of Peers with regard to the election of the Scotch peers.' These debates came to nothing, but the influence of the Government was from that time so much weakened in Scotland that, though anxious to support the authority of the law by saving Porteous, whose offence they regarded as merely an excess of zeal in the performance of his duty, the ministers were afraid to grant the prayer of his petition. Another petition was therefore prepared at the same time, which the Ministry privately agreed to support, on condition that the opposition as well as the friends of the Government should sign it. This condition, which was kept as a profound secret at the time, was insisted on lest the opposition should make political capital out of the reprieve of Porteous, which, it was well known, would be highly unpopular in Scotland. Signatures were, therefore, eagerly canvassed for, and the petition bears the names of about fifty persons of high social position, of whom no less than fifteen were peers.

Owing, probably, to the time which had been occupied in obtaining signatures, it was not until the 25th of August that the petitions were finally sent up to London. On that day, the Lord Justice Clerk writes to the Duke of Newcastle: 'At the desire of persons of quality and distinction, I have taken the liberty of troubling your Grace with the enclosed petition to Her Majesty, in favour of John Porteous, now under sentence of death, together with a petition from himself to the Queen, and it is their request your Grace may present them to Her Majesty as soon as may be convenient, because the 8th of September is the day fixed for the execution.' Sir Walter Scott, with the genuine instinct of a great master in the art of writing fiction, has described, in the fourth chapter of the *Heart of Midlothian*, how a crowd assembled at the place of

execution 'prepared to enjoy the scene of retaliation in triumph, silent and decent, though stern and relentless,' and how, when the hour for punishing the criminal had passed, 'the news, which the magistrates had almost hesitated to communicate to them, was at length announced, and spread among the spectators with a rapidity like lightning. A reprieve from the Secretary of State's office, under the hand of his Grace the Duke of Newcastle, had arrived, intimating the pleasure of Queen Caroline (regent of the kingdom during the absence of George II. on the Continent) that the execution of the sentence of death pronounced against John Porteous, late Captain-Lieutenant of the City Guard of Edinburgh, present prisoner in the Tolbooth of that city, be respited for six weeks from the time appointed for his execution.' But, in point of fact, the announcement was not made so suddenly, nor delayed until the last moment. The fact that a reprieve had been granted was communicated to the magistrates of Edinburgh on the 3rd of September; and on the following day it was rumoured in the city that the mob had resolved to set fire to the prison on the evening of the 8th, if the sentence against Porteous was not duly carried out. 'This,' says the compiler of the Narrative in the Record Office, 'was carefully inquired into by the magistrates; but they could not discover any foundation for the report.' It also appears that Lord Justice Clerk Fletcher did not anticipate any disturbance on account of the mercy shown to Porteous; for on the same day he writes to the Duke of Newcastle, 'This act of Her Majesty's royal mercy, and as it points to further, meets with almost a general approbation, especially among those of the higher rank and greatest distinction. And the few who grumble are only of the meaner sort, or such as either have confined ways of thinking, or such as seem determined to complain whatever happens.' But there can be little doubt that, during the next few days, a band of determined men were quietly but busily preparing for the tragedy which afterwards took place.

The scene on which the Porteous riot was enacted is well known. Every traveller who has visited the ancient capital of Scotland will remember the long steep thorough-

fare which ascends from the Palace of Holyrood to the Castle Hill. In 1736 the part of that picturesque street which lay next to the Palace was known as the suburb of Canongate, at the western termination of which stood a massive gateway called the Netherbow Port. Beyond this gateway the city began, and the thoroughfare was known as the High Street. In the centre of the High Street, and at the north-west corner of the Church of Saint Giles, which still remains, stood the Tolbooth, the gaol in which Porteous was confined. Beyond the Tolbooth, and sloping upwards towards the Castle, was the Lawnmarket, from which a short steep street, the Westbow, led down into the Grassmarket, where the execution of Wilson had taken place, and where the city-guard, under the command of Porteous, had fired upon the crowd.

On the evening of Tuesday, the 7th of September, the magistrates, who appear to have been enjoying themselves at a convivial gathering, were informed that a few boys were beating a drum in the Grassmarket. This news reached them, according to the 'Narrative,' from which the following details are taken, at 9.45. At 6 minutes to 10 (the writer is very precise in giving the time) they sent an order to the captain of the guard to have his men under arms at once. But, 'just before the clock struck 10,' a mob drove the guard from the guard-room, seized ninety firelocks and several axes, and proceeded to occupy the gates of the city. At the Netherbow Port, which separated the city from the Canongate, they placed a strong party. A regiment of infantry, the Welsh Fusileers, was at this time stationed in the Canongate, under command of General Moyle; and the magistrates were anxious to obtain their assistance. Mr. Lindsay, member of Parliament for the city, undertook to carry a message to the troops, and, by taking a circuitous rout, managed to find his way to the officer's quarters, which he did not reach, however, until 10.45. Moyle had already heard of the riot, and had his men assembled under arms; but when Lindsay, who he afterwards hinted was not quite sober, made his appearance, the General raised a difficulty. As the gates of the city were locked he 'refused,'

says the Narrative, 'to allow any man to march without a warrant from the Lord Justice Clerk, or a Lord of Justiciary, who happened then to be all out of town.' This hesitation and loss of time, as will afterwards appear, in all probability cost Porteous his life. In a letter to the Duke of Newcastle, written two days later, Moyle says that he was in bed, at a quarter-past ten, when one of his officers came to him and said he heard that there was a great disturbance in the city. He at once ordered the regiment to be roused, and while he was dressing Lindsay arrived. After explaining that he did not choose to force the gates without a warrant, he goes on to say: 'Knowing that the Justice Clerk lived but two miles out of the town, I desired Mr. Lindsay to write immediately to him for his directions what he would have the troops do, and sent the letter by my own servant, who galloped all the way. My Lord being in bed, he got no answer from him till nearly one of the clock. The letter was directed to Mr. Lindsay, so I never saw the answer, and long before it came the poor man was hanged by the mob. By what I since hear he was executed before Mr. Lindsay came to my house, for they got him out of prison a little after ten.'

In the meantime the mob was attacking the Tolbooth. The magistrates attempted to disperse the rioters, who, having provided themselves with ammunition by breaking open the shop 'of one Alexander Dunning,' threatened to fire, and drove away both the magistrates and the city-guard. The assault on the prison continued for an hour before the door, which was at last destroyed by fire, was broken in. Porteous was speedily found, and hurried up the Lawnmarket, and down by the Westbow into the Grassmarket. The Justice Clerk, writing to the Duke of Newcastle, describes the scene 'of that unheard of cruel action, so far as I have yet been able to discover.' All was hurry and confusion as the wretched victim was dragged to his doom. 'On his way he lost one of his shoes, which they would not suffer him to put on.' He was loaded with curses and abuse until the spot was reached where he had, nearly five months before, committed the rash act for which he was now to suffer. There he was hanged with every

species of cruelty. 'He humbly implored,' says the Justice Clerk, 'time to make a short prayer, which they refused; and on lifting up his hands, one of them struck him over the arm with a Lochaber axe and broke his arm. And they hung him up; and, after he had hung about four minutes, they cut him down in order to augment his terrors and increase his tortures, at the same time cutting him over the head, and burning his foot that had the shoe off with a torch. Thus they used him three times, so that he was near expiring when they hung him up the last time.'

It was at a quarter to twelve o'clock, according to the Narrative, that the execution, or rather murder, took place. When all was over 'several attempts,' says this account, 'were made to take down the body, but the mob beat everyone who made such a proposal, till about daybreak a few members of the Council, and some neighbours, got the body taken down and laid it in the Greyfriars Church.'

It is almost certain that if General Moyle had made up his mind to act without a written warrant, and had, as soon as he received the message from the magistrates, forced his way into the city, the mob would not have succeeded in their object. The request for assistance reached him at about a quarter to eleven. His men were ready. He was quite mistaken in supposing that Porteous was 'got out of prison a little after ten.' The mob was then engaged in driving away the magistrates, and in attempting to break into the prison with sledgehammers and axes, and it was some time before the door was set on fire. It was only a few hundred yards from the Canon-gate to the scene of the riot, and an hour at least passed before an entrance was effected into the Tolbooth. There can therefore be little doubt that, even allowing for some delay at the Netherbow Port, the troops could have passed up the High Street and reached the Tolbooth in time to prevent the tragedy, which, as we have seen, was not completed till nearly midnight—that is, about an hour and a half after the General received the message from the magistrates. But it was perhaps natural that an English officer, with the knowledge that he might have, if bloodshed ensued, to stand his trial, like

Porteous, before a jury of Edinburgh citizens, should hesitate to act without a regular warrant from some civil authority.

When morning came all was quiet. The dead body of Porteous, discoloured by blows, and with the neck and one arm broken, lay in the ancient church of the Greyfriars. The weapons which the rioters had used lay scattered along the Westbow and the Grassmarket, and at the Tolbooth the charred and battered doorway alone showed that another had been added to the long roll of violent deeds which its venerable walls had witnessed. The Lord Justice Clerk, General Moyle, and the magistrates began to make enquiries into the origin of the riot, but no one would give information. In a rather curious account of the affair, published fifty years after, the writer says—'Although this mob was riotous, yet none concerned was ever known, although great rewards were offered to the informers. Nor was there such a villain in all the Highlands of Scotland as to accept £30,000 for the head of a Prince.' This reference to the Jacobite rebellion of '45 suggests that among the mob of Edinburgh, which at the time of the Porteous Riots had a strong bias against the Hanoverian dynasty, it was considered a point of party honour to shield the murderers of Porteous from the vengeance of the Crown. The law-officers for Scotland (the Lord Advocate and Solicitor General) were summoned to Edinburgh. Lord Ilay came down to assist them, and General Wade, who was at that time engaged in the important work of constructing military roads in the Highlands, brought a body of his men to help in maintaining order. The difficulties which hampered the law officers, from the apathy or uselessness of the magistrates and the reticence of the citizens, are described in the 'Memorial' printed in the notes to the *Heart of Midlothian*. The letters in the Record Office tell the same tale. No one would give definite evidence, for the mob had spread a rumour that death was to be the punishment of any informer. Some arrests having been made, Lord Ilay writes to the Duke of Newcastle: 'There was some little grumbling among the mob, who gathered upon the seizing the criminals, such as saying one to another, "We will not suffer our fellow-citizens to be dragged

away." But upon the first beat of the drum that attended the party which marched up the street, in order to conduct them to the Castle, all was entirely quiet.' At one time the authorities thought they were secure of at least one conviction. 'To-day,' Lord Ilay writes to the Duke of Newcastle, on the 9th of October; 'I believe we shall catch one, who is footman to a fair lady, and assisted the mob in his livery;' and a week later he writes: 'There has nothing happened remarkable since I troubled your Grace last, except that the Countess of Wemyss, whose footman I had ordered to be taken up, went out of town with him to Haddington, and I have sent a proper person to catch him there.' But in the long run, although this man was the only person of whose presence in the mob complete evidence was obtained, it turned out that he had been so drunk as to be quite incapable of understanding what was going on, and he was therefore acquitted.

Soon all hope of discovering and punishing the rioters was abandoned, and the blame for this failure of justice was laid on the magistrates. General Wade writes to the Duke of Newcastle on the 4th of November, sending a list of persons confined in the Castle as concerned in the murder, 'Since the arrival of Lord Ilay, for before I do not find there was any enquiry made upon them by the magistrates, who, by the best information I have been able to procure, not only permitted the murder to be committed (which they might easily have prevented) but suffered all who were conscious of their guilt to make their escapes; and I fear it will be difficult to find a jury who will not acquit those who are now prisoners.' In the list sent by General Wade six persons are named; but only two trials took place, and in both cases the accused were acquitted.

The story of the Porteous Riot was heard with emotions of violent resentment in London; and the Queen, in particular, could hardly find words strong enough to express her indignation. 'It is still recorded in popular tradition,' say Sir Walter Scott, 'that Her Majesty in the height of her displeasure, told the celebrated John, Duke of Argyle, that sooner than submit to such an insult (the execution of Porteous) she would make

Scotland a hunting-field. "In that case, madam," answered that high spirited nobleman, with a profound bow, "I will take leave of your Majesty, and go down to my own country to get my hounds ready." The import of the reply had more than met the ear.' The royal anger found vent in a bill of pains and penalties against the city of Edinburgh, which was brought into the House of Lords, when Parliament met in February, 1737. By this measure it was proposed to disable the Provost from holding any office in Great Britain, and to imprison him; to abolish the city-guard; and to remove the gate of the Netherbow. The extreme severity of this measure, and the personal feeling displayed by Queen Caroline have often been spoken of with astonishment, and are, indeed, hardly to be accounted for by mere zeal for the maintenance of law and order. But the explanation may possibly be found in the contents of the private letters which had been sent from Edinburgh at the time of the Riot. For instance, the Lord Justice Clerk, writing on the 11th of September, 1736, says: 'Tis beyond all doubt that the magistrates connived at this murder, for they had intimation of the design of the rabble the Sunday before, and gave the troops no notice of it in order to secure the peace, and consequently save the poor man's blood. I had forgot to tell you that the villains had the impudence to have a watch-word, which was Hanover, speaking on all occasions very disrespectfully of the Queen who granted the reprieve, and at every interval of letting him down from the tree, cried (insulting Porteous), "Where is your reprieve? Shew it us, and we'll save you," and then, with insulting curses, hung him up again.' He adds, in a postscript, 'The town, I believe, would now be glad to be at quiet, their favourite point being gained; but if severe reprisals are not made, Lord have mercy upon me!' General Moyle also writes in the same strain of censure against the magistrates of the city; 'I am surprized the magistrates were not more on their guard. The town soldiers, instead of resisting, delivered their arms to the mob. The turnkey of the prison owned he had a hint given him in the morning that the prison would be attempted to be broke open that night, and that he acquainted

the goaler with it, and desired him to make it known to the Lord Provost, that care might be taken to prevent it. The magistrates were drinking together in the Parliament Close when the mob first assembled, and did not take care to read the proclamation, which was a very great neglect in them.' That clause of the bill which provided for removing the Netherbow gate, is, to some extent, anticipated in one of the Justice Clerk's letters. 'As it was necessary,' he writes, 'an effectual communication should be secured betwixt His Majesty's forces in the Castle and in the Canongate, the gate of the city which leads that way was at first chained back; and to prevent any possibility of accidents, one of the sides of the gate was on Monday last taken away, on pretence it stood in need of repairs. I choosed this should be done by degrees, and in the easiest way, because the populace fancy some of their privileges are wrapped up in their gates.'

The Bill passed the Lords, and was sent down to the Commons in the middle of May. In the Lower House even the first reading was opposed by all the Scottish and many of the English members. Although it was a Government measure, both the Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General for Scotland followed the example which the Duke of Argyle had set them in the House of Lords, and strongly resisted it. Walpole, fearing to offend the members for Scotland, accepted amendments which reduced the Bill to a measure disabling the Provost, and imposing a fine upon the city. The Bill, thus altered, was nearly lost on the motion to report it. The numbers were equal, and the question was only decided by the casting vote of the chairman. The Common's amendments were accepted by the House of Lords, and the measure, which did not at all satisfy the Court, received the royal assent on the last day of the session.

The Town Council of Edinburgh now thought that something must be done, to show that they were not wholly indifferent to whether the city was guilty or not. The magistrates had taken no part whatever in the movement for the reprieve of Porteous, though he was their own officer, and must have been personally acquainted with them all; nor had they done

much to aid in the search after his murderers. And now, even after the lesson they had received, they contented themselves with issuing an order that, in future, if there was any appearance of a riot the various public bodies were to assemble at the Council Chambers 'to receive instructions for their guidance in preserving the peace of the city.'

The Parliament followed up the statute which has just been mentioned, by passing another Act 'for bringing to justice the murderers of Captain Porteous,' which made it a capital offence to conceal or assist anyone who had borne a share in the murder. This Act was ordained to be read aloud, before sermon, in every parish church in Scotland, on the first Sunday of every month, for one year from the 1st of August 1737. Any clergyman who failed to read the Act was rendered incapable of sitting in any Church Court for the first offence; and for the second offence he was liable to be deposed from his living. The Scottish clergy were at once up in arms. What some of them thought of the fate of Porteous may be surmised from the opening sentence of a curious pamphlet setting forth, 'The Lawfulness and Necessity of Ministers, their reading the Act of Parliament for bringing to justice the murderers of Captain Porteous.' 'God,' says the writer, 'in his sovereign providence, which, in all events, we should adore, has permitted this cruelty to be acted on Porteous, that so he should be put to death in a worse shape than that which was designed for him.' Some of them, without actually regarding the Riots as a providential event, disliked the idea of using the pulpit as a means for bringing criminals to justice. But the chief cause of discontent was found in the fact that the Act began with the usual words of style: 'Be it enacted by the Lords *spiritual* and temporal.' These words could not, it was maintained, be read without a virtual approbation of the order of Bishops and Archbishops, and of the civil power of churchmen, against which Presbyterians had always testified. Various plans were suggested for the purpose of evading the law. Some proposed having no service on the first Sunday of the month until the Act had expired. Others wished to have no sermons preached on the first Sunday of the month. One of

the Edinburgh clergy got out of the difficulty by announcing to his congregation that he had a proclamation which the law required him to read, but that they need not wait to hear it unless they pleased. He then paused. The congregation walked out, and the Act was read to the empty pews. Lord Ilay, writing to the Duke of Newcastle, says: 'One of the King's chaplains being, the other day, to preach at the giving the Sacrament (which they do here, while the communicants are sitting round a very long table, which holds great numbers), I sent to him to desire that he would use some proper expressions upon the late murder of Captain Porteous. He accordingly did it, by warning all sorts of impenitent sinners, and (among the rest) the murderers of Captain Porteous. The effect of it was that above one hundred, as I am told, withdrew, and did not receive. But the minister, who immediately preached next, gave many hints of his being of another spirit. *Tantum religio potuit.*' Three months after the Act passed, the Lord Advocate writes to inform the Government that he had instructed the sheriffs of counties to send in returns of the manner in which the law was being carried out, and that it appeared that two-thirds of the parish clergymen of Scotland refused to read the Act in their churches.

Such being the state of public feeling, when the law officers were baffled by a conspiracy of silence, when even at the communion table a congregation would not listen to a warning given to the murderers, and when the clergy of the national church refused to obey the law the object of which was to punish the authors of so foul a deed, it is little wonder that the ring-leaders in the Porteous riot were never discovered. In the *Heart of Midlothian*, the leading part is assigned to Robertson, who becomes, in the romance, a man of good family, Sir George Staunton, the lover of Effie Deans, but who, in reality, was the dissipated son of an Edinburgh hostler. It is very likely that he was concerned in the riot; and the following account of his subsequent career, taken from a pamphlet published in 1787, may be read with interest. 'He afterwards went to Holland, and settled at Campvere and at Middleburgh, where he tricked many of his countrymen. At last he set up for a

private informer, and wrote to the custom-house officers in several towns on the coast of Scotland, and settled his correspondence with them; and then he sent them over an invoice of the cargoes on board of the Scots vessels, the names of the ships and masters, so that the custom-house officers knew what they brought in, and when they sailed; and the excise yachts went out and caught many cargoes, which ruined many merchants. He at last got into some way with the English smugglers, and ruined many of them. The Dutch got information of him, and he took the hint and escaped over to London. Had he been taken in Holland, they would have executed the Scots sentence against him. He skulked about in London for some time, and got letters from those he did for in Scotland; and he applied to that hero, William Duke of Cumberland, who procured him a pardon from the king; and at last he died in misery in London.'

G. W. T. OMOND.

ART. IV.—THE REMINISCENCES OF MARSHAL MACDONALD.

Souvenirs du Maréchal Macdonald. Duc de Tarente. Paris.
1892.

THE author of this valuable and attractive work was a prominent figure in the grand procession of warriors, who upheld the arms of France, from 1792 to 1814. Macdonald was one of that school of soldiers, of whom Hoche and Moreau were the highest types, men born aloft by the revolutionary wave, who defended the natal soil against enormous odds, rolled back the invasion of Europe, and remained true to their republican faith, through the Reign of Terror, and the reaction that followed. Unlike Kléber and Desaix, who died in their prime, Macdonald became one of Napoleon's marshals, winning his staff on the well-fought field of Wagram, though never one of the Emperor's favourites; but he had little in common with the Napoleonic chiefs; and he adhered through life to the patriotic

creed, the proud traditions, nay the habits and ways, that distinguished his old companions in arms. It cannot be said that he was a great captain, though in this respect he was not inferior to his brother marshals, with but few exceptions; but he was a capable, skilful, and bold soldier; and if somewhat wanting in readiness and resource, a wise, judicious, and experienced leader; and, especially, like most of the generals of his school, equal to face dangers, to meet grave crises, and to take the initiative on his own judgment, not, as the Grouchys and Victors, the mere puppets of a master who bowed their wills to his own. The military career of Macdonald, however, scarcely exhibits the finest side of his character. Unsullied honour, devoted loyalty, and a frank, fearless, and independent spirit, were the distinctive virtues of this eminent man; and the license of the Revolution and the base servility of the Empire did not impair their lustre. Macdonald, though owing the Emperor little, was the only marshal who stood to the last to Napoleon in the hour of misfortune; he was almost the only marshal who did not desert Louis XVIII., after the return from Elba; and he always boldly spoke out his mind, with a republican freedom which became him, and that, too, sometimes at the risk of disgrace, whether in the tent of his imperial master, or in the closet of the head of the Bourbons. This volume contains the reminiscences of the life of the marshal, written by himself in a series of paper addressed to his son; and though he did not intend that they should be published, and he expressly denies them the rank of memoirs, they form an autobiography of no common interest. Their chief and peculiar merit is, that they bring out naturally, but in clear relief, the noble character of Macdonald himself; and they illustrate and confirm the judgment of history on his remarkable qualities. They abound, however, in information, occasionally of importance and value on the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, on the incidents of that wonderful epoch, and on the personages who are conspicuous in it; and they unfold in many passages what may be called the unheroic parts of Napoleon's nature, though here the author betrays a somewhat adverse bias. The book has been described as a kind of pendant to Marbot's brilliant and charming volumes; but it is a work of quite a different type, of a more sober and

sadder cast of thought, and not so attractive as a picture of war, but more profound, and of almost equal interest. An introductory chapter, we may add, from the accomplished pen of M. Camille Rousset, forms an excellent commentary on the volume, and M. Thiers, we believe, must have read the manuscript; as in the case of other memoirs of the time, parts of it seem fused into his great history.

James Stephen Macdonald, the future marshal of France, was born at Sedan in 1765. The family of the child was a stray offset of the great clan of the Lord of the Isles, which had sent several members to the French army; and Neil Macdonald, the warrior's father, was brought up at Douai, at a training college established for the sons of Scottish gentlemen. Neil Macdonald was 'out in the 45,' and, Lord Stanhope tells us, was the first of the name to declare for Charles Edward, when the Prince unfurled the standard of the Stuarts on the shores of Moidart. He was at Culloden, and, after that fatal day, wandered from place to place in the Western Islands, attending upon the royal fugitive; and, after many adventures, he returned to France and became attached to one of the 'Scottish' regiments, which retained the name in the French service. His son, from earliest boyhood, showed a love for arms; he treasured all that he heard of Turenne at Sedan, the birthplace of that illustrious chief; and Homer, he tells us, taught him to dream of a career like that of the Divine Achilles. After a short apprenticeship in the 'Dutch Legion,' an irregular body raised in France for the Republic, in one of its disputes with Austria, the youth became a cadet in Dillon's regiment, one of the corps of the famous Irish Brigade; and he had reached the grade of lieutenant when the Revolution broke out. The sons of the Irish exiles of the Boyne and Aghrim had been always devoted to the House of Bourbon; they had just received from the ill-fated Louis XVI., a flag bearing the proud device, 'at all times, and in all places, true;' they were deeply attached to the Catholic faith; and when Jacobinism had begun to shake the throne and the altar, the officers, for the most part became émigrés, and carried their swords into the camp of Condé. This was a turning point in Macdonald's life. Of an independent and manly nature he had learned to detest the harsh Prussian

discipline, introduced of late into the French army; he inclined to the new ideas that were stirring France; he had married, and was about to become a father; and he refused to leave the natal soil with his comrades, and threw in his lot with the Revolution and its cause, at this moment threatened by old feudal Europe. Many years afterwards, with characteristic frankness, he explained the motives of his conduct to the Comte D'Artois, the Coryphæus of the Emigré faction:—'I must make a confession to your Royal Highness.' 'Well, what is it?' 'I worship the Revolution.' Monsieur made a gesture of surprise, and changed colour—I hastened to add, 'I hate its leaders, and its crimes; the army had no share in these, it never looked behind; it stood face to face with the enemy; it lamented the excesses committed at home. But why should I not venerate the Revolution? It raised me, and gave me rank; without its aid I should not be to-day at breakfast with your Royal Highness, at the table of the King.' Monsieur who had got over his vexation, and recovered his good temper, tapped me on the shoulder, and exclaimed, 'Well you have done rightly, I like this frankness.'

Macdonald became aid-de-camp of Beurnonville, one of the obscure men who contrived to rise to high place, under successive governments in France, from 1792 to 1815, and afterwards of the most famous Dumouriez. His aptitude as a soldier was soon made manifest; he greatly distinguished himself at Jemmapes, and in other engagements along the northern frontier; and in the strange chances of that tremendous crisis, when, deserted by most of the chiefs of her armies, and struggling against the coalition of Europe, France was compelled to find her commanders in the ranks, he rapidly attained well-deserved promotion, and was made a general of division in less than four years. Advancement, however, in his case, as indeed in many instances, was as dangerous as it was often wonderful. The Terrorists in Paris ruled the nation; the Jacobin Republic fought for existence; its multitudinous levies rolled over the border battling with 'York, Cobourg, and the hordes of tyranny,' and woe betide the general who was not successful, or officers suspected of 'want of civism;' the delegates of the Committee of Public Safety

and the guillotine made short work of such obstacles. Macdonald, as one of Dumouriez's aid-de-camps, inevitably became a marked man, when the defection of his chief had transpired, and he was haled before the Conventional Judges at Lille to account for an imaginary military fault. At this time, soon after the defeat of Neerwinden, he was colonel of one of the 'old' regiments of the fallen monarchy, as they had been called, and 'Picardy' had still a strong Royalist spirit:—'A voice from within the gates of the town cried that the colonel of Picardy should attend the Council; my grenadiers mutinied, and said either he should not, or they would go with me, but this had been forbidden. I had nothing to blame myself for, so I resolved to go alone. The soldiers muttered threatening language; among other words, they exclaimed, 'these . . . had caused the death of their poor Capet, and others of his kin, and they cried out, "Long live the King."'

Macdonald escaped the inquisitors of Lille, but as often happened at that terrible time, he very nearly became the victim of an incapable soldier, who had a grudge against him, and summoned him before another set of Commissioners:—'Two new Commissioners extraordinary arrived with largely extended powers. I was denounced, and their first act was to have been to dismiss me from the army, to order my arrest, and to hand me over to the revolutionary tribunal of Arras, which let no one escape. I had made a republican general and an extravagant revolutionist a mortal enemy, for I had ridiculed his cowardice at the assault of Ménin; he had become a bye-word and the laughing-stock of the troops, even of those of the same mind as himself. He had denounced and caused the death of General Lamarliere, poor fellow; but it was the will of divine justice that he should lose his life and by the same punishment.'

One of Macdonald's comrades, General Souham, a republican of the most extreme type, and well known many years afterwards as the principal author of the defection of the Corps of Marmont in 1814, urged his friend to avoid certain death by flight:—'The general sent a message to inform me of what had occurred.' He added, 'Well, you are J——m; see what you have to do, for you will be deprived of your command. He advised me to elude the order, which had been postponed.'

In this emergency Macdonald appealed to a former commissioner, who called himself a friend. The conversation that followed shows what was the terrorism of the time and the meanness and baseness that generally prevailed:—"Faith," he said, "do you wish me to speak out, you are not a republican, and I will have nothing to do with you." "Still," I replied, "I have not changed since we met on the frontier in the affair at Commines, and there you told me in public" . . . "I know what you mean," he answered with an interruption, "times are changed," and he turned his back on me.

The fearless soldier stood firm and fortunately escaped:—"I repeated this conversation to Souham, and he urged me to make up my mind what to do. "I have done so," I replied, "if it must be, I shall be one of the many victims immolated, day after day, but I shall stay." "But have you considered and weighed the consequences?" "Yes." I did well. The Commissioners extraordinary were ordered to Paris from Dunkirk, and I was sent back to my post. So I was passed over.

Macdonald narrowly escaped for the third time, having been summoned 'as a noble' by *sansculotte* patriots. His services, however, had been recognised, and in the memorable campaign of 1794, he played a considerable part in the conquest of Holland. The Republic had by this time triumphed; the league of all Europe had been defeated; the Civil War which was tearing France to pieces had been put down with remorseless cruelty, and the Revolutionary armies were overrunning the region between the Meuse and the Rhine, like the lava floods of a raging volcano. Macdonald, availing himself of the winter's frost, effected the passage of the Wahal on the ice, and soon reduced the important fortress of Naarden, which had baffled the arms of Condé and Turenne. The exultation of Pichegru and his troops was at its highest pitch:—"I went to Amsterdam with the capitulation of Naarden and to receive new orders. On entering the quarters of the general in chief, I handed him the articles; he answered with a jest, "I only take the surrender of provinces." In fact, after the general surrender of the Government of the State, excepting the strongholds occupied by the enemy, my prize was of little importance, whereas, in olden times, it would have

done a General the greatest credit. The whole forces of Louis XIV. and the King in person had failed against this fortress.'

The winter of 1794 was long remembered as one of the severest ever known, and the experiences of Macdonald stood him in good stead in the frightful disaster of 1812, for he learned in Holland how to take precautions against extreme cold, and to protect his men. He administered several of the conquered provinces, nearly lost his life from Walcheren fever, and in 1790 was moved to the Rhine to support the army of the Sambre and Meuse, in retreat before the Archduke Charles, who had imitated, though with inferior skill, the grand strategy of Bonaparte in Italy. In the following year Macdonald became acquainted with Augereau, at this time radiant with the honours of Castiglione and the 18th Fructidor, and appointed to supreme command on the Rhine. Marbot has described Augereau with too friendly a hand; he was an ill conditioned, but a very clever scamp, a military demagogue of the lowest type, who always took what he thought the winning side, and betrayed Napoleon basely in 1814. He had been in the service of Frederick, before the Revolution, and humoured the French troops by decrying the Prussian discipline. He presented himself to the orderly soldiers of Moreau and Hoche with the swagger and display of one of the chiefs of the army of Italy, and curiously did not allude to Napoleon:—'Augereau reviewed us at Cologne, and was surprised at the excellent bearing of the army of the North immediately under my orders. Instead of praising it, he said to me, "These troops are managed after the Prussian fashion, but I shall arrange all this." There was a halt before the march past; the soldiers crowded round the new general in chief. He wore a glittering uniform; down to his very boots he was all embroidery; this was in striking contrast with our simple costume. He described the campaigns of Italy, spoke of the bravery of the troops, but made no reference to their commander; he said the soldiers were well off, there was not one of them, rascal though he were, who had not ten louis d'or and a gold watch in his pocket. This was giving a hint to our men.'

The coarse and savage manners of some of the French generals are illustrated in this characteristic anecdote. Augereau and

Lefebvre were both raised to the highest rank in Napoleon's peerage; the Conqueror truly said that he had to make Dukes out of mud:—"The manager of the theatre offered him his choice of pieces; he asked for what was most revolutionary, and selected, I think, Brutus, or the death of Cæsar. General Lefebvre, who had commanded in the interim, was his principal lieutenant. Trigny, the commandant of Cologne, had offered his carriage, expecting probably that the general in chief would give his wife a place in it, but as Augereau did not propose this, Trigny very respectfully took the first step. Lefebvre, sitting beside Augereau, put his head out of the window, and said "What are you at?" Trigny repeated what he had suggested. "Go and be —— said Lefebvre, we are not fit to make company for women, especially for your wife, who has the ——. Lefebvre, who had no idea of literature, applauded heartily, clapping his big hands; he thought it was a play for the occasion; he nudged me every moment with his elbow, exclaiming, "Tell us, tell us, who the —— is the author? Is he here?"

An accident only prevented Macdonald from taking part in the descent on Egypt. He served in Italy, under Championnet, in 1798, and was compelled to evacuate Rome when the celebrated Mack advanced with the army of Naples. The quality of the Neapolitan levies was as bad as possible, and Macdonald routed Mack's army with a handful of men:—"I turned back, repulsed every partial obstacle, and defeated this showy and boasted army with less than 3000 men. The result was considerable; a great number of prisoners, a quantity of guns and of baggage were taken, with the camp and the military chest."

Mack soon afterwards threw up his command, and Macdonald had an interview with the defeated chief, who at this time had a great name in Europe, but was ere long to show what he was at Ulm:—"As he passed through Capua the General paid me a visit; it was five in the morning, and I was in bed. I was soon up, and said—"Sir, a fortnight ago, you would not have surprised me in this way." "Ah," he replied, "you broke my neck at Calvi?" "How," I said, "could a General so distinguished as you are, and so great a tactician, risk his military reputation by putting himself at the head of such an army?"

Curiously enough, Nelson had, some years before, seen through Mack, and called him a wretched poltroon.

Championnet—and this is Napoleon's opinion—had acted feebly in this campaign, and Macdonald was placed in command of his army. He entered Naples and set on foot again the short-lived Parthenopean Republic; he tells us that it was chiefly at his instance that Carracioli joined the newly formed government. 'He became afterwards the victim of the English Admiral, Nelson, who cruelly and unjustly had him hung at the yard-arm of his ship. I bitterly reproached myself on account of his death, for it was I who overcame his scruples, and brought Carracioli to our side.'

Stern work, however, was at hand than governing Naples for the French Republic. The Battle of the Nile had destroyed the fleet of Brueys. Bonaparte and his army were shut up in Egypt; the Directory in Paris was weak and unpopular; and France was again invaded by Monarchic Europe. Italy was one of the principal scenes of the conflict; and there was a most striking contrast in the conduct of war, on this theatre, within three years. In 1796, Bonaparte had refused to listen to the injunctions of the men in power in Paris, and had kept his forces united in Northern Italy; unrivalled in the great combinations of war, he had defended the Peninsula on the Adige, and he had confronted and destroyed the forces of Austria, in a series of operations which will always rank as grand illustrations of the military art. All this was changed in 1799; though her armies were composed of the same men, and certainly were superior in strength, France met nothing but defeat in Italy, a result due to palpably bad generalship; and had her enemies possessed more skill, her southern provinces might have been invaded. At the beginning of the campaign one French army was in Lombardy, and another at Naples; and either no real attempt was made to unite them, or the attempts that were made were late and ill-conceived. Schérer was driven in defeat from the Adige, because he did not know how to hold that line, Moreau, who succeeded to the chief command, instead of marching to join the army of the South, fell back towards the Alps in eccentric retreat; and then, when

he tried to approach that army, he made a series of false and unskilful movements, and ultimately failed to effect the junction. Meanwhile Macdonald, the chief of the southern army, had lost time and committed himself to operations essentially faulty; and though certainly less to blame than his colleagues, was unable to come into line with Moreau, and was beaten at the Trebbia, partly through his own errors. Nor was the strategy of the allies much better; Kray, Suvóroff, and Melas overran the Peninsula; but the Russian chief threw many chances away; he ought to have defeated Macdonald and Moreau, in detail, as Bonaparte would have done in his place; and he ought to have destroyed the army of the South, after its retreat from the Trebbia. In a word, the immortal campaign of 1796 is a masterpiece of war of the highest order, that of 1799 was a succession of mistakes and failures.

Macdonald, we have seen, was in command of the army of the South in this contest, and conscious of the faults that have been laid to his charge, has dwelt at considerable length on his conduct. He certainly seems not to have been to blame for the first, and the capital, mistake of the campaign, the delay in concentrating the divided French armies:—‘I applied to the French government that Naples and Rome should be evacuated, the fortresses being retained. If our troops are victorious at the Adige, I argued, they will require men to make up their losses; if they are beaten, they will be in need of reinforcements; no troops are near as mine; and besides, in the supposed case of defeat, they will lose their communications; in the first case I could return, and, with the support of the fortresses, could reoccupy the two States. But it had become a fixed resolution to keep everything, and not to abandon an inch of territory, even under the stress of imminent danger. My advice was rejected.’

Macdonald, however, as Napoleon points out, lost time in marching from Naples northwards; and he never should have ventured to cross the Apennines, and to make a long flank march within the reach of his enemy. He should have tried to join Moreau behind the range, making his way either by the coast, or at sea, and this, indeed, he partly admits; the excuse that there were no means of transport is confuted by the

facts :—‘ It would have, perhaps, been a better course to have effected the junction by the Corniche ; the result would have been obtained without much difficulty, as happened afterwards, but I think I have said that there were not sufficient means at Lerici, to carry the artillery and other material to Genoa, the Corniche being only a mule track. Nevertheless, while we undertook a different operation, we did not neglect to collect a number of boats, and light craft, in the event of a reverse ; and these, indeed, saved our precious material afterwards.’

Undoubtedly, however, Moreau was mainly to blame for not accomplishing the projected junction. His retreat towards the Alps, after the defeat at Cassano, which separated him completely from Macdonald’s army, was a remarkable instance of bad strategy :—‘ Moreau, I think, ought to have so manœuvred as to have drawn near me, making Genoa his base. Our junction alone would have enabled us, if not to resume an offensive attitude, at least to await, in a good defensive position, assistance from France ; but he seemed to wish to preserve his communications with Piedmont, already in a state of partial insurrection, and not to maintain them by the Corniche. This last course would have had the double advantage of covering that route, and preventing obstacles to our junction by Tuscany. Instead of carrying out an operation, at once simple, natural, and advantageous, when he was forced to fall behind the Ticino, he threw himself into Piedmont, to draw towards himself, it is said, the Austrian and Russian army, and then, by a rapid march, to return to Genoa, by Ceva, as I understand. But Ceva had surrendered to a band of insurgents, and so, deprived of this means of passage, he was obliged to abandon part of his material, and seek a way through the mountains.’

Moreau ultimately arranged to unite with Macdonald, near Tortona, that is within reach of the enemy. The essential defects were then seen of an attempt to bring two armies together, moving on double, if converging lines, an adversary being in force, at hand ; Macdonald was defeated on the Trebbia ; and Moreau was too late to come into line with him. This kind of operation no doubt, has sometimes succeeded ; Sadowa is a notable instance ; but, for one instance of success, there have been a

... and he was un-
 ... of Moreau
 ... but rather
 ... has more
 ... position. He
 ... but to no pur-
 ... of his nature.
 ... of the Bourbons, his
 ... more
 ... his intrigues, more
 ... was seen through,
 ... by common consent,
 ... of no signifi-
 ... in his remorse?
 ... of disgrace; had no
 ... from the Imperial
 ... made his own. He
 ... of Joseph Bonaparte when
 ... of Naples, but he
 ... his remarks illustrate
 ... the despised auxiliaries in the
 ... with indignation, and all
 ... these lines, and when
 ... have been my fate had
 ... Neapolitan soldiers!
 ... at Civita Castellana
 ... at Calvi,
 ... I, who had
 ... their flight! I, who
 ... a few days after!

... Taking advantage of Napoleon's
 ... suddenly prepared for war with
 ... of Presburg, and
 ... in the spring of 1809,
 ... made a descent on Italy. Dynastic
 ... had already begun to have its evil effects on the
 ... Eugène Beauharnais was given the chief
 ... which Masséna ought to have had of right.

Spain, however, and its devouring war detained many of the best generals of France on the spot, and Macdonald was despatched to Italy to act as a mentor to Eugène, though nominally a subordinate only. When he reached Verona, the French army had suffered a serious reverse at Sacile. Eugène, a gallant but inexperienced man, had been unable to rally his troops, and a retreat towards the Adige was fast becoming a rout:—'Every thing at Verona was in confusion and disorder; the wounded were arriving in great numbers; fugitives, horses without riders, carts, waggons, carriages, were coming back, utterly crowding the streets and encumbering the squares; it was, in short, a rout, a hideous spectacle. The siege train, collected at the *glacis*, had been precipitately removed, and had gone to Mantua.'

Macdonald, if not a great commander, was a capable and well-tried leader, and his presence inspired confidence and restored order. The veterans of the old army of Italy were glad to see again a chief they respected, and the beaten army was soon once more in the field. The relations between Eugène and his skilful adviser were cordial in the extreme, and honourable to both; the Prince had none of the pretensions of mere rank, and was not above following wise counsel, and Macdonald, if not a courtier, was never obtrusive. The practised eye of the trained warrior perceived that the Archduke was unable to advance, and a retrograde movement of the Austrian army assured Macdonald of Napoleon's success on the Inn. M. Thiers must have had these words before him when describing this passage of the Campaign of 1809:—'The immobility of the enemy was not natural after his victory at Sacile; I made this remark to the Viceroy, and induced him to give orders for a general reconnaissance, and this he did. We were following with our reserves when I remarked through a telescope a precipitate movement of chariots and baggages. "We are victorious in Germany," I said to the Viceroy, "the enemy is retreating."'

Though Eugène and Macdonald continued friends, the mischief of conferring supreme command on the unskilful Viceroy became apparent. The French pursued the Austrians across the Piave, the Archduke John being compelled to retreat, and to defend the Monarchy on the Danube. Eugène lost an oppor-

tunity to cut off and destroy a large detachment of the hostile army:—"See, I exclaimed to the Viceroy, the enemy's right wing is flying precipitately. I will cut off its retreat, and this evening I will present 10,000 prisoners to you. "Nay, but I see nothing," he answered. "Do you not perceive that huge cloud of dust that is leaving us?" "Yes." "Well, it is easy to know that that means a hasty retreat. Go to the left, make a feigned attack to retard this movement, and I will push forward our right, and advance our centre. We separated, well pleased with each other, but this did not last long, for he had scarcely begun the movement on the left when a few cannon shots stopped him and he ordered the centre and right, whither I was going to halt. Astonished at such an order I returned to the centre and found it stationary. We missed our chance. . . . I accompanied the Prince as far as Conegliano; the chief functionaries met the Viceroy, and one of them said, 'Ah, Monseigneur, if you had only pushed forward two squadrons yesterday, you would have cut off the entire Austrian right wing, at least 10,000 men.'"

Macdonald, we are told by M. Thiers, still wore the simple and old-fashioned uniform of the Republicans of 1794-99. He became a butt for *pétit maîtres* of the Imperial army, and on this march from Italy, across the Austrian Alps, found it difficult to make his lieutenants obey him: 'One of these was weak enough to fall under the influence of the other, who pretended that the Emperor had given me a command to ruin me, and that they would be involved in my disgrace. . . . Two days before the capitulation of Laybach, I severely reprimanded one of them, and declared that I would arrest and send to the Emperor any officer who did not obey me at once.'

The French army had been divided into two masses—one, under Eugène, passing by Tarvis and Klagenfurth; the other, led by Macdonald, marching eastwards, by Trieste and Gratz, in order to join the corps of Marmont, moving from Dalmatia. The two armies drew near each other as they descended into the plains of the Danube; and Eugène attacked the Archduke John of Raab. He did not wait for Macdonald to come up—a mistake which was nearly costing him dear. His mentor rebuked him

with characteristic frankness : “ I was very sorry,” he said, “ to leave you at Papa. You would have been very useful to me in this critical position.” “ You did more harm than that,” I replied. “ You engaged and endangered a part of your army when you had before you the whole army of Prince John in a position which seems strong ; but take heart, my corps is at hand.” “ Where ? ” he eagerly cried out. “ Go back to your men, it is debouching at this moment. How grateful I am to you for your foresight,” said the Prince, heartily shaking my hand.”

Meanwhile Napoleon, baffled at Aspern and Essling, had made his wonderful preparations to cross the Danube, and to attack the Archduke Charles in the plains of the Marchfeld ; he had summoned every available man and horse to join the Eagles in the great camp of Lobäu. Macdonald and the army of Italy took part in the passage, perhaps the most extraordinary in the annals of war ; and the General of the Republic met the Emperor for the first time for years :—‘ My line had scarcely deployed, and I had taken my place on the right, when shouts of “ Vive l’Empereur ” was heard to the left. The soldiers, seeing him passing at a short distance, put their shakos on their bayonets, as a sign of their delight ; he turned his charger towards the direction of the shouting, and recognised the army of Italy. He rode along the line, and as he approached the right I advanced a little. He spoke to no one, merely saluted by a wave of the hand ; and, notwithstanding all that the Viceroy had told me, especially that I would be satisfied with the first interview, I was no more favoured than the others.’

Macdonald blames Napoleon for the partial attack of the Austrian lines before the great fight of Wagram. His account of the battle is not good, and he hardly does justice to the admirable skill of Napoleon, who, defeated and outflanked on his left, broke the Archduke’s centre by a grand effort, and decided the fortunes of a long, doubtful contest. This fine movement was led by Macdonald ; and, had he been properly supported by Nansonty’s horsemen, when the Austrians yielded to the onset of the Italian army, and to the terrible batteries of the Imperial Guard, the results, he assures us, would have been immense.

Nansonty, however, was not in time, and the cavalry of the Guard was not allowed to engage, because not ordered by their immediate chief—a rule which, more than once, led to disaster and failure, as was notably seen at Fuentes d'Onoro:—‘A general officer, in a splendid uniform, came up. I did not know him; but, after the usual exchange of courtesies, he complimented me highly on the action which had taken place, expressed his extreme admiration of the brilliant courage which my troops had displayed, and asked me my name, which I did not give. “I know you by your reputation,” he answered, “and am happy to make your acquaintance upon a field of battle so glorious for you.” Having replied to this compliment, I asked him who he was. It was General Wathier of the Guard. I had not heard of him before. “Do you command,” I exclaimed, “that fine and large body of cavalry I see in the rear?” “I do.” “Well, why did you not charge the enemy at the decisive moment, when I had thrown him into disorder, and when I had several times asked you to do so? The Emperor must, and will be, very angry at the immobility of the cavalry of his guard, especially when it had such a grand opportunity, and certain and great results would have followed.” “In the Guard,” he replied, “we must have direct orders, either from the Emperor in person, or from our chief Bessières; he was wounded, and the Emperor sent us no message.”’

The Emperor gave Macdonald a marshal's staff; the supreme grade had been honourably won:—‘I saw the Emperor surrounded by troops, who were receiving his praises; he came and embraced me cordially, saying, “Let us be from this day friends.” “Yes,” I replied, “in life and death.” I kept my word up to his abdication. He added, “You have done admirably, and have done me the greatest services on this occasion and throughout the campaign; on the field of your glory, where I owe you a great part of the victory yesterday, I make you a Marshal of France—he said this word, and not of the Empire—you have long deserved the honour.”’

Macdonald was sent to observe part of the force of the Archduke John, who had failed to join his brother on the field of Wagram. He had an interview with Vandamme, one of the old

soldiers of the Republic, long passed over like himself, and Vandamme uttered this strange apostrophe—a sign of the rankling jealousy felt to the last by many a veteran of Hoche and Moreau. Vandamme used the same kind of language the day before Waterloo:—‘He declaimed against Marshals Oudinot and Marmont, who had been raised to that grade after me; as for myself he said it was just, but he abused the two others to his heart’s content, and especially the Emperor, who had promised at the beginning of the campaign to make him Duke and Marshal. “He is a coward, a forger, a liar; and, but for me, Vandamme, he would still be herding swine in Corsica?” He talked in this way in the presence of about thirty general and superior officers of his *corps d’armée*, and of the Würtembergers too.’

Macdonald was soon afterwards made a Duke; his title of Tarentum was in remembrance, perhaps, of his first command, as General-in-Chief, in Italy. He occupied Styria with part of the Italian army. Unlike most of the Imperial proconsuls, he enforced discipline and restrained plunder; and, with a characteristic sense of honour, refused to accept a present from the Estates of the Province, he doing, what he rightly thought, was his duty. Napoleon was grateful to the Marshal for upright conduct, very different from that of Masséna and Soult, two of his ablest, but most rapacious, lieutenants:—‘The Estates of Styria visited me once, and offered me a large sum of money on account of the care I had taken to spare the country, and of the strict discipline I had maintained. I refused, and as they persisted, said, “Well, if you feel under an obligation to me, there is another way, and one more worthy of myself, to pay the debt. Look after the sick and wounded men which I must leave, for the present, behind, and the detachment and medical staff charged with attending them.”’

After serving for a short time in Spain—the ‘ulcer’ of his power, as Napoleon called it—Macdonald was placed in command of the left wing of the Grand Army in 1812. He advanced as far as Riga in this memorable campaign, but took little part in the operations in the field, and saw nothing of the appalling retreat from Moscow. His foresight and capacity were conspicuously seen in the series of disasters that followed, and distin-

guish him from most of Napoleon's generals—mere satellites, unequal to independent command. His army was nearly 30,000 strong, but more than 15,000 of these were Prussians, men burning to avenge their country's wrongs; about 5000 were faithless auxiliaries, South Germans of the Confederation of the Rhine; and his only trustworthy soldiers were 10,000 French and Poles. The troops had not suffered much when he began to fall back, for the Marshal, taught by the experiences of Holland and the Alps, had laid in great stores of warm clothing, and discipline was preserved until the Niemen was approached. At this juncture, however, the defection of York made enemies of the whole Prussian contingent: the German allies became unsteady, and Macdonald was left with a handful of men to make his way to the wreck of the main army. He conducted the retreat admirably from Tilsit to Dantzic, and gave excellent advice to Murat, left in command of the perishing host, as to the proper strategy to be adopted in view of the general rising of Germany, and the impending crusade against the French Empire. No doubt can exist that the large French garrisons on the Vistula should have been withdrawn, and united to the remains of the army of the field: 'These garrisons, which we were abandoning to their own resources, without the prospect and, I will add, the hope of succour at hand, with the exception of Dantzic, were certain to fall from want of provisions, and through their own weakness; it was already too late for the fortresses of Poland and for Pillau, but not for Dantzic. . . I proved that, by adopting my plan we could concentrate on the Oder all the troops fit for the field, that is, from 60,000 to 70,000 fighting men. The Russians had suffered great losses; the Prussians required time for preparation. The position we should take would enable us to keep down the greater part of that Monarchy, and we could wait in safety the levy of 300,000 men being raised in France.'

Napoleon, however, was not on the spot; when he left the Grand Army at Smorgoni—one of the capital mistakes of his life—he had calculated that he would have 200,000 men, including his Prussian and Austrian allies, in first line on the verge of the Niemen; and had this been the case he might have been justified in keeping his hold on the Prussian fortresses. But the

Grand Army was a thing of the past; the 200,000 men had been reduced to less than 40,000—a mere horde of broken and worthless fugitives—and Macdonald's counsel was plain common sense. Murat, however, had completely lost his head; and, really, was one of these mere servitors who could do nothing without a positive order from the Emperor, hundreds of miles distant:—'No objection could be made to my reasons; and the King, Murat, did not take the trouble to refute them. He thought a great deal more of escaping himself, and of returning to Naples—a step he took without informing the Emperor. He handed the command over to Prince Eugène: it was unfortunate that the Emperor did not give it to the Prince when he left the army.'

The garrisons were thus left to their fate, and this unfortunate course not only deprived the shattered French army of valuable support, but had a disastrous effect in 1813, for it was a main cause of the ruinous efforts Napoleon made to attain the fortresses, and of the extravagance of his strategy in that year. Murat transmitted Macdonald's plans to Napoleon without an explanation of the real state of affairs, and the Marshal was naturally much displeased:—'I asked him if he had not carried out, at least in part, the project which I had sent him at his request. "No," he said, "I have transmitted it to the Emperor, and shall receive his orders in three days at farthest." "How," I exclaimed. "You have transmitted what I gave you in confidence. The Emperor who, doubtless, is ignorant of all that has taken, and is taking place, will be justly indignant if the plan is not explained with all the parts in detail."'

The French army was driven to the Elbe; and Napoleon, not aware at first of the facts, and believing that the retrograde movement was largely due to Macdonald's advice, treated his prudent lieutenant with marked coldness. The Emperor, however, when better informed, did Macdonald the justice he certainly deserved. The following interview took place between them; and it will be observed that, if undeceived as to the state of his military power in Germany, Napoleon still trusted in the good faith of Austria. The conqueror long clung to this and other illusions in 1813:—'I was indignant that all my exertions, and the devotion I had shown was so ill recompensed; I did not

return to Court. A few days afterwards, however, I was sent for; it had become known that the King of Prussia not only had approved of the conduct of General York, but that he had allied himself to Russia, and that all his subjects were taking up arms against us. The Emperor acknowledged that he had been misinformed about my conduct, and the treacherous policy of Prussia; that I had acted judiciously; that he had not been exactly made aware of the later disasters of Kowno and Wilna. He said that our reverses had been great, but not irreparable; that we had both conducted war at the same time, and both would have to conduct it together; that this would be the final campaign, and that he requested me to prepare for it; he added that he had perfect confidence in his father-in-law, the Emperor of Austria. I shook my head, and said, "Beware; distrust the artful policy of that Cabinet."

Macdonald held an important command in the eventful campaign of 1813, and though not a personal friend, and unsuccessful in his operations, as a whole, retained his master's complete confidence. His Reminiscences from this time forward are not altogether fair to Napoleon; they breathe the discontented and soured spirit of a patriotic and clear-sighted man, himself smarting from the effects of defeat, and indignant that the fortunes of France should be made the sport of utterly reckless ambition. These sentiments, however, were, in the main, just, and were shared by most of his companions-in-arms; all that can be truly said is that he dwells too much on the faults and mistakes of his great master, and not enough on Napoleon's genius in war. The narrative is instructive in some parts, if it does not add much to our previous knowledge, and it illustrates clearly the author's character. Macdonald was sceptical as to the good faith of Austria, after the armistice of Pleistwitz—an opinion still held by some able writers, in spite of Metternich's protests and the published State papers. We have not met the following remark before:—"Austria was the soul of the Congress at Prague; she had pretended to be neutral during the late hostilities; but, as transpired afterwards, she had pledged herself by a treaty with Russia and Prussia since February. There were indications of this in the position taken by the allies in their retreat before the

armistice ; they gathered together at the foot of the Bohemian hills, instead of recrossing the Oder ; had these armies been defeated in this position they would have been obliged to lay down their arms, if Austria had meant to make her feigned neutrality respected—this was as clear as daylight.’

The Reminiscences do not retrace the main incidents of the Campaign of 1813. Historically these form the second act in the drama of the fall of Napoleon, and show how the conditions of the Revolutionary War had changed ; how the cause of France was now that of a despotism of the sword, and that of old Europe the cause of the Rights of Nations. From a military point of view they are instructive in the extreme ; they illustrate, by most striking examples, how Napoleon’s ambition and lust of power occasionally marred his conceptions in war, and yet they abound in instances of his extraordinary skill and capacity as a great commander. Beyond question he aimed at too much, if we recollect how inferior he was in force, and he wasted his resources and courted defeat by trying to trample Germany down, and to disengage his garrisons on the Oder and Vistula. Yet he exhibited over and over again the genius of the warrior of 1796, in this gigantic and long doubtful contest ; and had he had the troops of Arcola and Rivoli, he probably would have retained his hold on the Elbe, as he had retained his hold on the Adige, and have triumphed over the ill-directed allies. Macdonald looks back at the struggle with an eye disposed to see Napoleon in an unfavourable light ; and he scarcely alludes to Lützen and Bautzen, to Dresden, and to the fine operations on the Elbe, operations which, but for unforeseen defection, would probably have broken the coalition up. The Marshal, as is well known, was given the chief command of one of the secondary armies, thrown forward, too far from its supports, towards the Oder, in the hope of relieving the beleaguered garrisons ; and he was defeated by Blucher upon the Katzbach. His sketch of the battle is feeble and confused ; and certainly he committed a decided mistake, in fighting with a flooded river in his rear, and in permitting or carrying out a plan, which would have been good, but for this accident. Towards the close of the campaign, when the scales of fortune were evidently inclining against Napoleon, the Emperor

asked for his advice ; and, like most of the French military chiefs, he counselled a general retreat to the Saale.—‘ One morning the Emperor sent me one of his orderly officers, to find out what I thought about the situation of affairs, and what it was proper to do. October had come ; we had no supplies but what we could seize by using force ; the soldiers, however, had potatoes dug up on the ground where they were encamped. I told the officer frankly, that if the Emperor did not immediately take the offensive, with good prospect of success—and this seemed to me improbable, for up to this time it had been found impossible to enter Bohemia—he would expose us to a serious catastrophe. The army was every day becoming weaker through sickness and the want of food ; a lost battle would increase its weakness, and would cause the expenditure of munitions, that could not be replaced ; the magazines were empty, the country ruined ; and in this position of affairs prudence required that we should at once fall back to the Saale, leaving a strong garrison in Leipzig, and that we should strengthen the fortresses on the Oder, with which we could still communicate, and especially those on the Elbe. The officer was frightened at the idea of being the bearer of a message like this ; “ Go,” I said, “ the Emperor will understand its importance ; he will thank me for my plain speaking.” ’

Such a retreat would, probably, have averted Leipzig ; but it ultimately involved a retreat to the Rhine ; and Napoleon would not as yet abandon his great central position upon the Elbe. He hesitated however, perhaps for a moment :—‘ The officer returned within some hours, and told me he had fulfilled his mission. The Emperor was in his bath, and had admitted him. He had listened attentively, and had only this objection to make, that the Saale was not a defensive line, that the Rhine was, and that as I thought he ought to retreat, we should fall back to the Rhine. “ Go, tell the Marshal so,” he said to the officer.’

The Grand Army was forced at last upon Leipzig ; and after a struggle of three days, in which the German auxiliaries attacked it in the field—a defection naturally denounced by Frenchmen, but which Napoleon might have foreseen—it was driven across the Elbe in defeat and ruin. Macdonald throws

no fresh light on the scenes of the battle; and only confirms all that has been said respecting the fatal neglect of not bridging the rivers which crossed the path of the French in retreat, and the catastrophe of destroying the only bridge which gave the army an avenue of escape, before thousands of the troops had effected the passage. These appalling scenes have been often described, the account of Marbot is especially good; and we shall not recur to frightful incidents again, which strikingly show how the staff of Napoleon, as the Duc de Fezensac has well pointed out, was on many occasions far from efficient, and how the Imperial lieutenants would not take the simplest precautions, or do anything, without the express command of their master. Macdonald, more fortunate than Poniatowski, contrived to get over the swollen Elster, and thus describes the heartrending spectacle presented by his troops on the opposite bank:—‘The firing continued on the other side of the Elster, suddenly it ceased. Our unhappy soldiers were driven in multitudes upon the river; whole platoons rushed in, and were carried away by the flood; cries of despair burst forth from the bank on the town side; my men saw me, and above the shouting and confusion, I distinctly heard these exclamations, “Marshal, save your soldiers, save your children!” I could do nothing for them. Agitated by passion, anger, fury, I shed tears.’

The retreat of the beaten army to the Rhine was scarcely less disastrous than that from Moscow. Even Marbot tells us that the French soldiery were indignant at the shameful neglect which had caused the sacrifice of thousands of lives, and stood sullenly aloof from the Emperor. Macdonald was naturally full of resentment, and places Napoleon’s conduct in the worst aspect. This was his first interview with the defeated conqueror:—‘The Emperor listened to my story without interrupting me, the bystanders were deeply moved, and showed their sympathy in their attitude. I ended my remarks by saying that the losses of the army in men and material were immense, and that not a moment was to be lost to save its wreck, and to regain the Rhine. We were at Markrandstadt; I had walked several leagues, I was still wet through, and

very tired. The Emperor saw this, and coolly said, "You had better take rest." I left his presence indignant at this callous indifference.'

It was not, however, only men like Macdonald, who felt indignation during the retreat from Leipzig. The favourites of the old army of Italy, loaded by Napoleon with wealth and honours, joined in the general chorus of complaint. The authority of the Emperor, founded on success, had, in fact, begun to slip away from him; and the sons of the Revolution had no scruples in denouncing their chief in adverse fortune. Augereau broke out in characteristic Billingsgate:—"He answered me with an oath: "Does the b—— know what he is doing? Have you not already seen this? Have you not heard that during the late events, and especially since the catastrophe which has followed, he has lost his head? The coward! He deserted and sacrificed us all; and do you think me such a fool, or a madman, that I should allow myself to be slain or taken prisoner in the outskirts of Leipzig? You ought to have done as I did, and gone away."'

Even Murat, the Emperor's near kinsman, and raised by him to the throne of Naples, could not refrain from expressions like these; in truth he was already plotting treason:—"The King of Naples told me that the Emperor intended to direct me to make out a good defensive position, for he wished to make a halt of five or six days. "F—— . . .," added Murat, "make out a bad one, otherwise he will ruin himself, as well as ourselves."'

Macdonald fearlessly urged his master not to lose a moment to attain the Rhine. In good and evil fortune he was always frank, to the astonishment of Imperial courtiers:—"I was introduced. The Emperor gave me the commission which I had heard of from Murat. "This reconnaissance is, at present, impossible," I said. "The fog is so thick that nothing can be seen clearly at a distance of fifteen paces. But do you really intend to halt here?" "The troops are fatigued," replied the Emperor, "and the enemy pursues slowly; they are all in need of repose." "That," I retorted, "would be all very well in different circumstances; but in the actual state of disorganisa-

tion, and I must add, of demoralisation of the army, it would be of no use. You must, as quickly as possible, fall back on the Rhine: besides, the men are hurrying to the river in disorder." "Nevertheless," he said, "I am informed that a great number had been stopped, and that fifteen battalions of those fugitives had been pursued." "You are flattered and deceived," I firmly expressed. "It was the same thing after the death of Turenne and the rout of his army."

Napoleon more than once showed, in his wonderful career, after Moscow and in 1814 and 1815, that he was not equal to himself in extreme misfortune. He gives proof of this defect during the retreat from Leipzig:—"I joined the Emperor, and spoke strongly to him about the position of affairs. "What would you have me do," he replied, with apathy; "I give orders and no one attends to them." . . . On other occasions, at a sign, at a gesture, at a signal, and from his lips, everyone was in movement, otherwise he would have been frantic.'

Macdonald, however, is not just in insinuating that Napoleon gave proof of want of personal courage before Hanau, a victory due to his admirable skill, that threw a gleam of light on the last stage of the retreat. It is puerile to make a charge of this kind, which reveals the animus of the discontented Marshal:—"The Emperor appeared followed by his guards and by other corps; he asked me for information, which I gave; I had estimated the enemy's force at 30,000 men at least. "Can we examine his position without danger," he added. "Without danger, no; but we must run risks, as I have done myself." "Well, let us retreat." As we were moving forward, a shell fell and burst near him, but no one was hurt. He stopped, dismounted, and it was impossible after this to get him out of the wood.'

The old republican soldier spoke out his mind to his great master as to the extreme imprudence of rejecting the offers of Austria in 1813; even if Austria was acting a double part, the acceptance of her terms would have put her in the wrong, and rallied opinion in France to the Emperor. It may seem strange that Napoleon allowed such freedom; but, even in the days of

his absolute power, he sometimes bore much from the chiefs of his armies:—‘Why,’ I said, ‘did you not agree to the conditions sooner? The army wished it extremely; the honour of its arms had been restored; its chief commanders begged for this in its name, and in that of France in distress. I myself explained the danger of the situation to you; I represented to you that it was difficult enough to contend against the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia, and what would it be when Austria, Sweden, and other lesser states should join them? Our losses, no doubt, had been in some measure repaired, but with what means? With children of the new levy, with young horses, not trained, and already worn out by long and forced marches; the return of hostilities would cause our communications to be intercepted; a serious defeat would ruin us; we had neither a store of provisions nor magazines; above all, demoralisation was to be avoided.’ All this reasoning had had no effect on him during the negotiations; to-day he admitted it was right.’

In the winter of 1813, as Macdonald was in command on the Lower Rhine, charged with an impossible task, the defence of Holland. The allies, surprising Napoleon by their bold movements, invaded France even before he expected; and the Marshal, with most of his brother chiefs, was forced back to the plains of Champagne, to endeavour to resist the hosts of Europe. Macdonald had been promised large reinforcements, but Napoleon had hardly a man to send him; and he contemplates the grand contest of 1814, like that of 1813, with a jaundiced eye. Undoubtedly, in this instance also, the Emperor tried to accomplish more than was possible with his actual military strength; he aimed at defending three-fourths of his empire, whereas he should have thought only of defending France; and his strategy, as a whole, reveals this error. But his operations on the Marne and the Seine are masterpieces of war of the highest order; they recall the achievements of 1796-7, and they shed a splendid light of glory on his fall. Macdonald scarcely alludes to these grand passages of arms, though his position on the Marne gave Napoleon an opportunity to strike down Blücher, and to win a series of triumphs

almost unparalleled. The Marshal was engaged towards the close of the contest in resisting Schwartzberg upon the Seine; and this short anecdote again illustrates how the special privileges of the Imperial Guard were often attended with bad results:—‘I found Marshal Oudinot at Grey and the Granges; and on my asking him why he had left his position in the morning, he said that the Young Guard was not made to be a rear-guard. “In that case,” I replied, “I have no more orders to give you, seek them from the Emperor.”’

Macdonald asserts that he was the only Marshal who warned Napoleon that the enemy was at hand, when the Emperor was surprised at Arics-sur-Aube. He accompanied his master in the celebrated march to relieve the fortresses on the Meuse and the Moselle, and to fall on the communications of the allies, with an army largely increased by the garrisons, the last great manoeuvre of the campaign of 1814. He informs us that he urged the Emperor to persist in the movement, though Paris should fall, wise counsel from a military point of view, but rejected by Napoleon on political grounds:—‘Whatever orders you may give,’ I said, ‘Paris left without defence will have succumbed before we can arrive, if you go there, whatever may be the celerity of your movements. In your place, I would march on to Lorraine and Alsace, and collecting part of their garrisons, would carry on an internecine war on the rear of the enemy, cutting his communications and intercepting his envoys and reinforcements; he will be compelled to fall back, and you can make the fortresses your base of operations.’

The empire had fallen in a few days; and the most striking feature of this immense catastrophe was the extravagance of Napoleon’s conduct, as a leader of armies, and chief of a State, during the years immediately before his overthrow. Macdonald was not the only adviser who had warned him that his efforts to keep down Europe by military force, and to refuse offers of peace, would be attended by the gravest disasters. His lieutenants had urged him in 1812 not to advance on Moscow; they had entreated him in 1813 not to stand on the Elbe, and to attempt to hold all Germany in his grasp; in 1814 Soult had plainly told him that the defence of France should be his

only object; he had been advised by Caulaincourt to accept the terms offered to Austria long before Leipzig. How was it then that the greatest of captains, and certainly the ablest sovereign of his time, did not see what was seen by very inferior men; overleaped himself in his vaulting ambition; ran into wild excesses in war and in peace; and exhibited, in this phase of his career, the perversion of genius, which is akin to foolishness? The answer to the question is, in part, to be found in a consideration of Napoleon's natural character; overconfidence and arrogance were his distinctive faults; and these are perilous qualities in generals and statesmen. But it is chiefly to be sought in surveying the circumstances of his life: he had been invincible for many years; he had overrun and subdued the Continent; he had founded an empire that seemed of adamant; and the lord of three-fourths of Europe, in the pride of his power, scoffed at the menaces of adverse fortune, would not believe that he could not regain a supremacy that had been finally lost, and trusted, to the latest moment, to the magic of a sword, which had been a talisman of victories beyond all example. It was thus that Napoleon fought for his whole empire to the last; that he rejected the overtures made by the allies; and that he risked everything on the hazards of war; and thus, too, it was that, in this desperate contest, he committed a series of grave mistakes; knew not how to proportion means to ends; showed a want of wisdom, and of simple prudence, which ordinary persons could not understand. Yet the spectacle which this extraordinary man presented, in his gigantic fall, was not that of mere blind recklessness, rushing inconsiderately to a certain fate; it was that of genius, grand even in its aberrations, contending against irresistible force, and keeping the issue long doubtful; and it must be observed that, even to the last, it required but little to incline the scales of fortune, so immense was Napoleon's superiority in war. Macdonald does not give due weight to these facts; and this part of his book, therefore, is not just.

We have reached the most honourable passage in the Marshal's career. The Emperor, and his still large army, had

attained Fontainebleau, after the fate of Paris, and his purpose was to attack the allies in the rear, distributed carelessly around the capital, an operation which, he has declared, must have been successful. His lieutenants, however, were sick of the war; they had taken it into their heads that Napoleon intended to fight a pitched battle in the very streets of Paris, and they resolved to oppose an attempt of the kind. They made Macdonald their spokesman, and he transcribes part of his account of this eventful interview. M. Thiers has, in some measure, toned down the language; but the text of this work was, we believe, before him:—"The troops say that you are summoning them to march on the capital, they share our regrets, and I am here to tell you in their name that they will not expose it to the fate of Moscow. . . . Our resolution has been formed, and whatever you may do, we are determined to have done with the present state of things; as for myself, I declare that my sword shall never be drawn against Frenchmen, or stained with French blood."

Macdonald then handed Napoleon a letter from Bermonville—we have met him before—he was a member of the new Parisian Government—and this repeated the previous statement, that the allies would not treat with the Emperor. Napoleon at once consented to abdicate; but it will be observed he still thought he could defeat the allies; and those who describe him as a mere heartless tyrant, should bear in mind that he made no stipulation for himself, and thought only of the Empress and his infant son.

"Well, gentlemen," he said, "since it is so I will abdicate. My wish was to secure the welfare of France. I have failed; events have turned against me. I do not intend to increase our misfortunes; but if I abdicate, what will you do? Do you wish to have the King of Rome as my successor, and the Empress as Regent?" We unanimously agreed. "We must," he added, "treat for an armistice, and I shall send commissioners to Paris. I select for this important mission Marshals the Prince of the Moskwa, the Duke of Ragusa, and the Duke of Vicenza . . ." The Emperor, after the act of abdication had been drawn up, threw himself upon a sofa, and exclaimed,

with a careless air, "Bah, gentlemen, leave all this alone, let us march to-morrow, and we shall defeat them!" He had remarked, "I will prepare instructions for the Commissioners, but I prohibit them from making personal conditions for myself."

Ney, Marmont, and Caulaincourt had, we have seen, been selected by Napoleon to treat for his cause; but Marmont was replaced by Macdonald at the last moment. The three plenipotentiaries had now reached Paris, and had an interview with the Czar Alexander, the arbiter of the situation for the time. The conversation was friendly and long, and Macdonald and Caulaincourt strongly urged the claims of Marie Louise and of the King of Rome, and denounced the Bourbons, the Senate, Talleyrand and his crew. It is not probable that they could have succeeded, for the restoration of Louis XVIII. had been almost arranged; but they terrified the provisional government:—"We went to the house of Marshal Ney. We were told that our arrival had caused the greatest alarm among the partizans of the new order of things, more than 2000 white cockades had been taken out of peoples hats; the Senate was in a state of consternation.

The defection, however, of the corps of Marmont at this crisis, decided the question, and made the efforts of the envoys hopeless. Macdonald endeavours to palliate Marmont's conduct; but his was a repentance like that of Judas; and he infamously betrayed a too generous master. The Czar announced the decision of the allies:—"He spoke at once on the subject of our conference, and said that our request had been answered in the negative. Thus was extinguished the last and feeble ray of hope which our first interview had produced, namely, that a Regency would be established after the abdication of Napoleon in favour of his son.'

The plenipotentiaries next fought for Napoleon's interests, and, as is well known, Elba was assigned to him. The language of the Czar was noble and generous:—"Napoleon has been unfortunate; from this day forward I am once more his friend; all has been forgotten. He shall have the island of Elba, or some other spot to rule over; he is to retain the title

by which he has been generally known ; his family will have pensions, and will retain their property. Tell him, gentlemen, that if he will not accept this sovereignty, and cannot find an asylum elsewhere, he may come to my dominions ; he will be received as a sovereign ; he may take the word of Alexander.”’

Macdonald, Ney, and Caulaincourt returned to Fontainebleau and were thanked by Napoleon for their services. The abdication was signed, and Elba accepted ; and Macdonald confesses that the allies felt an immense sense of relief when all was over. Napoleon’s military power was, in truth, still formidable ; and if the Marshals had resolved to fall away from him, the great mass of the army was devoted to his cause :— ‘Napoleon had the great majority of the inhabitants of the capital in his favour, and the whole of the National Guard ; the allies by no means felt themselves secure. The armies, still numerous, which had evacuated Spain, the frontiers of Italy and Piedmont could unite with ours ; the garrisons on the Rhine and the Meuse could form a large body of troops, and could support the risings, which, though at first partial, might become national ; the energy of Napoleon, though weakened by multiplied reverses, might awaken and powerfully stir France.’

Macdonald and Caulaincourt had loyally served the Emperor in these negotiations, from first to last. But Ney had begun to play a double part ; the ‘bravest of the brave’ was really a weak man ; and while still acting as his master’s envoy, had made his peace with the Provisional Government :— ‘We were at dinner with Marshal Ney, when one of his aid-de-camps came into the room, and, with a radiant face, said “your letter has been received by the Emperor of Russia in the best spirit.” He pointed to an order on his neck, given to him by that sovereign : “there is the proof.” He added that M. de Talleyrand, the President of the Provisional Government, thanked the Marshal for the important counsel he had given.’

Napoleon was deeply touched by the noble conduct of Macdonald at this most trying crisis. The one of the Marshals, who owed him least, and had never been anything like a

friend, had defended his cause with the most loyal energy, while favourites and satellites had forsaken him and fled. We can only quote a part of Macdonald's description of his well-known parting with the fallen Conqueror; the Marshal, it will be seen, seems to have been not aware that Napoleon had taken poison a few hours before:—

‘The Emperor, shaking off his sad thoughts, sat up with a less preoccupied look; but his complexion had not changed, his countenance was dark with melancholy. “I feel a little better,” he said, and then added: “Duke of Tarentum, I am deeply moved and most grateful for your conduct and devotedness. I did not know you well; I had been put on my guard against you; I have done much for and enriched many others, but they have abandoned and deserted me, and you, who owed me nothing, have remained faithful! I appreciate your loyalty when it is too late; and I sincerely regret that my present situation does not permit me to recognise it, and that I can only thank you by words. I know that your sense of honour and disinterestedness have left you without a fortune. I am aware, too, that you nobly refused in 1809 to accept a donation from the Estates of Gratz, in token of their gratitude for the strict discipline and good order you maintained among my troops, and for your perfect equity in doing justice to all. I have been rich and powerful, I am now poor.” “I flatter myself,” I answered, “that your Majesty esteems me sufficiently to believe that I would not accept a recompense from you in your present position; my conduct—and you value it too highly—was wholly disinterested.” “This I know,” he said, clasping my hand; “but you may, without hurt to your delicacy of mind, accept another kind of gift—I mean, the sabre of Mourad Bey, worn by myself at the Battle of Mount Thabor; keep it in remembrance of me and of my friendship.” He had it sent for, and offered it to me; I thought I might take a present of the kind; I thanked him warmly; we fell into each other's arms and cordially embraced.’

With a characteristic sense of honour, Macdonald refused to declare for the Bourbons, until the treaty of abdication had been ratified. He stood alone with Caulaincourt in taking

this part :—‘M. de Talleyrand came forward and said, “Now that all is finished, we ask you, gentlemen, to express your adhesion to the new order of things.” Marshal Ney hastened to say he had done so. “I do not address myself to you, but to the Dukes of Tarentum and Vicenza.” I simply replied that I refused, and Caulaincourt said the same.’

The same fearless and chivalrous spirit distinguished the later parts of Macdonald’s career. He had kept aloof from the Bourbons, as became his position, but he remained true to them through all the changes of fortune. He was made a Peer of France by Louis XVIII., and received one of the great provincial governments, bestowed on the Marshals as props of the throne. But he perceived and resented the faults of the Bourbons; and he has dwelt, in these pages, at some length on the follies of the returned *émigrés*, on the violence of the extreme Royalist faction, and the infatuated policy which combined all the interests of the Revolution against the Monarchy. Especially mischievous were the progresses of the Royal Princes, made in the hope of winning popular favour, but only arousing anger and bad blood, owing to a series of extravagant errors; and he boldly expressed his views on the subject :—‘The Princes were surrounded by their partisans alone; they only saw the men of the old *regime*; they had nothing but words of feigned politeness for the authorities, which, for want of proper appointments, had not been changed. Their Royal Highnesses saw and learned nothing, for they looked through the eyes of men full of the passions of the past. The result was mistrust and discontent more strongly excited.’

After the extraordinary return of Napoleon from Elba, Macdonald was placed in command at Lyons, and did his best to resist the Imperial exile. He had resolved to lead in person a few daring men, and to fire on the little band which attended the Emperor. He insists—we believe he was wholly mistaken—that the enterprise might have succeeded:—“It is a proof that my calculations were not irrational, that when I was at Bourges, after the army had submitted, the Grenadiers of the Island of Elba, soldiers, officers, nay the commandant himself, were all, being asked one after the other, unanimous in declaring that

they were enchanted at returning to France, but that had they met the least resistance, the least obstacle, nay, had a shot been fired, they would have thrown down their arms and asked for mercy !'

Authority, however, slipped from the Marshal's hands, and he was obliged to fly from Lyons in the universal revolt of the soldiery gathering around their unforgotten chief. On his return to Paris, he found the King still hopeful, owing to the pledges of Ney ; and the unfortunate Marshal, it appears certain, uttered the celebrated words which were laid to his charge :—'I have great confidence in Marshal Ney,' said the King ; 'he has promised to arrest him, and to bring him in an iron cage.'

Macdonald entreated the King not to go to La Vendée, when the triumph of Napoleon had become certain ; and urged Louis XVIII. to remain in France. He bade the monarch farewell on the frontier, for he did not choose to bear the odious name of *émigré* ; his language was characteristic :—'I have loyally done all that in me lay to support the authority of your Majesty, and to keep your Majesty in your dominions ; you choose to leave them ; I will conduct you in safety to the frontier, but I will not go further.'

The Marshal remained quiescent during the Hundred Days, and turned a deaf ear to Napoleon's overtures conveyed in flattering terms by Davoust :—'He said that he had been sent, on the part of the Emperor, to repeat the expression of his gratitude on account of my conduct in the last agony of the Empire, that he wished to thank me in person, and that he proposed a public or private interview, at my choice. I at once replied, that I had been true to his cause and his person to the last moment, that I had other engagements which I would fulfil with the same loyalty, and that Napoleon doubtless esteemed me enough not to flatter himself that he could lead me astray by allurements of wealth to this, a high office. I had formed a decided resolve which nothing could shake, and that it was useless to persist any further.'

Macdonald evidently was indignant with Ney, whose conduct had shocked Napoleon himself :—'Our carriages were

facing each other, when a voice from his desired it to stop. "Go to Paris," he said; "you will be well received; the Emperor will give you a friendly welcome." "I shall dispense with his politeness," was my answer; "I will not see him, and I will not join his party."

The Marshal took no part in the Royalist movement which agitated Paris after Waterloo. The highest honours were properly bestowed on him at the second restoration of Louis XVIII.; he was made Chancellor of the Legion of Honour; had the refusal of the Ministry of War; and was given the command of the still powerful army which had retreated behind the Loire. This was a delicate and most difficult trust: the soldiery were exasperated at their late defeat, and at what they rightly deemed the vile treason of Fouché; and the higher ranks swarmed with partisans of Napoleon, fearing for their lives, and detesting the Bourbons. Macdonald admirably fulfilled his mission, won the hearts of the troops, and restored discipline, and saved many officers from proscription and death. He tells us how he baffled the emissaries who had been sent by the Junta in Paris, to arrest and immolate some of the bravest men in France:—"At the close of the day Body Guards in disguise presented themselves to me. They had been furnished by the commandants of the gendarmerie with directions to obey the orders of these gentlemen, and to arrest the persons named in the ordinances. . . . I did not know how to find out those who had been threatened in order to give them warning. The Prince of Eckmühl had just left me. . . . I called on him at once, and told him of what was on foot. "At once," I said, "give notice to every individual contained in these lists; send messengers to the cantonments; they will have eight or nine hours to escape." I do not know how it was accomplished, but they all got off well, even General Laborde, who had the gout.'

Unfortunate Ney might, it seems, have escaped; jealousy had been one of his motives for abandoning the King; and jealousy, perhaps, led to his cruel fate. In truth, he had not been himself since he had betrayed the Bourbons: this had been evident at Quatre Bras and Waterloo:—

‘Unhappy Marshal Ney might have had this advantage, had he at once made use of the passports obtained by his wife from the leaders of the allied armies. She begged him on her knees not to lose a moment and to set off. He dryly replied, “Madame, you are thinking of getting rid of me!” The unfortunate widow told me herself this characteristic tale.’

Macdonald used all his influence, unfortunately in vain, to disabuse the Government of the false notion, that a conspiracy had been formed to bring Napoleon from Elba, and strove to moderate the frenzy of the vindictive Royalists. He freely declared his mind to the King:—‘The conversation turned upon the existing position of affairs and on the causes which had produced it; reckless charges were made, that all parties, especially the army, had entered into a vast plot to overthrow the Royal Government and to restore Napoleon. I insisted, on the contrary, that the errors of the Ministers—I could speak boldly of these for they had been openly confessed in the proclamation from Cambray—the prodigalities, the iniquities, the abuses, the powers that had been wrongly conferred, the violation of the charter, the arrogance, the scorn shown by those in high places—that all this, in a word, had exasperated the army and a part of the nation, and that a serious agitation would have been the result, even if Napoleon had not made his appearance.’

These ‘Reminiscences’ close at this point, and we shall not dwell on Macdonald’s later years. The Marshal died, full of honours, in 1840, a few weeks before the remains of Napoleon were brought from St. Helena and restored to France. He was a most striking figure among the warriors of an extraordinary time, and it may be truly said of him that, in the Land of Bayard, the son of a Jacobite-Scottish gentleman was one of the very few soldiers who deserved the proud title ‘*sans peur et sans reproche*’ in his Revolutionary and troubled day.

WILLIAM O’CONOR MORIS.

ART. V.—THE RUSSIAN UNIVERSITIES.

- (1) *The History of the Imperial University of Moscow*, by S. Shevirev, Moscow, 1855. (Russian).
- (2) *The Imperial University of St. Petersburg*, by V. V. Gregoreev. St. Petersburg, 1870. (Russian).
- (3) *History of the Imperial University of St. Vladimir*. Edited by Professor M. F. Vladimirsky-Boudenov. Kiev, 1884. (Russian).
- (4) *General Statutes of the Imperial Russian Universities*. Charkov, 1884. (Russian).
- (5) *Calendar for Students*. Edited by Toubyansky. St. Petersburg, 1890. (Russian).
- (6) *Reports of the Imperial Universities of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kiev, for 1889, 1890, 1891*. (Russian).
- (7) *Die Reform der Russischen Universitäten nach dem Gesetz von 23rd August, 1884*. (Anon.) Leipzig, 1886.

IN reviewing the history of the Russian Universities during the last century and a half, it is impossible not to be struck with the progress learning has made in Russia in spite of the serious hindrances which have been cast in its way by the Tzars and Russian government. The constant changes also to which the universities have from time to time been subjected, have materially interfered with their expansion. Russia one hundred and fifty years ago emerged from a state of comparative barbarism. Under Peter the Great the education of the empire was in the hands of officials. Most of the learned men were foreigners imported by the Emperor, or men of foreign extraction whose ancestors had travelled eastward in search of adventure and had ultimately settled down in Russia. The nobles despised literature and had few thoughts beyond their personal enjoyment. Von Vizin, the Russian satirist of the 18th century, draws a vivid picture of the society of his day in the 'Nedorosl' or 'Fop.' In that play he satirises his fellow countrymen for their indifference towards learning.

There was at that time no educated class, and no desire for education was exhibited among the more powerful section. Among the peasantry reading and writing were almost unknown.

Russia was then to a great extent in a state of lawlessness. In the large towns bands of robbers often paraded the streets, with whom the police were unable to cope. Soldiers were not infrequently called out against them, and pitched battles were sometimes fought. Little attention could be paid to the fine arts. It is therefore a matter of surprise that the small band of scholars who lived about the Court were able to stir up their imperial patrons to see the necessity for disseminating learning more widely.

Peter the Great was the first to make any real efforts to improve this state of things. He was, however, unfortunately too anxious to make Russia the greatest military power of the world, and although he founded many schools, their usefulness was marred by the fact that their main object was to fit the youth of the higher classes to become better soldiers and sailors.

It would be tedious to recount the history of the foundation of the several universities in Russia, and the motives which led to their establishment. The intentions of the emperors were narrow and confined. This is shown by many addresses which were delivered by themselves or their representatives. Great monarchs such as Elizabeth and Nicholas designed the university mainly as a nursery for officials of the state. Nicholas in a speech to the students of Kiev is reported to have said, 'It is not enough to study well; science alone leads to no good results. I require faithful sons to stand beside my throne, a devotion which knows no limit, a submission which does not reason, and an absolute obedience.' (Tikhomorov, 'La Russie politique et sociale,' etc.)

Count Schouvalov in the reign of the former, almost one hundred years before, had a better comprehension of the functions of a university; but still when addressing the assembled students he points to the doings of Peter the Great as if he were inciting a body of warriors to victory. But the acts more

than the speeches bear witness to the ideas which the emperors entertained. The governor-generals of the provinces periodically held reviews of the students, and military exercises were gone through. The detailed inspection was made by a colonel of regular troops. Sometimes the students had to parade at the house of the governor. The objects of these parades were twofold; first, to inspect the outward appearance and bearing of the alumni and see who had uniforms, as attempts were frequently made to avoid wearing the hated dress; and secondly, to acquaint the students with the faces of their superiors, so that there should be no excuse for not giving the proper salute. The inspector gave notice of the review, warning the student that he was 'to be shaven, washed, and correctly dressed.' The governor-general appeared with his suite, military and civil, 'to keep up the spirit of military discipline and to quicken the dormant feeling of submission.'

It is natural, therefore, that the Russian universities should still bear upon them the characteristic marks of their origin. The student has, theoretically, liberty to choose any profession, but he is often practically debarred from doing so. A friend, a Russian official, lately wrote to me as follows: 'The intelligent Russian does not wish to be an official, but he cannot help himself. If he becomes a village doctor or schoolmaster, nay even if he is friendly with the lower classes, he is immediately suspected, and put into gaol as a revolutionist. Nothing can be more painful than being a Russian; one never feels secure. Only that man is safe who has killed his conscience and reconciled himself to everything that is mean and low.'

There are eight Universities in the Russian Empire, exclusive of Dorpat and Helsingfors—the Universities respectively of the Baltic Provinces and Finland. Dorpat is passing through a crisis of change, and has always been more German than Russian. Out of 1,632 students in 1888-89, 1,179 were Protestants, and mostly of German descent, 250 Jews, and 95 Orthodox Russians. The other Universities of Russia are Moscow (founded 1755), Kazan (1804), Charkov (1804), St. Petersburg (1819), Kiev (1834), Odessa (1864), Warsaw (1869), and Tomsk (1889) in Siberia. All of them are endowed by the

State, and have to a great extent been organised after the German system.

Russia is divided into educational districts, in each of which there is a university. The Government appoint a Curator over each district, who directs all matters concerning public instruction. This official is generally a man of ability, and he acts as an intermediary between the Government and the higher schools. His duty is to see that all regulations are properly obeyed and enforced, as he is responsible for the discipline and order of the district. At the head of the University itself stands the Rector, who was formerly elected yearly, but now holds the position for four years, being eligible for re-appointment for a second term of office. The appointment of the Rector is in the hands of the Minister of Public Instruction. The Rector is assisted in the government of the University by a Board composed of the deans of the four faculties, an inspector, of whom we shall speak afterwards, and an official appointed to look after the domestic economy. This Board had formerly extensive powers. To it was entrusted the opening of new schools, and its members constituted the University court. But these powers no longer belong to it. The Rector exercises considerable authority. All applications for admission to the University, for permission to migrate to another University, and for remission of fees, must pass through his hands.

It is no uncommon occurrence to see thirty to fifty students waiting for an audience at his door at the appointed hour to ask for one or other of these privileges. He has also to discharge the duties naturally incumbent on the Rectorship. In extreme cases he has the right to 'take any measures he may deem expedient for the maintenance of order in the University,' even if they exceed his ordinary powers, but he must immediately give notice to the Curator, the Council, and the Minister of Public Instruction, together with his reasons for acting on his own responsibility.

The Council of the University consists of the professors, under the presidency of the Rector. Upon it devolves the right of selecting names to be submitted to the Curator and Minister of Public Instruction for appointment to vacant posts

of 'readers,' professors, as well as candidates for honorary degrees. The Minister is, however, not compelled to accept any of the candidates named, but may use his own discretion. All scientific societies in connection with the University come under the control of the Council. The members of these societies are very numerous, and exhibit great life and energy. The Government subsidizes them in Moscow, where they count over 600 members, with five thousand roubles a year.

The faculties were originally only three, but are now four, namely, Law, Medicine, Philosophy, Physics and Mathematics. The University of St. Petersburg has a faculty of Eastern languages, but none of medicine. Each faculty is composed of the Dean as president, and the professors of that faculty. The Dean is nominated by the Curator, but the nomination must be confirmed by the Minister of Public Instruction. The business of the faculty is to arrange all matters connected with examinations, prizes, and medals. Each faculty also draws out a list of students deserving exhibitions, which has afterwards to be submitted to the supreme Board of the University, and, if approved of, is sent on to the Curator for confirmation.

It was not easy in the reigns of Peter, Elizabeth, and Catherine II., when universities were new institutions, to find men qualified to occupy the professorial chairs. Very few Russians took any interest in education, and it was impossible during these reigns to get native scholars to fill the posts. Had it not been for the foreign blood which the Tzars attracted, no headway could have been made against the prevailing ignorance. Catherine II. was fortunate enough to induce Grimm to reside at her court. The difficulty of procuring suitable professors repeatedly presented itself, notwithstanding all the efforts of the Imperial house. Schools for training teachers were started, and young men were sent to the gymnasia and universities of France and Germany. To encourage the student further, a certain number received the title and emolument of 'extraordinary professor' while resident at the foreign universities, and in addition a promise was made to them that they would be appointed 'ordinary

professors' on their return home. This practice of sending students to foreign countries forms one of the great encouragements given to scholars. Almost every year the Government or the University send a few men to carry on their researches in various countries, and facilities, such as free passports, are accorded to them.

The salaries attached to the extraordinary professorships, referred to above, ranged at that time from 200 to 400 roubles. The ordinary professor also enjoyed many privileges, some of which still belong to that position. He was permitted to leave and enter the empire when he liked without hindrance, and could bring back into Russia three thousand roubles worth of goods free of duty. When the censorship of books was established, it was provided that books should be delivered to professors without passing through the custom's office. Yet, in spite of all these measures, the demand for teachers exceeded the supply for upwards of seventy years.

Scholars, however, were invited from abroad, especially from Germany and Austria. This plan was accompanied by a serious drawback. The majority of the Germans, who came at the invitation of the Russian Government, were not conversant with the Russian language, and their lectures were therefore delivered in German, or Latin, to students often ignorant of both one and the other. To make matters worse, other complications occurred as soon as the nineteenth century dawned. A reaction set in against all such foreign elements. The jealousy which the Slav had always felt towards the Teuton now came to the surface, and many of the foreign professors were compelled to vacate their chairs. Men were nominated in their room who had little or no experience, and had often not completed their own studies. When Arakcheev was in power, the University of St. Petersburg possessed only one professor who was even slightly known to the outside world; hardly half-a-dozen were specialists. With respect to the others, says a contemporary, they not only knew nothing, but they were so indolent that they sought to conceal the sources of information from the pupils. As late as 1832, there were only five or six professors in the University of St. Peters-

burg who had made any progress in science, and some of these were foreigners, who read their lectures in Latin.

The Russian Government, which always jealously watches the rising generation, has very frequently suspected the teaching given in the Universities not to be in harmony with the religion of the State, and has traced student disturbances to its influence: it has at times accused the professors of instilling into the minds of their pupils a spirit of defiance and disobedience. Many of the former have consequently been expelled, and others have been prosecuted before the tribunals. Drenteln, Governor-General of Kiev in 1884, openly censured the professors of Kiev, and laid the responsibility of the disturbances on their shoulders. 'The University,' he said, 'is chargeable with the crimes committed in Russia, and the root of the evil lies in the fact that the professors aim at popularity.' But we cannot discuss in this article the history and causes of these riots.

To make matters more difficult, books, such as Grotius, Newton, Buffon, and Comte, have been wholly excluded from the curriculum, and only expurgated editions of certain works were and are permitted to be used.

Arbitrary acts of Russian ministers occur on almost every page of the histories of the Universities; and if science and literature have progressed in spite of such interference, this has been owing to the efforts of the Russian student himself.

At the present day the Russian Universities are well supplied with able men, who love science for its own sake. They have now five distinct classes of teachers, *viz.*, the emeritus professor, the ordinary or full professor, the extraordinary professor, the docent, and the lector or reader. To qualify for a chair, the candidate must have the degree of Doctor, and must have lectured not less than three years in the capacity of docent, but the Minister of Instruction has power to curtail this period.

A professor keeps his appointment for a term of twenty-five years, after which he may be re-appointed for another five years, at the discretion of the Curator and Minister of Instruction. After thirty years' service, he must retire from the

regular staff, but may, if he wishes, still retain the title of professor, with a seat on the Council, and may deliver lectures. He is, however, then called 'Emeritus professor,' and, as such, may continue for one or two additional periods of five years, always, of course, if the Minister of Public Instruction approves. The latter allows him 1200 roubles a year extra to his pension as 'Emeritus professor.'

The docents are the source from which professors are chosen. The five chief Universities possess about 350 ordinary and extraordinary professors, 210 docents, with some 20 lecturers. Moscow has 95 docents. Teachers in the higher schools may also be docents in the University. Thus one of the most popular docents in Kiev is a master in one of the higher schools. When I attended lectures in the University of Kiev, the lecture-hall of this docent was crowded with over 200 students. The rivalry between professor and docent in Russia, as in Germany, is generally wholesome; it keeps the former from relaxing his exertions, while it stimulates the latter to greater exertions. The student who wishes to become a docent must obtain leave from the Faculty, and then, through the Rector, permission from the Curator.

The incomes of Russian professors vary very much. The ordinary and extraordinary professors are paid three thousand and two thousand roubles respectively, and fees in addition. The Rector receives 1500 roubles extra as Rector, and the Dean of each Faculty 600. The honorarium of a docent varies still more, being mainly dependent on the bounty of the Minister of Public Instruction, and on the recommendation of the Curator and Council.

The institution of Examination Boards similar to those in Germany was one of the chief improvements recently introduced. The members are nominated every year by the Minister. The examinations of these Boards are a guarantee to Government that the student on leaving the University has attained to the standard required for entrance into the Civil Service. No student is admitted to the examination who has not kept ten half-yearly terms in medicine, and eight in any of the other faculties. Each faculty prescribes set examina-

tions for degrees, prizes, etc. In order to show the course of studies pursued in the Russian Universities, it may be well to describe, as a sample, what is done in Moscow.

In the school of ancient philosophy, Professor Grota, in 1890, took as his subject Plato's dialogues and the Platonic philosophy; three to four chapters of the former were gone through at each lecture. Docent Lopatina lectured on Kant. Ancient art was treated by Professor Tsvetaev, who illustrated his subject with plaster models of Greek art borrowed from the museum. In connection with this, Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* was read; the students being expected to study Brunn, *History of Greek Art*, Overbeck, *History of Greek Sculpture*, and Baumeister's *Monuments of Classical Antiquities*. Four other professors and six docents also lectured on various other branches of classical literature. One of the latter devoted himself especially to the intricacies of Greek and Latin style. Cicero, *De Finibus*, and Thucydides, book ii., were the basis of his lectures. Professor Miller lectured one hour a week in Sanskrit, using Boller's grammar.

In the department of Russian literature the well-known Professor Sokolov read twice a week on the Russian monuments of the eighteenth century. Old Slavonic has also many devotees. All over Russia and the Danubian provinces stones with inscriptions are continually being found, and much valuable information is gradually coming to light. In Kiev, Professor Vladimorov had a class of ten in 1890, and discoursed on ancient South Russian monuments of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.*

In general literature many interesting authors were treated, among whom were Schiller, Beaumarchais, and Byron. Each foreign language has its lector, generally a foreigner.

In the mathematical and physical faculty, three professors and two docents were engaged in lecturing on pure mathematics; two professors and two docents on mechanics and its branches; while about twenty-five of both classes of teachers lectured on astronomy, physics, chemistry, mineralogy, geology

* In Bukarest, Professor Tocilescu is engaged on the same study.

and palæontology, botany, zoology, physiology, agriculture and anthropology.

In the other Universities the same subdivisions exist.

In the school of law Gaius and Justinian were expounded, due consideration being also given to other departments of law. The lecturer on police law took a survey of the institutions for public safety and comfort.

Students of medicine attend lectures from nine in the morning till eight in the evening, listening to men of world-wide reputations.

Oriental learning has been concentrated by Russia in the University of St. Petersburg, where an Oriental faculty was established in 1854, with professorial chairs, for the following languages—Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Tatar dialects, Mongol and Kalmuck, Chinese, Hebrew, Armenian, Grusinian, Manchu, Pushtu, Tibetan, Sanskrit. The professoriate has not only been composed of Russian and German scholars, but also of native Orientals of high literary reputation. Kasembeg was the first professor of Persian. In his place the University has now Prof. Chernaev. Wassiljev occupies the Chair of Chinese as Emeritus Professor, having held it from the beginning. Dorn was the first lecturer on the Afghan languages, and Prof. Chwolson (now Emeritus Professor) devotes himself to Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac. All these names are well known to Orientalists in this country, as are also Beresin, Smirnov, and others. To give the student conversational practice in the language, native Arabs, Tartars, Chinese, etc., assist the professor, and sometimes receive a small salary.

It is interesting to note that Wassiljeff, when a young man, was sent to China by the University of Kazan to perfect himself in Chinese and Oriental studies.

The career of Prof. Chwolson is an example of perseverance and determination. He was born in 1822, the son of a poor Jew. At eighteen he was unacquainted with any language save his own, and only at that age did he begin to learn French, German, and Russian. Such was his diligence that in three years he was able to read with ease in any of these languages. Young Chwolson then proceeded to Breslau in

order to gain admission into the University, but he found that his want of classical knowledge debarred him from being admitted to the rights of a student. In 1844, however, he had overcome this obstacle and entered the University. Six years later he obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Leipzig. His thesis on that occasion was on the 'Ssabians and Ssabismus,' on which subject, in 1856, he published his monumental work, exhibiting great acquaintance with Arabic literature. In 1855 he joined the Greek Church, and was made Professor of Hebrew in the University of St. Petersburg, and afterwards Professor of Hebrew and Biblical Archæology in the Theological College in the same city. Prof. Chwolson's last important work is *Corpus inscriptionum Hebraicarum*, St. Petersburg, 1882.

Similar biographical notices are given in the *History of St. Petersburg*, but I have cited the above, having the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Prof. Chwolson.

Besides these lectures, the professors occasionally give public prelections. But what still further testifies to the activity of the Russian professors is the list of works published by them.

In the Universities of the Continent the scholar does not publish so much with a view to gain as to advance science. The study of *Brotwissenschaft* is not so universal as in Great Britain. The common question asked concerning a German 'Gelehrter' is, 'Was hat er geschrieben?' By this test the university man is tried.

In Moscow, during 1890, one hundred and thirty professors, out of a staff of one hundred and eighty-five, all told, published books or wrote articles.

The institution of the censorship of books has had a deterring influence on the Russian scholar. Catherine II., by an ukase in 1796, brought it into being 'to put an end to various inconveniences caused by the unrestrained printing of books,' and two scholars were named censors with salaries of 1000 roubles a year. The censorship was associated with the Universities down to 1835, when the connection was severed. The severity and stupidity of the censorship is too well known to require demonstration. Ministers of Public Instruc-

tion who find fault with Rectors for permitting articles on Russian mediæval history and folk-lore to appear in University publications are not worthy of their positions.

A little more liberty exists at present; whatever issues from the University press, in the name and with the approval of the University, need not be submitted to the censor. Of course these works undergo a scrutiny at the hands of the Rector and Council. The University has the right to publish any periodicals of a scientific character, to have a press of its own, and to receive any book from foreign countries without hindrance.

The Universities have no theological faculties (Dorpat excepted). To take its place there are Theological Seminaries in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and Kazan. Each University has, however, a Professor of Scripture, a priest of the Orthodox Church, who has charge of the religious instruction of the student, and gives catechetical lectures. Every student is bound to go to the University chapel, and to perform his religious duties as a member of the Greek Church.

There are at present over 9,000 students in the five chief Universities. The numbers were:—

St. Petersburg in 1891,-	-	-	2087
Moscow in 1890,	-	-	3473
Kiev (St. Vladimir)	-	-	2088
Warsaw -	-	-	1151
Kazan -	-	-	785
	} in 1889,		

In 1760 the University of Moscow had only thirty. The idea of a university education was then so novel to Russian parents that they did not send their sons in any numbers to the Universities, and when they did, they did not scruple to keep them from attending lectures, nor hesitate to withdraw them before they had finished their course. Between 1755-1770, three hundred left the University of Moscow, after a few terms, without any valid reason.

Inducements had to be held out to young men, eighty years ago, to get them to enter the university. A number of posts in the Civil Service were, therefore, reserved for those who had attended the necessary terms, and some were even gazetted as Senior Lieutenants. The reverse is now the case; the

class-rooms are packed to such a degree as to be injurious to health. The author of *Contemporary Russia* (St. Petersburg, 1890) reveals an appalling state of things. The number of students in Charkov University is so great that the lecture halls cannot contain them. The Professor of Physics has 300 students, and there is only room for 60; the Professor of Chemistry has only seats for 70, while there are 270 seeking to be admitted. Whether this condition has been materially altered since the above book was published I have not been able to discover.

The working year in the university in the 18th century was reckoned at one hundred days, but the student was so careless that the maximum of attendances was only about from thirty to forty days. Stringent measures were taken to put a stop to this irregularity. Corporal punishment was then common, and was carried to such a pitch in the reign of Catherine that Schouvalov proposed to substitute the wearing of the peasants' garb as a means of correction. The students' dress consisted of a dark blue coat with a red collar, a broad cap and a sword, which was handed to them on being enrolled as members of the corps of students. The same practice of carrying swords prevailed in the 18th century in Germany, but the custom gradually died out, and has now ceased to exist in Russia. The majority of the students used to be supported by the government, and received one hundred roubles a year. Large sums of money have also been bequeathed by private individuals to assist them. In most of the large towns institutions were built to provide them with board and lodging. In Moscow an anonymous benefactor handed over a house with 42 rooms to the authorities, and in St. Petersburg Polyakov presented a similar building.

The material position of the student is not an enviable one. Poverty and want stare him in the face wherever he goes, and his personal appearance leaves much to be desired. In 1850, when the Russian government wished to limit the number entering the university, the most effectual way of stopping the influx was by giving notice that only those would be received who were able to dress themselves decently

and keep up an appearance suitable to their rank. By far the larger proportion of students are sons of officers whose pay is small and whose life is a continued struggle against want; about one third are children of merchants and shopkeepers. Out of 4000 in Petersburg and Kiev 90 belong to the peasant class. The minimum that a student requires in the year to keep himself at the university has been calculated at 375 roubles, or nearly £60. Imagination can hardly picture the condition in which the student lives: sometimes without fire or light. Three or four of them often occupy the same room, and each pays one and a half roubles (4s. 6d.) a month for his 'corner.' Cases have been known where he had only five copecks (2½d.) a day to buy food. The purchase of books under these circumstances is not to be thought of. Some credit is due however to the government for the assistance it has afforded. A large percentage of students have always been assisted by the State. In 1877, 82 per cent. were in some form or other aided by the State. In the accounts of the university of Moscow for 1891, the sum of 130,236 roubles, (in round numbers, £20,000) is credited in 1890 to stipendia or exhibitions, varying from 200 to 600 roubles a year. These were distributed among 429 students in the first half year, and among 435 in the second. And again, out of 3334 students, 642 had their fees remitted in the first half year, and 690 in the second. In Kiev, 600 out of 2,000 were released from payment. Besides this 2,000 roubles were distributed in Moscow in sums from 4 to 50 roubles in cases of great necessity; and during the same year the society for helping poor students paid over 10,000 roubles in fees, and provided 1,813 men with dinners. With these figures before us we cannot say that the material welfare of the alumni of the university of Moscow is entirely neglected. The same applies to all the universities. Nineteen stipendia were also allotted in Moscow to those who had obtained the degree of Candidate and intended to become professors.

The stipendia or exhibitions to which reference has so often been made are of two kinds, those endowed by government and by private individuals. Exhibitions are given to poor

students of exemplary conduct after examination. At the end of every six months the exhibition must be renewed, but this generally takes place provided the inspector lodges no complaint. The Government, however, demand a *quid pro quo* from all exhibitioners. After leaving the University, they have to serve the State for one year and a half for every year that they have been in receipt of a stipendium; liberty being accorded to choose any branch of the Civil Service.

While this regulation remains in force, the true aim of a University, which is to encourage study for its own sake, must remain in the background. Under the present circumstances the poor student is doomed to spend hours over official papers, wading through some law documents or other, when his natural bent would draw him towards other pursuits. The good done by these exhibitions is therefore sadly marred by the conditions imposed. With three or four years, or perhaps more, compulsory official life awaiting him, the student does not trouble himself to work hard. The exhibitions which are given by private endowment are comparatively few, but they entail no service. Entrance into the University takes place once a year, in the month of August. Several certificates must be produced previous to enrolment; the most important of which are, the school certificate vouching that the scholar's conduct and final school examination have been satisfactory; the certificate of birth and baptism, and the police certificate of good behaviour. The production of two photographs with autographs underneath is also necessary.

Leave is granted every year to a few persons to attend lectures as outsiders. Such attendance is of no value in assisting a man to a post where University education is a *sine qua non*. The student has to pay 25 roubles into the University exchequer each half year, and about 23 roubles in fees. No married man may matriculate. The Jews are limited to 5 per cent. of the total number of students.

In 1884, when the University statutes were undergoing revision, the question of freedom for the professor as to what he would teach, and freedom for the student as to what he would learn, termed by the Germans 'Lehr—and Lehrfreiheit,' called

forth a great diversity of opinion. The extraordinary amount of intellectual force in the German Universities is mainly attributable to this system which admits of a multiplicity of teaching and a great variety of views. It creates a healthy competition between the professors, and makes them pay more attention to the choice of their subjects.

The majority of the Council appointed to revise the Russian University statutes were opposed to 'Lehrfreiheit,' fearing that some of the professors were not in earnest, but were more likely to seek after popularity than science. However, the Emperor decided the point in favour of the minority.

As regards 'Lehrfreiheit,' the difficulties in granting it were greater. The Russian student was too backward and too unaccustomed to work to avail himself of such a licence. The result was that it was refused to him. A programme of the lectures is hung up in the hall of the University. A comparison of the number of hours that the Russian professors lecture shows that they are about the same as in other countries. The Russian student has often been condemned for careless attendance and uproarious conduct during lectures. The former was partially due to the 'lithographed lectures,' in which the student had the lecture cut and dry, and could carry it home to read, the necessity for attending being therefore taken away. The dearness of books and the poverty of the student are accountable for this evil, which in 1882 was a cause of much mischief.

As in the Continental, so in the Russian Universities, the degree of Bachelor is not conferred, but at the conclusion of their course the candidates are practically divided into three classes; those who pass out first are given the title of 'Candidate,' next come the 'Real Students,' corresponding to our second class, and finally, those who receive certificates. There are also physicians equal to the M.B. The higher degrees are those of Doctor and Master.

In St. Petersburg, Moscow and Kiev, the numbers passing out in 1889 were:—

	Candidates.	Real Student.	With Certificates.
St. Petersburg,	274	124	
Moscow,	220	108	609 (in 1890).
Kiev,	81	192	

The number of those who received the higher degrees were :—

	Doctor.	Master.	Physician = to M.B.
St. Petersburg,	7	8	
Moscow,	11	7	230
Kiev,	6	1	108

The last important functionaries to be mentioned are the Inspectors, who in some respects have their counterpart in the proctors of the English Universities and the curators of the German. Owing, however, to the arbitrary manner in which authority is exercised in Russia, the students have often been roused to protest against their tyranny but, in most cases, with little or no success.

The first mention of an Inspector appears in 1834, when Nicholas appointed Captain Maximov to keep a strict surveillance over the students, both inside and outside the walls of the University of Moscow. Five assistants were to be under the Captain's control, whose sole duty was to watch over the students and report their impressions concerning them to the authorities.

The powers of the Inspector fifty years ago were almost unlimited. By his orders the assistants frequently went the rounds of the restaurants and other places where students were wont to congregate, to take the name of any who were absent from lectures, and to drive them to the University. The students were absolutely in the power of the Inspector, for without a certificate of good behaviour from him they could neither hold an exhibition, nor present themselves for the final examination. One disparaging word would destroy the fruit of their study. The Council of the University of Kiev once inquired of an Inspector why a certain 'B' was not allowed to go up for his examination. 'He was sent,' was the reply, 'to the consistory to undergo a course of instruction for the purpose of being converted back to orthodoxy'! This was in 1845.

Students were not allowed to absent themselves from their lodgings without noting down in a book, which was provided for the purpose, where they were going, and they were bound to be indoors by ten o'clock. Permission had to be obtained

from the Inspector if any student wished to go out of town, to a theatre, or public gathering.

Moscow was divided into sections. The Inspector and his assistants were supposed, as far as possible, to make an inspection of the students' rooms. The Inspector had to furnish a certificate to the Rector of the behaviour of the students at home, in the lecture room, in church, and to make general observations on their characters.

Numerous amusing citations could be given from the histories of the Universities how the student suffered ridiculous punishment for his misdemeanours. For omitting to take off his hat to the governor-general, eight days imprisonment; for shouting 'bravo' in a theatre, seven days in gaol, on bread and water. Still more absurd is an account of a student who for smoking a cigar was expelled from the University of Kiev. This poor fellow had gone to Odessa for his Easter holidays, and happened to be walking on the boulevard smoking a cigar, when some high officials passed by. An Inspector noticed the miscreant, and promptly reported the matter to the Inspector of Kiev, who brought the matter before the Council, with the above result.

Inspectors have still the right of making household visitations. The most innocent gatherings often arouse suspicion in these vigilant officers of order. The rules regarding dress are still strict; it is imperative on a student to wear his uniform; if he infringes this rule, he is liable to be arrested.

In Kiev one inspector and five assistants prowl about the corridors and halls of the university watching every one with eagle eyes. They fulfil the duties of their office to perfection, as I can testify. The first day after having obtained permission to attend some lecture, when on my way to the hall I was suddenly stopped by an assistant and promptly brought before the inspector. A few questions were put by the head of the university police department, who was polite and soon satisfied. Orders were given against further molestation, but nevertheless the vigilant eyes of these assistants were ever on me, and divers interrogations had occasionally to be endured as complacently as possible.

This all important official is appointed by the Minister of Public Instruction on the recommendation of the curator, but he is subordinate to the rector. The university punishments are *consilium abeundi*, rustication, imprisonment and expulsion. The first named is very frequent; any little disturbance leads to this advice being given to the student. Rustication is not so often resorted to, as it practically means expulsion to the poorer student, but imprisonment often takes its place.

A great want in the Russian Universities is the total absence of any club or 'Verein,' such as are found in Germany, where opportunities might be given to the students for meeting together in a sociable way, and where *esprit de corps* might be fostered. But the Russian Government, fearful of plots, has always discountenanced this feeling on the part of the student, and invariably rejected all petitions to recognize the corporation of students. It must be remembered that in England the social life of such Universities as Oxford and Cambridge fills the place in the development of young men which, in Germany, is filled by the 'Verein.' At present the University is little more to the Russian than a series of lecture halls, which he enters three or four times a day to spend an hour or two in them. To make matters still more disagreeable, a certain antagonism often exists between the professor and student which sometimes goes the length of hatred. A professorate of officials or 'tchinovniks' is not calculated to live on very friendly terms with the student world, for their official training prevents them from regarding the students merely as youths striving after knowledge. The very fact that they are 'tchinovniks' of high rank, is a barrier to the existence of cordial relations; it is *infra dig.* to associate with those who have not as yet attained to any 'tchin' or rank. There is a great gulf fixed between them. So much do some professors make this felt that they are genuinely hated by the students. In other ways, however, the former are handicapped. The classes are occasionally so large as to render it impossible for the professor to become acquainted even with the faces of the undergraduates; and so his manner is often stiff; he walks into the hall, lecture in hand, bows to the class, takes his seat,

and begins at once to read; no sooner done than he bows once more and disappears.

On the other hand, there are professors who are afraid of being on terms of familiarity with the student, as it might endanger their positions. To show that this is the case, it is only necessary to call to mind the resignation of Professor Mendeleev, the celebrated chemist, who took part with the students in getting up a petition asking for modifications in the existing rules. On that occasion the Minister of Public Instruction is reported to have asked him 'how he dared hobnob with scoundrels who deserved to be sent to Siberia.'

Not very long ago several professors, of more liberal views, resigned their chairs in Charkov for similar reasons.

C. T. HAGBERG WRIGHT.

ART. VI.—THE LEGEND OF ORENDEL.

IT was the good fortune of the writer to spend some days last autumn in the town of Trèves or Trier, usually from its old world buildings and its sweet river scenery, a place suggestive of dreams and meditations, but then crowded with pilgrims from many lands, vocal with their chants, and entirely given over to the cult of the Sacred Tunic or Holy Coat. The seamless garment of our Lord, for many centuries preserved in the Cathedral of Trier, was for about three months last autumn exhibited to the eyes of the faithful, who came in their thousands and tens of thousands to behold it. It was not necessary to have studied the history of the Holy Coat exhaustively in order to sympathise with the devotion which brought whole villages and provinces of peasant men and women on a toilsome journey, and caused them to walk the streets of Trier in slow procession, half a hot autumn day, for the sake of a brief sight of an object they believed to have belonged to the person of the Redeemer.

The history of the Holy Coat which was put before the

pilgrims, in the little manuals printed for their use, bears that St. Helena, mother of the Emperor Constantine, undertaking a journey to Palestine after her conversion to Christianity, discovered there the Holy Sepulchre and the true cross, and, along with these and other objects of veneration for Christians, the seamless garment of our Lord, for which the soldiers cast lots, according to John xix. 23. As St. Helena was born at Trier, and had a residence there, she was a benefactress of the church of that town, and committed to its keeping this priceless relic.

This is the story of the Holy Coat which the Church puts before the pilgrims, and to which the criticism of Protestant writers has been directed. There is, however, another and an entirely different history of the Holy Coat which, though it has long been in existence, and was composed under the influence of ecclesiastical ideas, the Church has never favoured, and which is consequently little known. The present writer, seeking to possess himself of the manuals used by the pilgrims, picked up at a bookstall at Trier a little brochure with the title (in German), *King Orendel of Trier, or the Holy Coat; a fair and pleasant history*, printed at Reutlingen in 1874. This rough little print proved to contain an extremely entertaining story, in which many things besides the Holy Coat are treated of. The reader of this Review is now presented with the outline of this story, taken, however, not from the Reutlingen version of it, but from the original high German romance. Before, however, proceeding to present the story itself, it is right to give some sort of introduction to it, and to say what class of compositions it belongs to, what is its date, and, if that can be made out, of what earlier elements it is composed, and what ideas are meant to be set forth in it.

Let it be said, in the first place, that the romance of Orendel has not been very long known even to the German world. It was printed in 1844 and in 1858; but a critical edition only appeared in 1888. The critical editor, E. Berger, has done his work excellently, and his book is now the chief authority on the subject. Karl Simrock published in 1844 a metrical rhymed version of Orendel as an addition to his great collection of the heroic legends of Germany.

The poem, for it is a poem, was preserved to modern times in a single manuscript only, and that manuscript was burned in the library of Strassburg in 1870; a copy of it, however, had been made, and was preserved at Berlin. The critical editor has the advantage of comparing a prose version, which was made from the poem late in the 15th century, and exists both in a manuscript of that period and in a printed copy of 1512.

The poem extends to nearly 4000 short rhyming lines, and is judged, from the style of versification and rhyme, to belong to the second half of the twelfth century. The dialect is held to place it in the district of Trier; and the subject of the Holy Coat, with which it deals, also fixes the circumstances of its origin. The first historical evidence of the presence at Trier of the famous relic belongs to the early twelfth century; it was placed in the Nicolaus altar of Trier Cathedral by Bishop Bruno in 1121. From that time forward it was known to be there, and was an object of interest to the faithful in that part of the world. It was natural that it should then be taken up into German song; and we know that German song was at that time in an active state, and disposed to lay hold of any interesting theme.

The romance belongs, in fact, to a peculiar class of early German literature, on which we must be allowed to say a few words. The time of the Crusades saw the rise in Germany of a new class of singers or poets who developed a new type of national poetry. Up to this time the Church had been hostile to the old national poetry of Germany, and it had in consequence sunk below the surface of society, and been superseded in the upper classes by a style of song which dealt with Christian themes. The monastic period of German literature, as it has been called, strove to suppress the poetry of heathenism. The national songs and stories, however, still survived among the lower orders, and travelled from village to village, from market to market, on the lips of the professional entertainers of the people, the 'spielmänner,' *i.e.*, playmen, the jocalators, jokers, or jongleurs, who provided that age with its music and its drama, its news and its squibs, and even in some cases, with its moral instruction. These wandering players, to whom we

owe the preservation of the German national legends, were a class the Church was zealous to discountenance and suppress, and they lived under great discredit, as wandering people are apt to do.

With the age of the Crusades, however, a better age approached for this despised and persecuted class. Contact with other nations in these expeditions taught the Germans to prize the ideas and standards of chivalry, as well as those of the Church; the arts began to be thought of, and the despised *spielmann* was remembered again, brought to castle and palace to teach music and song, as *Isolde* learned from *Tristan*, and encouraged to produce his tales and to develop them. The great literary movement was thus begun which led to the clothing of the national legends in the rhymed form in which they have come down to us; but the earlier *spielmänner* are a humbler and also a rougher set of men than the poets of the *Nibelungenlied* and of *Gudrun*, and what is important, they were still under the leadingstrings of the Church, and had to give a Christian colour to the legends they treated. At the time of the Crusades the player was often a man who had been in the East and had news to relate of what was going on at the far distant seat of war, as well as many a marvel of those unknown regions to set forth. He had met there the singers of other lands, and had been fired to attempt the revival of German song. His poems thus came to present a wonderful medley: the old legends were the main stem, for they were the traditional stock-in-trade of his craft; but he added to them freely at his will, or connected them with more modern matters, at whatever cost of incongruity; the old German heroes are transformed into knights of chivalry, the characters of the Old Testament into leaders of Christian armies. Old times and new are jumbled together, and so are East and West, oriental scenery setting off the stories of chivalry most effectively, as we know from our own *Tales of the Crusaders*. The Christian setting often appears like a part which has been added, and added last, as it is not essential to the poem. As to the manner in which he produced his compositions, the player may be heard referring to the sources of his

information, and is rich in asseverations of his own good faith. He tells his story, of course, in the hope of a reward, which consists oftenest of clothes, bright-coloured ones preferred, but sometimes beans are not disdained. Some of these spielmann poems are divided in a very curious manner, the places being indicated where the speaker is to stop and have a drink; and another amusing feature is that, after he has led his hero into some dire strait, he appeals to the audience to take counsel together how they are to get him extricated from it: the tradition is not so fixed but that a good suggestion on such a point might be adopted.

It is to one of this well-defined class of players or poets, to a spielmann in the early period of the popularity of the class, that the romance of Orendel, as it now stands before us, is to be ascribed. All the features of the spielmann treatment are very apparent in it. There is a German heroic legend, but the legendary characters are changed into knights and ladies of chivalry (rough enough they often are still, as the reader will see; court influence is not yet very apparent); there is an extraordinary confusion in history and geography; the scenery is mostly Oriental; and Christian phrases are diligently employed throughout. These characteristics place this poem in the same class with 'King Rother' and 'Solomon and Merolt,' both spielmann pieces.

We come now to the discussion of this particular legend and poem of Orendel, and it will be convenient to speak first of the materials and sources of the romance, and then of the use the spielmann made of them. Here we follow in the main the scholarly introduction of Mr. Berger.

Many of our readers will remember that 'Orvandill' was the name of Hamlet's father. Shakspeare does not give this name, and that consideration tends to make it doubtful if he had read Saxo Grammaticus, who tells us all about Orvandill as well as about Hamlet. The name is not unknown in early German, and there is a village in Franconia called Orvendensall, formerly Orvendelsall. But the name goes back to much earlier times. There was a star called in early Scandania Orvandilsta, Orvandil's toe, though it is not known which star

it was that bore this name; and its position in the sky was accounted for by a myth in the Edda, which tells how Thor brings news to the wise woman Groa of the approaching return home of her husband Orvandill, since he, Thor, has brought him back from the land of the giants, in a basket. One of his toes had stuck out of the basket and got frozen, and Thor had broken it off and flung it against the sky, where it had stuck. Thus Orvandil has a place in mythology, he has to do with light, so Mr. Berger interprets, since even his toe sticking to the sky shines there permanently; he has been absent and lamented, but he comes back, and his return is an occasion of joy to Groa. Grimm says Groa is the growing, the grass-green, and is equivalent to Breide or Bertha, the shining one. Thus Orvandil is not exempted from the fate of most mythological heroes, which is to be interpreted as sun-myths or year-myths.

That however is going very far back; what the *spielmann* found to work upon was not a year-myth but undoubtedly a story about a personal hero called Orendel, and a heroine called Breide; they may originally have had to do with the seasons and the sun, but that stage of their career is long past, and the story the romance is founded on is one about a prince who went to seek a bride. So at least it appears at the beginning of the story; but as it goes on there are signs which appear to point to a different theme. Orendel is received by Breide, according to many expressions in this part of the romance, not as a new claimant for her hand, but as her rightful lord, come back after a long absence to free her from disagreeable suitors who have taken advantage of her lonely position. The story then which formed the basis would be something like that of Odysseus, a story of a long absent lord returning to his own. This is a point on which any one can judge for himself, even from the sketch of the romance here given. Up to this point we have as the sources of Orendel a popular *märchen*, derived it may be from a heroic myth, and with features added to it from various quarters. Grimm called Orendel a kind of Odysseus, and the reasons for this will be apparent to the reader; and Berger also traces in the tale the

influence of the Clementine Recognitions, the earliest Christian romance, which had a great diffusion in Europe in the early century, and in which there were many journeys and returns of friends. Whatever be thought of that, few readers will question that the motive furnished by the Crusades for the long travels of Orendel is not an original part of the tale, but super-added to it. Orendel's first request to his father on being invested with his sword, is that he may be provided with a wife; that would seem to be original, at least in comparison with what follows, the equipment and the beginning and progress of an expedition to the Holy Land. It was the Spielmann himself, little doubt of it, who made Breide Queen of Jerusalem, and turned the journey of Orendel to woo her or to deliver her, whichever it was, into a crusade. It is but a step further in the same direction if we put down to the spielmann's own account the introduction into the tale of the Holy Coat and of Orendel's connection with Trier. This as well as the crusade business very much spoil the story as a story, though of course for a Rhineland audience in the twelfth century, they added very greatly to its interest and made it most effective. But that the Holy Coat and all that it involves in the romance, were introduced into the tale with reference to ecclesiastical proceedings at Trier at the time, to furnish a popular account of the famous garment the cathedral there had lately been declared to possess, this no intelligent reader of the tale will doubt.

The addition of one incongruous element after another to a story originally simple, leads us, as might be expected, to the production of a piece stuffed full with inconsistencies and absurdities. It is but one more incongruity that after seeing the Holy Coat safely deposited at Trier, the motive of the tale being fully satisfied and the story virtually ended, all the persons should set out again on a further crusade. Nor has this unnecessary latter part the vigour and interest of the first.

On the whole, it must be judged that some admirable passages were present in some of the sources of Orendel, but that the spielmann who gave the whole its present form, was but a poor hand. In the first 150 lines which are his own and give

out the theme of the romance as he constructed it, he displays an almost incredible ignorance of the commonest Christian facts; but his Christian phrases are sprinkled all over the piece, and his readiness to resort to miracle is excessive. It is less for its intrinsic beauty or interest that his romance will be valued than for the illustration it affords of the way in which stories arose and were transmitted in the early ages of Europe. Orendel and his journeys and returns, to how many different uses has the theme been turned, how it has been altered and the older and the newer version then combined in one, what additions have been made to it, how it has been doctored out afresh as circumstances varied and brought forth as if it were new, to be the ornament of the new movement of each age. It is mainly in the hope that the tale, known perhaps to few in this country, may be welcome to the students of legend and story, that it is presented in this Review.

A work of 4000 lines could scarcely be reproduced entire in a Review; nor is that necessary. The writer has given translations of a few passages to show the tone and style, but has in the main contented himself with reporting the course of the narrative, not omitting any important point in it; and from what is thus given the reader will be able to judge for himself of the statements we have made by way of introduction. The pieces translated are given in smaller type. Berger's amended text is the source drawn from, but in some cases where there are various readings the writer has followed a reading which Berger rejects. The original has no division into chapters as the versions have, and in a report like this these are not needed.

Introduction.—The action of the piece begins at the knight-
ing of Orendel (line 155 in the original). Berger surmises that in the older story the hero got the coat along with the horse and shield given him at Jerusalem. The introduction is certainly inferior to the body of the romance. It begins as follows :

' Good was the time when the holy Christ was born ; but not less good the time when the Queen was born, the holy Mary ; and had not the holy Christ been born, then had many souls been lost. Ah ! Jesus, most dear Lord, depart from us no more ; fill us with thy grace to the end we may

consider who it is that hath given us our life. That the Creator of the world hath done. Now you will be pleased to hear why God fasted the forty days ; that did he for our sins, that Christendom might know that the sins we do throughout the year, the forty days take up into themselves.

Now will I begin myself and sing of the holy grey coat : it was wrought in truth of the wool of a fair white lamb, and that wool the noble and free lady span, the Queen Saint Mary. St. Helena herself * began to work it ; it was wrought and not sewed, and was wrought with care that the gory coat should never give way nor tear. It was wrought on Mount Olivete, where the Lord himself slept. When the grey coat was made, our Lord himself put it on his body, and in it he fasted forty days, with such great love did he seek to win us back from bitter hell ; and after he had redeemed us, the coat was to comfort King Orendel too.

‘ Now hear ye at this hour ; it was found in a German book how the poor miserable Judas was the betrayer of our Lord. The Jews then set to work and hung our Lord on the cross, and laid him deep in a grave. Now hear how an old Jew spoke : “ O judge, King Herod, pay me to-day my fee for all the service I have done you, these three and twenty years, complete. Rich and famous king, reward me this day for all that service, and give me the grey coat, the famous one, which the preacher of the Christians wore. I ask no more than this.” Then spake King Herod, that shall indeed be thy reward. And when the Jew heard it, he took up the grey coat and carried it off joyfully to a fair spring he knew of, and washed it with water from the spring and carried it out to the sun, and spread it on the earth to dry. Our Lord Jesus Christ ordained that his rosy blood should remain on the coat as if He had just suffered, and when King Herod saw that, he forbade the Jew ever to set his eyes on the coat or put it on. Then closed he the coat up tightly in a stone chest and bore it in a short time seventy-two miles to the sea, and cast it straightway to the bottom of the stormy sea, and said, “ Lie there grey coat, never, God knows, shalt thou be found again !” The waters set themselves, they came in floods, and broke up the chest in which the grey coat lay. Then it floated three long summer days and came to land at a desert place. It lay on the shore there, but an angel of God found it and buried it nine fathoms deep under the earth ; there the grey coat lay, and that is true, eight years complete, and in the ninth year it came to the surface again.

‘ Then came a poor pilgrim who was minded to go to the Holy Sepulchre, but with all his seeking he could find no sort of vessel, no sort of boat (of that you may be sure) ; his name was Tragemund. He knew 72 kingdoms, and now he was going to Cyprus-land, when he came to the seashore. There happily he found the grey coat which God wore in his passion, and with his snow-white hand he cleansed it from the sand. He spoke, “ Lord thou hast given me the coat, I will put it on my body and will peaceably

* Mother of the Emperor Constantine.

wear it, for the good of the man's soul who was drowned in it. Thou knowest well, Christ in heaven, that I have great need of it. He who puts his trust in God, he in truth builds well!" so spoke the wandering man. He washed the good grey coat in the waves of the stormy sea; but our Lord ordained that His rosy blood should stay fast in the grey coat just as on the day when He suffered. When the pilgrim saw this, he quickly began to speak, "Thou heavenly Lord, that must be Thy coat; Thou didst wear it Lord when Thou didst receive the thrust of the spear, which Thou didst bear for me and for the sake of all men, when Thou didst save us from bitter hell. It is not meet that I should have the coat nor that any sinner should wear it." So took he up the goodly coat, and cast it again into the sea-flood. Then came a fish, the whale it was called, and swallowed the coat down into his belly, and carried it, at that same hour down to the bottom of the stormy sea. He carried it in his belly, as I hear the Scripture say, this know ye—it is true—for eight years full told.

Now it says in the book; a town lies there on the Mosel, which is called Trier, and is well known. There sat a lord bold and strong, King Ougel* was his name. He was a right master and famous judge over 12 kingdoms which were all subject to him. This king had 3 sons to bring up; and one was brought up tenderly, young king Orendel was his name. He was rich and famous, and the Holy Sepulchre beyond the sea was subject to him and also the good land Jerusalem. Him the King brought up, that is well known, for full 13 years, and then he received his sword, truth do I speak.

On becoming a knight Orendel at once pays his devotions to the Queen of Heaven, and prays that he may be a good knight, and a protector of widows and orphans. He then asks his father to find a wife for him and promises to make her queen of thirteen kingdoms. His father knows no one worthy of him but Lady Breide, who lives far across the sea and to whom the Holy Sepulchre is subject; to win her Orendel must devote himself to the Sepulchre. Preparations for a crusade are at once begun; trees are felled to build seventy-two ships, which are built in three years. A summons to the expedition is answered by eight kings and a thousand dukes and earls, and after distributing to all of these their spurs, Orendel pushes out from shore and floats down the Mosel. At Coblenz on the Rhine the greatest number of the pilgrims came on board, and after sailing down the Rhine to the Welter See (North Sea), the ships are provisioned afresh and sail away.

* Also written 'Eigel.'

'For six weeks they sailed forward with songs ; then came a mighty wind and cast the pilgrim host into the wild Klebermeer,* and there they lay three years ; that is true, the horses and the people also, as the book tells us. The young man lay in sore distress ; he feared his death was near. Now bring counsel, all of you, how we are to get them moved on from there. Then did the Queen St. Mary take compassion on them, and spoke, Dear good Son, help King Orendel out of his straits ; do this, dear Son, good master, for the honour of Thy holy sepulchre, for the sake of which he set out. Then did our Lord work a sign for the honour of His mother Mary ; He sent a storm of wind which cast the pilgrim band out of the Klebermeer. And when they had escaped from it they shouted and sang ; they hoisted their sails ; their vessels went on an even keel ; then these lords went with great pomp in the direction of great Babylon. In Babylon sat two-and-seventy valiant Kings, and among them was a heathen king called Belian, who had done much evil to the Christians. To him a fisher spoke strange tidings : "A Christian man with a great army is coming sailing on the sea with two-and-seventy vessels." The King sent out far and wide in his land till he had mustered many a heathen man.'

These men are put on board pirate ships, and there is a battle, in which the Christians are completely successful. Continuing their voyage towards Jerusalem, they soon—

'Came so near that they could see the Holy Sepulchre. The young King Orendel lifted up his snow-white hands and said : Heavenly Father and Lord, help me this day from the wild sea. As soon as he had so spoken, the mighty winds were on him from both sides and hurried through the floods of the sea ; then were they ill at ease. The mighty billows of the sea smote the great army, and that same hour the two-and-seventy ships sank to the bottom.'

Orendel alone is saved ; the rocks tear his clothes, and alone and naked, like Odysseus—like him, too, by the special favour of the heavenly power—he gets to land. He bemoans his losses and his danger—

"Whoever finds me naked here will say I have escaped from a pirate ship, and am a robber and a thief, although I never loved to steal, nor, by God's grace, ever shall." Then he dug a hole in the sand ; with his own

* Klebermeer, a sea that draws vessels to it and holds them fast ; they cleave (Kleben) to it. Some regard the Klebermeer as a mythical fiction, some as a poetical expression for a long calm, others think it is a name for some particular part of the ocean from which vessels could not escape, e.g., the Syrtis.

hands he did it, poor forlorn man, lest God in his wrath should have forgotten him, and left him for a prey for the wild beasts of the field. There he lay in the sand full three days, and on the fourth morning, as he lay there in great trouble, he heard a splashing on the sea and saw a fisher going along in his boat.'

The fisher, on being appealed to, enquires all about him, just as Nestor does about Telemachus, and the Cyclops about Odysseus; asks if he has not escaped from a pirate, if he is not a thief, and threatens to hang him. Orendel remonstrates and gives himself out for a fisherman who has lost his nets and his companions. So 'the noble man was obliged to lie;' and he offers himself as the fisherman's servant. The fisherman takes him on board, but orders him to catch at once a boatload of fish, else he will be cast into the sea. Orendel prays to God in this extremity, confessing in his prayer that he knows nothing about fishing, and then casts the net into the sea in the name of the Trinity, with the desired result. It was St. Peter of Rome, very appropriately, who accomplished this for him. Master Ise, so the fisherman is called, is delighted with his new servant, and takes him at once to his house, which turns out to be a palace, for Master Ise has 800 fishers under him. His wife sees the arrival from one of the towers of the palace where she is standing, clothed in velvet and silk, with six of her attendants. The question of the naked man and the pirate ship is all gone over again to the satisfaction of all, and then comes an incident which gives the story a new turn. One of the newly caught fishes, 'it was called the whale,' was found to have the grey coat in his belly. Ise declares it must have belonged to a duke or an earl, and counts on getting five shillings of golden pennies for it. Orendel petitions for it, but is told he cannot have it without paying the price, and serves for six weeks, till the feast of St. Thomas is at hand. It is felt that the serving-man ought to have some raiment for the celebration of this festival; Ise proposes to buy him a coat, his wife agreeing to the expense. An under-vest and a sailor's cloak are got for him at a very cheap rate, and ox-leather shoes of large size; he, however, will not put them on, but stands naked beside the grey coat in the market and bewails his fate, saying

that he could have borne the loss of his ships and his comrades, but cannot bear the want of a suitable garment for the holiday. His prayer to God on this subject gains the attention of Mary, who pleads for him with her Son, and thirty gold pennies are sent to him by the hand of Gabriel from Paradise. The coat, he is told, is to render him invulnerable, and he is to fight in it with many pagan rulers. He goes to the market where the coat is exposed for sale, and bargains with his master, who asks for sixty pence. A miracle is wrought to help the hero's bargain; the coat, on being handled, tears, and is seen to be rotten, but on Orendel's getting it for his thirty pennies it is found to be in perfect condition, and to fit him exactly. Orendel is now seen to be a nobleman, and on his declaring his resolution to proceed to the Holy Sepulchre, Ise and his wife give him gifts, and acknowledge that they have not treated him as he deserved.

Orendel proceeds alone, but soon meets a giant, who seizes him and shuts him up in a dungeon. The heavenly aid formerly vouchsafed comes to him here again, and Gabriel sets him on the path that leads to the Holy Sepulchre. Four Templars are singing mass, but no one notices him; and his offering of himself, since he has nothing in his hand to offer, appears unrequited, till a knight finds him as he sits outside the wall of Jerusalem, and salutes him respectfully, giving him the name 'Grey-coat,' which cleaves to him henceforward. A great noise heard inside the wall is said to be due to the revels of the Templars who are amusing themselves and doing pleasure to Frau Breide, the queen of Jerusalem. Orendel's heart leaps high at hearing her name, still more on seeing her, as she stands among her maidens on the wall. The scene of a tourney opens, and a very spirited scene it is; Orendel approaches two heathen princes, Mercian and Soudan, who are playing chess, and asks them to lend him a horse and shield, to ride not more than three courses, for the sake of the Holy Sepulchre. Soudan speaks:—

“What nonsense is that you speak in presence of two kings? you perfect boor, I will pay you for your folly.” But Mercian said, “Dear Greycoat, we here care nothing for your God, we are two men unbaptised; but I will

not refuse you my horse and shield. But tell me, my bold knight, if you lose my horse and my green shield, what shall I have for it?" Then spake Greycoat, "I assure you, sir, and God is my witness, if I lose your horse and your green shield, you shall have me for your own servant."

Lord Mercian then sends a man to fetch his horse ;

'black was it as a raven, and three men could scarcely hold it.' When Lord Mercian saw it, he said, "Take it to a stone and mount it so, lest it should do you harm, for three of my servants has it killed." "May God forgive you the scoff," Greycoat said ;

and he soon gets the better of the horse, which is now as quiet as a lamb ; a saddle of ivory is brought him ; a spear of horn and ivory and steel, and all needful equipments. His ox-hide shoes are found to be too great for the stirrups, and he throws them away.

'God reward the shoemaker,' he said, 'that cut the soles so broad ; but why should I reproach him for it, when he knew not that a knight should wear them.'

But a pair of golden shoes is sent to him by Christ through the hands of Gabriel. Orendel, now perfectly equipped, impresses the heathen princes as a dangerous foe ; but Soudan undertakes to win his brother's horse and shield, and rides to meet the stranger.

'Greycoat, the hero, let Soudan thrust at him with his spear, as if he had been a wall, and then said, "God forgive you, my lord, your scoff ; I have a mind not to bear more of your thrusts. You shall now have one from me, such as I have had from you." With that he turned and rushed upon the pagan, and so pierced the bold knight with his cruel spear, that the thrust bore him a dead man to the ground.'

Two heathens come against him, then four, then twelve, then four and twenty, then twelve again of great strength and beauty, but they all met with the same fate, and Mercian takes to flight. The Lady Breide has been deeply impressed with what she has seen of the strange knight in the grey coat, but can get no one to go and question him for her ; so fierce has he shown himself to be. At last Knight Schildewin goes, and carries to Orendel an assurance from her that she is anxious to receive him. The messenger receives six horses for his fee, but brings back to Breide in Jerusalem an ambiguous answer.

The Templars send to Syria for a giant to destroy Orendel ; he rides on an elephant and is covered with jewels, and equipped with curious musical arrangements and appliances of magic. His spear is four fathoms long ; his name is Metwin. The fight is told with great spirit ; the giant wants to know why he has been sent for to fight with such a little man ; Orendel, clothed in nothing but his grey coat, advises him to go home and attend to bringing up his children. After a hot battle, giant and elephant are hurled to the earth, and the Syrians lift up their lamentation. Orendel makes some more jokes over his adversary's body, and there is a sale of the giant's equipments, which is well attended by all the gangrels of that part of the world, and leads to a great deal of drinking. A battle with twelve kings ensues, for which Orendel is specially protected and assisted at the instance of Mary ; Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael being all sent to help him. The next scene in which Orendel and Breide at length meet must be given in full :—

“ God greet thee,” she says, “ Greycoat ; I ought not to greet thee, God knows, for thou hast slain my man, who was to have guarded the Holy Sepulchre with me.” Greycoat : “ Not I, lady, God knows ; no Christian have I slain to day ; but your Pagan servant who ever did me wrong.” Breide : “ Now see here, fair youth ; kiss me thou true child of an Emperor. God's voice declares to me concerning Ougel's son. He departed from Trier with two and seventy ships but they sank every one ; no man of any kind was left alive but the young King himself ; and he is to be my lord, he is to be King over this land and over the good castle of Jerusalem. If you are the same, welcome are you ! ” Greycoat : “ I am not, lady, God knows ; I am a poor pilgrim, and have come for God's sake to the Holy Sepulchre.” These speeches made, she embraced the knight : but the pagan Mercian saw it, and how he then began to run ! When he saw her from far he spoke an angry word ; “ How now lady Breide, most beautiful of women ; is it well done that you should be kissing my servant ? ” She answered him right soon ! “ How now proud lord ! seldom surely was it seen that a servant acquitted himself so well.” Then spoke Greycoat : “ It is not true, lady, by God ; I never saw him till this morning, when he lent me this horse. I never thought to be his servant, nor any man's on earth ; but only God's and Mary's, his royal mother.”

Mercian is naturally not delighted with this speech, and Greycoat has to knock him down, a service for which Lady

Breide thanks him cordially. Mercian is laid in chains, but Greycoat, in the generous spirit which rules in these Oriental affairs, begs him off, presents him with his horse and shield again, and lets him go free, and he rides off through the garden of Abraham to a land called the Wilderness of Shalim. Greycoat is now welcomed to the palace, and treated according to his deservings, but his period of rest has only lasted a fortnight when a giant called Liberian appears under the walls of Jerusalem from the Wilderness of Shalung, and demands the surrender of the hero, else the Holy Sepulchre will be burned up, and all the Christians about it put to the sword. Lady Breide and he resolve to give battle; he is equipped with a fine horse and an ivory saddle, puts on his grey coat, as he is determined to die in it, if he is to die, and then asks for a sword. What takes place about the sword is somewhat remarkable. Lady Breide summons her Chamberlain, and thus addresses him :

“Hear, Sir Knight, I require the sword of my father David : and as you love your life see you do not deceive me. He caused to be brought a chest which he opened with three keys ; but it profited him little. He took out of the chest a sword which shone like a mirror and gave it to Lady Breide’s hand. Against a stone wall she struck it, and it broke into three pieces. One of them she struck over his back, then seized him by the hair and kicked him with her feet. Loud cried the worthy Knight, “Enough, fair maid ; now let me go now beauteous queen, and I will shew you my lord’s sword.” Then spake lady Breide, fairest of all women, “That shalt thou do forsooth, before I give up my hold.” Then shows he her how it lies a man’s length under the ground, and straight she goes where she knew the good sword was. In a sheath of gold he swore it was, and sharp as well as broad, and would not turn for either steel or iron. The sword being unsheathed, Breide presents it to Greycoat, saying “Here take this good sword in thy hand, and keep it carefully : the blessing of St. Brandan* goes with it, and never any wore it who did not conquer.”

She completes his equipment and puts on his head the crown her father David wore when fighting his battles. He then leaves Jerusalem alone, the gates being locked behind him, and is confronted by fourteen thousand pagans. The three arch-

* Another reading is Bangraz (Pancras).

angels come to fight along with him, and assure him that if he falls, God will at once take him to heaven. He at once goes to the Jordan and there fights with the giant Liberian, whom he quickly overcomes. After defeating the champion he turns his attention to the pagan army, and the sword of David does such valiant service that he defeats a division of that force each day; the first is simply put to flight, the second is driven into the Weterish Sea (Mediterranean), the third with the Pagan Mercian at its head into the Klebermeer, and the fourth into a dark forest. The wives and maidens of heathendom set up a general mourning; and Greycoat having completed the defeat of the fourteen thousand pagans, returns honourably to Jerusalem.

Breide has been praying for him before the Holy Sepulchre, and on hearing of his victorious approach, goes to meet him, and declares that he must be her lord and reign over the land and fortress of Jerusalem. He says she must wait till a king comes for her hand; but she treats him as a king, decking him with splendid robes and setting on his head the crown King David wore on his marriage-day. A feast takes place, and in the evening the two retire together to their chamber. An angel however announces to Greycoat that he is not to approach Breide till nine years have elapsed; such is God's command. He therefore lays his sword on the bed between her and himself; she asks if this is the custom of his country, and on being told the state of the case, says the precaution is quite unnecessary; for ten years she can quite well remain a virgin.

Still another giant comes from the wilderness, his name is Pelian, and he is at the head of ten thousand men. Matters proceed very much as in the case of Liberian; as to defiances and preparation there is a good deal of repetition; new incidents are that the Templars are summoned for council, that the hero hears mass as if he were about to die, and that the lords scoff at his grey coat, which makes him look like a man just escaped from a cloister. On this occasion, after Orendel has set out, Breide herself dons armour and takes the field; the seven gifts of the Saviour (whatever these

mean here, which seems uncertain) show her the way to Jordan; she cuts her way through the ranks of the enemies to her hero's side, and finds him not injured, only in want of a fresh horse, which she quickly provides for him by slaying its rider. They then fight side by side to the speedy discomfiture of the Saracens, and the Templars standing on the walls of Jerusalem see them return together. Gerycoat can now no longer conceal his name from Breide, she greets him as Orendel, and the Templars receive him by his own name and pay him deep respect.

The narrative now takes a fresh turn by the appearance at Court of Master Ise, the fisherman and noble, who comes to look for his lost servant. He is kindly received by Orendel, but referred to Breide for the object of his journey; and she, on hearing what it means, gives him a shield full of gold to renounce his claim on Orendel. The latter also gives him a handsome cloak for his wife, and he goes home well contented. His wife too consents that Orendel should be left reigning over Jerusalem at Breide's side instead of being brought back to his fishing. Here the motive seems suddenly to change, as what follows does not agree well with what has gone before, and indeed the whole Ise episode is full of confusion, as if several Ise legends had got mixed up together. Orendel goes to Breide, and confesses to her that he is a fisherman's servant, and that duty calls him to his master. She dissuades him from such a sacrifice, and at her suggestion Ise is called to court instead. He is warmly received, as if he had never been there before, and is made a Duke of the Holy Sepulchre. The arming of him is described at length, and he at once begins to fight valiantly against the Saracens.

To another land now turns the tale. Ise gets up an expedition which brings him with Greycoat and their army to the castle of Westphal,* which they besiege three years. Greycoat, incautiously going too near to the wall, is caught by a hook, hoisted inside and lodged in a dungeon far underground. 'Now advise with me,' the poet says, 'as well as you can how

* The geographical confusion here is of a high order.

we are to get him away from there.' Ise sends word of what has happened to Breide at Jerusalem, and her utterances on this occasion are too original not to quote.

'When she saw the letter, then fell she to weeping, and said, "Alas! thou Lord of heaven, preserve my famous knight, who is so truly to assist me; else will I lay low thine altar and break thy sanctuary; thou holy sepulchre of our Lord, I will bring thee never a sacrifice again."

A baptised heathen hearing her, remonstrates against such sentiments, and bids her think that God can bring her knight to her again from whichever of the two and seventy lands may hold him captive. A levy takes place, and after two days riding Breide reaches the castle of Westphal with her army. There they lie half a year and two days, and there is no prospect of taking the fortress. But a dwarf, named Alban, comes to her as she sleeps in the morning, and promises to help her. She goes with him: but in the large room to which he leads her, he makes very improper advances. The queen is, however, very capable of defending herself, gets hold of his hair and kicks him, as she did the steward in the matter of her royal father's sword, and does not relax her hold of his locks till he has led her under two hollow mountains to a dark dungeon, where a candle being lit, Breide and Orendel see each other, and fall into transports of joy. But the dwarf is mindful of revenge; while the hero and heroine are weeping on each other's necks, he slips out of the dungeon and locks the door; then proceeding in safety, before he leaves them locked up, to express his views on her treatment of him. The dwarf is not, however, to have it all his own way. On turning to go he is met by an angel, an angel with a scourge, who first gives him a good beating, and then makes him go back and unlock the door. Orendel forgives him, which in the circumstances he could well afford to do, and leads Breide out to the camp, where there is a happy meeting with Ise. A successful assault on the fortress takes place; thirteen heathen kings are taken, and proceed along with the Christian force against seven more heathen kings in Mount Elias (wherever that may be), and these, in their turn, join in an expedition against seventy-two kings in the wilderness of Babylonia. The

former twenty kings kept the oaths of fealty they were obliged to swear, but the seventy-two latter kings broke their oaths. The Christian forces return to Jerusalem, but in a short time an ambassador, called Daniel, comes from the kings in Babylonia, requiring Orendel to be their man, and to rule over the territory extending from Acre to the Jordan as their tributary, else they will come at once to fight him. All the answer Orendel gives to this message is comprised in two violent buffets he bestows on the person of the ambassador, who then faithfully repeats this answer on the person of those who sent him. 'These are the letters I got for you,' says he. Then follows a war with the Babylonian kings, told in the same way, and largely in the same words as the two which have preceded; and in the end the kings make their submission.

'Then spake Greycoat: "God be praised for it! If they are minded to become Christians, gladly will I help them in that." Then he sent and caused priests to come at once, to baptise the pagans into the true creed. Then they baptised all who were there, whether they liked it or not, they had all to become Christians.'

As he lies in bed at night after these proceedings, Orendel receives a heavenly visitor, who informs him that 13 heathen kings, 16 earls and 12 dukes are besieging Trier, and that his father is in imminent danger. Ise is to be left in charge of the Holy Sepulchre, but pleads to be taken on the voyage to Trier, and two lately converted heathen dukes are left instead. In the 6th week of the voyage home 22 ships are met which are thought at first to be full of heathen, but turn out to be under the command of Ise's sons, Mersilian and Stephan, who hearing that their father has become a duke at the Holy Sepulchre are bringing a force of 30,000 men to assist him. All the ships are brought to anchor side by side and there is a good time which lasts three days. After this there is a buying of horses on shore from two dukes, Warmund and Berwine, who have a large stud running about wild. The wild horses stood still to be shod as if they had been tame. This we are told was at Bari. Here they go on shore to complete their journey by land, pass through Apulia, cross the Tiber, pass through Rome and through all the Welsh country (here Italy) till they

reach Metz, and then Trier. Here no fighting takes place, on the contrary, the heathens apparently overawed by the fame of Orendel and Breide, apply to be baptized, and the conversion scene quoted above is here repeated. And now we might expect repose; but the crusaders it appears cannot rest long in the fatherland. Only a fortnight do they stay there, when Breide has a dream that the sepulchre is again in the hands of the infidels, and this causes them to resolve on another journey to it. But here the purpose of the work, as the spielmann intended it, appears. An angel looks into Orendel's eyes just as he has spoken of departure, and says :—

‘ Hearest thou King Orendel, our God and His Mother have sent to thee to say thou must not take the grey coat with thee again but must leave it here, in the town of Trier. There God is minded to hold His judgment on the last day; and at that hour He means to point to His five sacred wounds which He got at the hands of women and of men. That will be in the vale of Jehosaphat when He is judge over all. So he sent at once and caused those priests to come and they shut up the grey coat firmly in a stone chest, and he commended it aloud to his father and to Trier, and then the hero went away.’

Here the tale might well end; and here, it may be held, the earlier and better poet left it. But as Ulysses has often been forced to set sail again from Ithaca, after the most perfect completion of his fortunes, so must Orendel too set forth. His father and mother go with him too, and Ise with his sons; all must share the merit of the crusade and none be left behind. The route by Rome, Apulia and Bari is retraced; but this time it is Breide who falls into the hands of infidels and is shut up in a dungeon; she has gone forward in the dress of a pilgrim to see if the disastrous tidings they have heard about Jerusalem are true, and she falls into the hands of the kings of Babylonia: one of them is bent on making her his wife; another undertakes by cruel usage to reduce her to willingness to do so. When that has taken place they say, there is to be an expedition to Trier, Greycoat is to be hanged, and Ise to have his eyes put out. Of this news is brought to Ise and Greycoat by a pilgrim who has escaped from heathen bonds and gives a lamentable account of matters up the country.

The Holy Sepulchre is surrounded by seventy-two idols which all are compelled to worship; and Breide is captive. The party then hoist sail and traverse in a short time a distance of seven hundred miles, which brings them to a place where the fleet can lie concealed while Greycoat and Ise proceed over the deserts of Babylon to the castle of Meinold, Breide's inconsiderate suitor. The plans for her marriage and for the subsequent inroad into Germany are just being served up to her again, and the heroes, as they arrive, hear what is in reserve for them, and tell each other what they think of it. The Pagans here go off the scene for their several abodes, as it is evening. Ise and Greycoat alone are left, with an old warder, or head of the city guard, who is seen from his devotion to be a Christian. They tell him they are escaped prisoners; he makes known to them all that is going on in the place, and urges them to send for Greycoat to save Breide. He also entertains them very handsomely in his own house, and is rewarded with the discovery that one of them, Ise, is his only sister's child, and the other that Greycoat, whose coming he has so much desired. In the morning the porter, now known as Duke Achilles, goes to King Meinold with a request to be allowed to go to the Holy Sepulchre, the others following at his heels, and entering the King's room as if to be presented to him. The King declares them to be the persons they really are; but there is some uncertainty, and Breide is to be brought to see if she will identify them. She gets a secret signal and declares she never saw them in her life; but betrays herself by begging that they may be spared. When he sees that the murder is out, Greycoat snatches down arms from the wall and takes possession of the door; the King makes for a tower, the Christians follow him, and there they are besieged by seventy-two thousand heathens, their own followers not knowing anything about them. Queen Mary however helps them; a dove is sent with a letter to the Christian army; it arrives while the priest is singing mass and drops the letter on the altar.

'The priest opened the letter, and that mass was never finished; "a thing that never happened before, and will never perhaps be again. Though a priest saw the cathedral in flames he would sing his mass to the end; but so did not this priest."'

The army is on the march at once, and accomplishes in two days a seven days march through the desert of Babylonia. For two days the fighting goes on; the principal personages all the time shut up in the tower and keeping hold of King Meinold there. A heavenly voice then calls for Orendel, and leaving Breide at the door to cut off Meinold's head should he try to escape, he makes short work of the fighting, and at once presents to king and people the alternatives of turning Christian or losing their lives. The kings are all killed; the Christians have a period of feasting in the fortress, and then set out to return to Acre, first by land and then by sea. Arrived there Lady Breide starts for Jerusalem alone; but she is recognised as a Christian by her devotions at the sepulchre, and being taken and challenged, shows herself as the warlike lady she is, and captures Jerusalem with little bloodshed, she herself alone. Orendel and his army are sent for to take possession of her conquest, and Christian rule is set up in Jerusalem once more.

And now the adventures are all over, there is nothing left for them to do, and the end may come. It is not to come, however, in any ordinary or earthly way. An angel announces to Orendel, this time also in what might have been the bridal chamber, that he and Breide are to remain virgin to the end; and that in a year and two days God is to send for them and bring them straight to the kingdom of heaven. The same fate was in store for Ise the Duke, so renowned and wise, and for Achilles, who, for God's sake, had served the holy sepulchre. On the appointed day, the angel came and carried these four souls at once to God, to the fair kingdom of heaven.

ART. VII.—THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL HISTORY OF EUROPE.

The Second Rhind Lecture, 1891.

HAVING touched lightly the nature of the agents which may be supposed to influence and alter the physical aspect of mankind, let us now enquire what are the opinions

of anthropologists as to their actual potency. These opinions differ very widely. I will indicate what may be considered the extreme views, both held by men of light and leading. Thus, Kollmann of Basel expresses himself to the following effect:—

‘ Many observations have been made use of as indications of a power in external influences, slow in action indeed but undeniable; and some have ascribed very great scope to the variability of European types since their appearance at the diluvial period until now. It is, however, questionable whether any kind of modifying changes in the typical peculiarities of the skeleton, or the more prominent bodily features, have really occurred. Their race-characters were in my belief already so settled and confirmed when the European races first arrived here, that they remain constant under the most powerful modifying agencies, and that the whole period which has since elapsed has not been sufficient to produce even moderate changes.’

The very considerable differences in physical aspect which we daily observe within the limits of a single nationality are due, in his opinion, to mixture of blood, the actual limits of variation in a pure race being comparatively narrow. He recognizes five separate race-types in Europe, which he discriminates according to the relative lengths and breadths of head and face.* Thus one has a long head and a narrow face: this type preponderated greatly in the ancient Germans, and specimens of it are very common in the British Isles. Another has a long head but a broad face, narrow orbits, and a dysharmonic type: this was the old Cro-magnon race of the caves of Perigord, in France. The broad-headed long-faced type is nowadays the prevailing one in the Tyrol and in Bavaria proper. The type with both broad head and broad face prevails among the Lapps and in the Caucasus; and wherever Mongoloid tribes have settled in force, as in parts of Eastern Europe. The

* It may as well be noted here that Anders Retzius, who first divided mankind into longheads and shortheads, dolichocephals and brachycephals, put the limit of the two at a breadth equal to 80 per cent. of the length. Nowadays, those with ratios between 75 and 80 are reckoned as intermediate, those beyond 85 are called hyperbrachycephals, and so forth. The distinction of long and short faces is made on a similar principle, i.e., it depends on the relative, not the absolute, length and breadth of the face.

mesokephalic (shall we say middle-headed, or having skulls of medium breadth?) with a broad face, occurred among the prehistoric peoples: the well known skull from the Judge's Cave at Gibraltar may have belonged to it: in the historic period it was common among the Helvetii, and at the present day among the Franconian and Thuringian Germans. But what Kollmann chiefly insists on is, that all these types occurred in Europe at early periods, that even then, every community, so far as we can judge, included representatives of several or all of them, and that such is the case still, the types intertwining like the strands of a rope, but seldom, or with the utmost slowness, mingling like the waters of so many rivers.

De Quatrefages says, 'The companions of the Mammoth and Reindeer have not disappeared, they are still among us.' Of that I entertain no doubt: I have myself, once and again, encountered in the flesh the man of Neanderthal; but Kollmann goes further: he says, 'The European in all his varieties or races is ready and fit for anything, whenever we drag his bones to the daylight from under the earth-crust; he was ready when he kept company with the Mammoth. He had nothing inferior, neither in the build of his braincase, nor in the formation of his face, in itself, but was "*homo sapiens*" in his best form already in the diluvium, then again in the Reindeertide, and in the pile-dwellings. If we are ever to find out anything about the differentiation of man into sub-species and races, we must go much further back, perhaps into the Miocene age.'

Let me here say, parenthetically, of Kollmann's five types, that though there is much to be said in their favour, they appear to me somewhat too arbitrary in their limitations, and too few in number. Thus we have in Britain, for example, two varieties of his leptoprosopic dolichocephalic (long-headed and long-faced) type, discriminated in several points, and particularly, as a rule, in colour: the one is of Anglo-Saxon, the other probably of Iberian origin. Of the colour of prehistoric races we can unfortunately know nothing, except by inference; even of that of early historic ones but little; for hair, though one of the least destructible of animal tissues, is liable, under some

circumstances, to post-mortem changes of colour. But as to its importance in classification, let us hear Deniker, a great authority in that department. 'On the whole, if it seems to us that the measurements of different parts of the body constitute very good characters of the second and third order, we believe we are in the right in maintaining that the characters of the primary divisions (of mankind) ought to be drawn from the nature of the hair and from the colour of the skin.'

To return! Schaaffhausen, differing from Kollmann, enumerates the various marks of inferiority, the various reminders of simian anatomical features, which he finds among the skulls of primeval men, and more than one of which are apt to be found combined in the early long-headed races. Among these are the receding forehead with swollen eyebrow ridges, as in the Neanderthal and Spy and Brûx men, and the underjaw wanting in chin, as in the La Naulette specimen. 'With a receding forehead are generally associated,' he says, 'a prominent muzzle, large teeth, high-placed temporal lines, strong occipital ridges, simple sutures, small cranial capacity. In primitive longheads the temporal squama or scale often reaches to the frontal, instead of being separated by the wing of the sphenoid bone; and this often occurs also in African negroes, in Australians, Peruvians, and Mongols; it occurs also in anthropoid apes, except in oranges. Or sometimes, though it does not reach so far, yet it is long and low.' Other low characters are, says Schaaffhausen, a short sagittal suture, a narrow flat frontal: so too the occipital scale standing out like a bowl from the back of the head, and the prominent parietal bosses, for these are remains of childish forms. (The bowl-like protuberance, as we shall see, is very characteristic of the Alemannic conquerors of Swabia and Switzerland). Retzius thought, it is true, that the projecting occiput, being a result of greater development of the posterior lobe, indicated a noble or advanced type; but this Schaaffhausen disputes. Having the greatest breadth in the parietal region is a low feature: this is found in the famous skull of Engis, as well as in Australians. Malay skulls, which belong to a low form of short-head, have also the greatest breadth near the parietal

bosses. A long flat extending from below these bosses to the temples ranks low; he means here, apparently, flatness of the temporo-frontal region, which is very general among the Gael, whether Irish or Scottish, and was common among Romano-Britons, but much less so among the Saxon English and Scandinavians.

Add to these, flatness of the floor of the nostrils, flat nasal bones,* large molar teeth, elliptic palate, small occipital tuberosity (for the tuberosity has to do with the erect position). Simplicity of sutures, and early closing thereof, go with low organization: this simplicity was commoner among fossil dogs than among modern house dogs, and it is found in several of the prehistoric long skulls, as those of Engis and Nieder-Ingelheim, and in the *Batavus Genuinus* of Blumenbach.

Schaaffhausen thinks, moreover, that the temporal muscles and indeed the other cephalic muscles, all work towards lengthening of the skull; and large temporal muscles go with the use of the coarse food of the savage life. Finally, he says that though in some cases the skull may grow large and broad simply from want of lime, the head does acquire that last increase of size and development which corresponds to increase of intelligence, through an enlargement in breadth. Against this I should be disposed to make use of the fact that adult heads are relatively to their length narrower than those of children; but perhaps Schaaffhausen would account for that by muscular action. I will here simply mention some varieties in other parts of the skeleton, which occur frequently or usually in some ancient races, whereas they are now rare. Such are the pilaster-, or columnar-femur, the flattened tibia (platyknesia), the perforation of the lower humerus, forms whose utility has apparently ceased, but which are not necessarily to be called low.

To sum up this view of the transformation question, 'Der Mensch,' says Buschan, reviewing Schaaffhausen, 'ist nichts weniger als ein Dauertypus.' Man is in nowise an unchangeable entity.

* I think most ancient skulls had good and prominent noses; but the nasal bones are seldom cognizable.

Before proceeding to divide Europe into great historical provinces, on a basis partly political, partly ethnological, it may be well to give a brief sketch of its general anthropological history, especially of that portion of such history as was prior to the formation of the present divisions and nations.

Our knowledge of this is more advanced as regards the west and south-west, partly because in the quaternary period the north and east were not inhabited, partly because civilization is more advanced and science more cultivated in the west and north-west; and as France, Belgium, and portions of the countries lying next to the east of them, combine both these advantages, it is here that anthropological history may be said to begin, and here only that plausible attempts have been made to minutely subdivide the prehistoric periods, in accordance with their archæological products.

The general result may be thus stated: The oldest human forms that have been found and located geographically, or rather palæontologically, with some approach to certitude, are longheaded—dolichocephalic, and that very distinctly. And we may go so far as to say that all, or almost all the crania may be distributed under two types, though whether we are entitled to say *two races* is not yet quite clear: the French say so, but Virchow is doubtful. The first of these is the Canstatt type, so called from the place where the first specimen was discovered; though the Neanderthal skull is a much better known example. It is long rather than narrow, deficient in height, with thick bones, huge frowning brows, low forehead and prominent occiput, protruding in the form which the German anatomists call *kügelig* (like a bowl). Some very low-type chinless lower jaws have been ascribed to this type; but the attribution is not always clear: in the modern skulls which have been supposed to reproduce the type the chin is often strong and prominent. Most of these skulls have been found in caves in the mountain limestone; and it may be suggested, that some of their peculiarities may have been connected with too great a supply of calcareous salts, whence perhaps the premature closing (synostosis) of the sagittal

suture and the enormous development of the bony browridges.*

The other long type is that called the Cro-magnon. Here also the head is a long, narrow relatively rather than absolutely, moderate in height; the capacity is often large compared with modern averages; the forehead is well developed, but the browridges not so large as in the Canstatt type. The occiput is large and capacious, but has not the marked protuberance just now described. The orbits are squarely formed and low; so that the eyes were probably narrow, (as in many Irishmen), of medium breadth (mesorbine). The limbs were robust; but the femur and tibia exhibit the pilastral and platyknic forms. These men may have been savages; but they were capable savages, at least. The frontal development is distinctively better than in the Canstatt types.

There are probably other quaternary skull forms yet to be discovered. In fact Professor Testut of Lyons has just given us an elaborate memoir on one such, recently discovered at Chancelade. It belonged to a man of small stature, but it is large and long, differs decidedly from either the Canstatt or the Cro-magnon form, and seems to resemble the well-known Eskimo variety. You may be aware that our own Boyd-Dawkins published, years ago, his conjecture that the Eskimos, or a branch of them, had once dwelt in north-western Europe.

There are those who think there was a chasm, an absolute hiatus, between these palæolithic people and those who followed them; that the former perished utterly or wandered away before the neolithic folk arrived, bringing with them the beginnings of civilisation. I don't think any one on the continent now holds that view. Huxley, I see, lately pronounced against it, though not very strongly. For myself, I am not a geologist, and perhaps cannot appreciate the evidence from that side; but I *know* that these old types are represented among us at the present day, and I *believe* it is by right of heredity. St. Mansuy of Toul, and Kai Lykke, a famous Danish noble, belonged to that of Canstatt, and so, it is said,

* Barnard Davis ascribed most of the peculiarities of the Neanderthal skull to premature synostosis.

did King Robert Bruce, though he had good brains as well as thews and sinews.* I have seen in the flesh, as I said just now, more than one exquisite example of it; and of the Cromagnon I have seen a great many, without having gone so far as the Canary Islands to look for them.

‘Nor need we blush,’ said the noble Broca, ‘to own for ancestors those rude quaternary hunters who knew how to conquer animals more terrible and more real than the monsters combated by Hercules, and who, first in the world, long before the Assyrians and the Egyptians, lit the torch of art. They knew not electricity nor steam; they were not armed with metallic weapons and with gunpowder; but, weak as they were, and with weapons of stone only, they sustained against nature a struggle that was not without grandeur; and the progress which they realised at the cost of such efforts, prepared the soil on which civilization was to grow.’

These were the two races, if two they were, to which the great majority of quaternary crania may be referred, and it seems hardly likely, now, that this conclusion will be disturbed, that longheads constituted the chief population of Western Europe in those times. Still, the broadheads, the brachycephals, were not unrepresented, at least in the latter part of the period. The palæolithic antiquity of a strongly brachycephalic skull found at Nagy Szap in Hungary, is said to be unimpeachable; and in Belgium, in the reindeer period, those found by Dupont in the neighbourhood of Furfooz are at least on the confines of brachycephaly, and in other respects are of an entirely different type to any of the quaternary long skulls. In Germany too, brachycephalic skulls are said to have been dug out of the loess.

With the period of recency in geology, and that of polished stone in archæology, we gain a great access of light, and in some countries an abundance of material. Whereas the two principal long-headed types had been scattered here and there, apparently dove-tailing with each other, we now find a

* The skull of Bruce has prominent brows and a receding forehead, but its breadth does not consist with the Canstatt type.

central type apparently derived from the Cro-magnon, though softened in its more striking characteristics, predominating in France, probably in Spain, and certainly in Britain, where the principal occupants of the longbarrows nearly always display it. Another, having a relation to that of Canstatt, seems to abound in the more northern countries, in Germany and Sweden and through all the great plain of northern and eastern-central Europe. The brachycephals, whether or not they have received an accession from the east, whether or not it is they who have now brought our domestic animals and cultivated plants from Asia, are certainly much more in evidence; in central France they have contests with the indigenous longheads, over whom they seem to prevail: there and in Italy they mix with their predecessors; and one may find in one grave skulls with breadth-indices from little over 70 to nearly 90, a thing hardly conceivable in the same race unless from the intervention of disease. In the dolmens of France, in the pile-works or lake villages of Switzerland, in the caves of higher Belgium, in the kitchen-middens and tumuli of Scandinavia, in the Hünnebetten or Giant's Graves of Germany, we find the same admixture, but never in England. Here in Scotland, too, as Sir Daniel Wilson pointed out, the form of long skull, which he called boat-shaped, prevailed pretty exclusively, while the few Irish skulls which may belong to the period are also long, and have the modern Hibernian aspect.

The introduction of Bronze into Europe does not appear to have been accompanied by that of any new element of population, at all events not on a large scale. The Phœnicians probably settled in small numbers on the coasts where they traded, for example in Sardinia; but except in Cornwall, where I am inclined to think their type occasionally crops up, it is difficult to distinguish any influence they may have had from that of the later Saracens. The Etruscans had their own skull type, in my opinion more Semitic than aught else; but its influence was of course limited to a small area, and belonged rather to a later period. The one country where the age of bronze seems really to have been ushered in by a new race is

our own, where barrows or interments that yield objects of bronze, alone or with flint, may be reckoned on, where the bodies have not been cremated, to yield also short broad skulls of a pretty uniform type, almost identical with those which are found, though not exclusively, in certain stone-age interments in Denmark.

When we were children, ancient history was presented to us in a very compendious form, that of a succession of Empires pictured in the Book of the Prophet Daniel. And the history of Europe since the Bronze Age might similarly be portrayed as that of the successive swarmings of so many different races, some already domiciled within its bounds, others having their centre of dispersion outside.

Thus first the Phœnicians—‘the first that ever burst into the Middle Sea’—explored the coasts, and even settled here and there in small trading colonies, and by the mere contact of commerce and eastern civilization supplied a motive power to break up the existing equilibrium. The subsequent beginnings of the abortive Carthaginian empire were a further development of Phœnician enterprise, but from what we know of their mode of warfare, their employment of mercenaries, etc., it is not likely that much of their blood was left to run in the veins even of the Sicilians and Sardinians, where, if anywhere, we should seek it. Collignon says he cannot find it in Tunis.

Next come the palmy days of the Greeks, even then a mingled strain, of which the ruling element seems to have been longheaded and largely blond, while the subordinate ones may have been dark. I do not quite hold with Ingoldsby—

‘These well-booted Greeks,
Their Egyptian descent was a question of weeks.’

but think it likely that the intercourse between Greece and Egypt was not wholly one-sided. An Illyrian element is certain; a Turanian one probable.

The Greeks appear to have been, in their best days, an extremely prolific race, so much so that they were able within a moderate number of generations to Hellenise the coasts of Sicily and Lower Italy (*Magna Græcia*) as well as the Ionian

and neighbouring coasts of Asia, and those of Cyrene and of the Cimmerian Bosphorus.

Of the spread of the Kelts we know very much less : in the first place we hardly know how to call the wandering mercenary warriors who were the terror of the civilized south ; I just now said 'Kelts,' but will amend the word, and say 'Gauls' instead. For at some period unknown the blond longheads of the north-east would seem to have avenged their long-headed brethren, the men of Cro-magnon and the cavern of L'Homme Mort, and their descendants, by conquering in turn their brachycephalic conquerors. And whereas for a great many centuries the descendants of these brachycephali are known to have been brown of hair and skin, and whereas the Romans describe as blond the Gallic invaders of Italy and even of Galatia ; it is perhaps easiest to suppose that they described the military aristocracy or caste, and that these, in distant migrations at least, did not encumber themselves largely with an accompaniment of serfs. Anyhow, the skulls found at the celebrated station of Hallstadt in Southern Austria, the rich concomitants of which are generally believed to indicate a Keltic civilization, and to date from many centuries before Christ,—these skulls are long and might be Galatic, Belgic, or even Germanic, say some German authorities. Further down the Danube we find, in Alexander the Great's time, for example, tribes said to be Gaulish and bearing Keltic names, as the Skordiski and Tauriski ; and some other tall red-haired warriors further to the north-east, such as the Bastarnæ, though probably German, may have been Galatic. To use an argument frequently employed about the Aryan question, it seems much more easy to derive the Skordiski and their neighbours from Gaul than the Gauls from them ; and then the universal consent of the old historians went that way.

The next great power to rise on the ruins of the Etruscan and Carthaginian, and Greek and Gallic, was of course the Roman. I have only to do with the results on physical anthropology, of its conquests and colonisations, but these were no doubt great. The Romans seem to have multiplied enormously during the growth of their power, much as the

Greeks had done at the same stage; moreover, their veteran armies, which were employed for colonisation, so far as they were not Roman were at least Italian, until the culmination of their power. The rule is that an anthropological type once in possession of the ground is never wholly dispossessed or extirpated. 'They beheaded,' said to me the great Broca, 'a score or two of the leading men, and called it exterminating a tribe.' Still, Cæsar gives us to understand (and he was a more humane conqueror than some of them) that he did his worst towards the destruction of some tribes. Thus, he says, he sold into slavery the whole survivors of the Veneti; but probably many of these enslaved people would be purchased and retained by the new possessors of the lands; besides, most countries have about them a little of the quality of Lorne, which the Highland freebooter found was 'as ill to harry as it was to pike a sheep's neck;' and there is reason to think there are still Veneti in Morbihan.*

The most important piece of evidence, wherewith I am acquainted, to the permanence of Latin colonisation is the following. The Romans are said by Livy to have transported 40,000 Ligurians, with their families, into the vacant tracts of Samnium, and to have filled up their places with colonists. Now, the Ligurians are believed, mainly on the authority and evidence of Nicolucci, to have been strongly brachycephalic, as the Piedmontese are to this day; whereas the Romans were mesocephalic as a rule, with indices of breadth below 80, and the modern Roman skulls are just what the old ones were.

But the modern inhabitants of the Ligurian coast, from Savona to Lucca, are mesocephalic, and have narrower heads than any other people in Northern Italy, as Ridolfo Livi has shewn. I can see two other possible explanations of this fact, but the one I have suggested (colonization from Southern or Middle Italy) seems the easiest.

The frequently dark complexions of the inhabitants of the old Roman cities on the Rhine may possibly be derived partly from old Italian colonisation. In the later ages of the Roman

* Topinard's statistics of colour point that way.

power, when the soldiery were gathered from all the subject nations fit for service, colonisation meant the mixing of one nationality with another on a very small scale. Minute enquiry might very probably, in some instances, detect permanent results, but I am not aware of any; and where the change was a violent one in respect of climate, such as that from Mauritania or Dalmatia to Britain, the descendants of the colonists may have gradually dwindled away.

The next race to rise into importance was the Teutonic; and its migrations, when it had once begun to overcome the resistance of the Roman Empire, were on an enormous scale, well deserving the name the Germans give to them—the Wandering of the Peoples. Here, again, the pressure of an increasing population had something to do with the movement, yet not everything, for many of the tribes appear to have abandoned their previous territories *en masse*;* but Germany was not at that time able to support a very large population. The net result of all the struggles of the fifth and sixth century was greatly to abridge the area occupied by the German language and, probably, the area in which the German physical type, the Graverow type, preponderated. More was abandoned on the east than was gained in the west and south. The Franks were comparatively few in number and spread over a large area peopled by subject aliens; the same was the case with the Visigoths and Lombards: the Burgundians may have been a little more numerous in proportion to their subjects; but they were content with one-third of the land, which may fairly be taken as proof that the Galloromans very largely outnumbered them. In the result the Burgundians soon lost their language; their well defined form of head, which was long, with a breadth index of about 74 or 75, and very similar to that of the Anglo-Saxon, has apparently disappeared, the heads in modern Burgundy and Franche Comté being extremely broad; but their fair complexion is still conspicuous; and whereas Sidonius Apollinaris talked of

* Thus the Angles, according to Bede, and the Saxons who accompanied the Lombards to Italy.

them as 'greasy sevenfoot giants,' Franche Comté still supplies the French army with its tallest grenadiers.

But the whole south-western frontier of the German language seems to have been really advanced, the Saxons, Frisians, and Salian Franks having occupied Flanders and Brabant, the Ripuarian Franks the right and left banks of the Middle Rhine and the Moselle, the Alemanni Alsace, Swabia, and after Swabia north-eastern and central Switzerland, and the Marcomanni (probably) Bavaria. In all these cases the new acquisitions were conterminous with the old holdings; and in some of them there is more or less reason to think that the invaders re-occupied ground which had been won by the Romans from their own kindred: I have said more or less reason—I should myself say *less* rather than *more*. The result is that Flanders and most of Brabant are thoroughly Germanic—the Electorates, (Treves, Cologne, and Mayence) rather less so, at least in their western parts; Alsace, Swabia, Bavaria, and Central Switzerland more German than otherwise in colour, but in headform more Keltic or Rhœtian.

But the greatest of the German conquests, from the racial point of view, was that of our own country (or shall we say of Eastern Britain), which was largely Saxonized in blood as well as in language and social state; while the western parts of the British Isles, including Ireland, have been Saxonized, if at all, more by infection and contact than by change of blood.

As a second wave of Teutonic conquest, we may reckon the Scandinavian, which, however, did not begin until long after the *Völkswanderung* of the Germans themselves had come to an end. Here, again, the movement must have coincided with a rapid increase of population; but it was too great an effort to continue; and though it did not lead to an actual curtailment of the area of the stock and language as the *Völkswanderung* did, it ended in such thorough exhaustion of the parent stock that it continued to be of little importance for centuries. Iceland, Shetland, Orkney, Caithness, were all that the movement added to the Scandinavian language area, but in many other parts of these islands it left its mark more or less plainly on the physical type; so it was in the Hebrides, especially in the Lews, in Man, in

Cumberland and Westmorland, and the West Border, very strongly; in Yorkshire, and along the east coast of Scotland, in Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, East Norfolk and adjoining districts, perhaps also in Pembrokeshire, certainly about Wexford and Waterford. On the Continent it affected the coast of Normandy, and to a less degree the interior. Collignon even thinks he sees its traces over a large tract of country on and about the Middle Loire; and finally, it is said to be visible in the nobility of Sicily and Southern Italy.

South of the Baltic, too, the Germanic wave of conquest is remarkable in having been double; several centuries after the *Völkswanderung* had ceased, population growing too dense, as it seems always to do in the early stages of the civilisation of capable races, the Saxons, Frisians, and even the Flemings, set themselves to reconquer those extensive territories east of the Elbe, the Hartz, the Thuringian mountains, and the Upper Main, which they or their kindred had relinquished long ago to the Wends; and gradually, by force, fraud, commerce, or peaceable colonisation of empty spaces, they re-germanised pretty thoroughly a large portion of them. The physical type of the tribes they submerged was apparently very like their own, but we must not forget the possibility that weak and scattered remnants of the Germans had been left behind in the great migration, and lost in the then flowing tide of Slavonism.

Next, after the great or earlier Germanic movement, and previous to that last spoken of, was the spread of Saracenic conquest. The extent of the extreme wave of this is scarcely realised; not only did the Moorish armies penetrate almost to the Loire, but they ascended the Rhone valley, occupied for a long period some of the passes of the high Alps, possessed Sicily, plundered the coasts of Italy, and settled there in small communities. In France, according to Lagneau, they are thought to have settled at Aubusson after their great defeat by Charles Martel, and perhaps made there the first carpet in Europe.*

The change they wrought in the physique of the Spanish population was probably not very great. The Semitic element in

* For 'Africa begins at the Pyrenees,' as Dumas said.

them was not altogether new to the coasts, at least, of Spain, and the Berber element was identical, or nearly so, with the primitive Iberian.

Perhaps the expansion of the Slavs should have been mentioned before that of the Saracens; it began earlier, but continued longer and later, and, like that of the Germans, after a considerable interruption, in this case owing to the intercalation of the Tartar dominion, it recommenced, to continue almost to our own day. Poland,* and the country between the Carpathians and the Dnieper, seem to have been the original occupation of the Slavs; thence, on the westward movement of the Germans, they spread across the Oder and the Elbe and to the mouths of the Vistula; they occupied the vacant Bohemia, and passed over Pannonia and Illyria to the Adriatic, and either by themselves, or under Bulgarian dominion, occupied also more or less completely almost the whole of the Balkan peninsula. By about the ninth century, spreading over or among the Finnish tribes, they had established themselves at Novgorod, long the chief seat of their power and commerce, and had apparently penetrated also to the Oka and the Upper Volga. Thereafter their northward expansion continued uninterruptedly; that to the south-east, however, was first checked and then completely arrested by the advent and rise to power of successive hordes of Turks, of which the latest included the Mongols of Bātu Khan. Meanwhile the Germans re-occupied, as was just now mentioned, most of the territory which had once been their own; the settlement of the Magyars, and later the growth of the Roumans, cut off the southern division of the Slavs from the northern, and the former were somewhat circumscribed by the arrival of the Ottomans, and by the revival of the Greeks and Albanians.

The tide of conquest to which I come last consisted of many waves, one of which indeed was coeval with the *Völkwanderung*; nay, it may be that the very first such wave was much earlier even than that. It is very difficult to say when the first tribe of Turkish race entered Europe. Who or what were the Etruscans,

* The Lygii, whom Tacitus describes as Germans, were pretty certainly the Lekhs (Poles). This was one of Latham's happy conjectures.

the Agathyrsi, the Kimmerians, the Scythians, the Sarmatians, the Alans? There is not one of these nations but has been conjectured to be Turkish by some one or other. Were the manners and politics of the Scythians and Sarmatians, which have a very Central-Asian or Turanian look, the product of their life on the grassy steppes of Southern Russia? or had they brought them ready made from Turkestan? We do not know. I will return to the Scythians in a future lecture.

In the latter part of the fourth century appeared the Huns, Mongoloid in type and in mode of life, whatever they were in tongue and in blood. That they had much to do with the inception of the *Völkswanderung* is clear; the terror of them drove the Visigoths across the Danube, perhaps the Sueves and Alans across the Rhine, nay, possibly, as the Quakers fled before the alarm of the Tartars into Norway, so may the Angles have fled before that of the Huns into England. When their power collapsed they were not extinguished: the next wave of nomads, the Avars, incorporated most of them. The Avars, if not entirely Turkish, were at least Turanian. Then followed the Bulgarians, a Finnish race from the Volga, and settled among and ruled over the Southern Slavs; but some of them wandered as far as South Italy. Next the Hungarians, the Magyars, from the same neighbourhood, but mixed somewhat with Turkish blood, who, settling in Hungary, no doubt incorporated the relics of the Avars. Then the Khazars, Turks of a high type, that is, may be, with an Aryan admixture. Then the Patsinaks, Petchenegs, or Besses, Turks of a lower civilization, who by much etymological torture are found to have given name to Bessarabia. Then the Polovtsi or Khomans, also undoubted Turks, who settled on the Dnieper, so far as nomads could settle; and after them the most terrible of all, the so miscalled Tartars, a mass of broken Turkish tribes with a nucleus of veritable Mongols, who destroyed or incorporated all the earlier Turkish colonists of southern Russia, and, if half that is told of them is to be believed, went nigh to destroying the Russians, Poles and Hungarians.

With the exception of the Ottoman Turks, who have been a great power in Europe, but scarcely anywhere, except in Eastern Bulgaria,

in Thessaly, and in a few large towns, a considerable element in the population, and the Gypsies, an Upper Indian tribe of totally different type from the Turks or Finns, in fact more Aryan than aught else, there have been no more invasions from Asia since that of Batu Khan; for Tamerlane's victorious campaigns against Toktamish, Khan of the Golden Horde, and Lord of Russia, were nothing but campaigns, and led to no settlement. The tide has long been running eastward: the Turanian flood has been ebbing; Aryan and Finnish islands have appeared among its receding waves, and have gradually coalesced until only a few pools are left here and there. The Tartars of Kasan and of the Crimea, the few that are left, are the most civilized peasantry in Russia; and the very fine type of the Roumelian Osmanli is rapidly dwindling away.

J. BEDDOE.

ART. VIII.—HOW THE SCOTTISH UNION WAS EFFECTED.

THE present Home Rule controversy has naturally turned attention to the means by which the union of the Irish and British Parliaments was effected, and this question in its turn has induced many writers and public speakers to make—not inquiries indeed—but statements concerning the causes which contributed to bring about the union of the Scottish and English Parliaments. Two classes of men who are bitterly opposed to each other in their aims and opinions, have tried to make out a complete parallel between the Scottish and Irish Unions in regard to both their antecedents and their consequences. The Unionists have insisted that if the Irish Union was effected by bribery and upheld in opposition to the great majority of the people, so too was the Scottish Union; and they appeal to the late success of the one as a precedent for expecting the ultimate success of the other. Scottish Home Rulers, again, have sought to make out a case for themselves by adopting all the arguments that may be urged for Irish Home Rule; and seeing that one of

the arguments consists in the absence of moral force in a transaction carried through by notorious bribery, they have not scrupled to affix a stain on their country's fame, in the hope that by so doing they will strengthen their claim for Home Rule, and thus confer the greatest of benefits on their native land. In opposition to both these classes of men the Liberals maintain that there is not a parallel but a complete contrast between the two Unions; that the startling difference in their outcome is the necessary consequence of differences in their antecedents and working; and that a study of the causes which have made the Scottish Union a success is the surest way of arriving at a satisfactory solution of the difficulties which have hitherto made the Irish Union a failure. We propose, therefore, to present to the reader an impartial statement of the events which led to the Scottish Union, of the means by which it was carried, and of the manner in which it has been worked for nearly two centuries.

Those who fancy that the Scottish Union was rushed through by a knot of unscrupulous politicians, will be surprised to know that before its successful consummation in 1707, there was twice a British Parliament with representatives from every part of the island, that there were intermittent negotiations for Union throughout a whole century, and that a deep and persistent tendency towards the union of the two countries showed itself from the first beginnings of their history. In fact, the wonder is not that there should have been a successful union after the lapse of centuries, but that it should have happened so late as it did. For all those forces which bind men together in political bodies—geographical contiguity, and community of blood, language, religion, and interest—were in active operation from a very early time. The kingdom of Scotland became consolidated in the tenth century out of four kingdoms—the Picts in the north, the Scots in the west, Strathclyde, and Lothian; but the predominating element in this composite mass was supplied by Lothian, with its population of Anglo-Saxon origin. The kingdom of England which had reached consolidation two centuries earlier, was composed mainly of people with exactly the same origin, language and religion as the Lothian folk. Then there was no natural barrier, no scientific frontier to mark out the boundaries

between the two states; as Bacon afterwards said, 'There be no mountains nor ranges of hills, there be no seas nor great rivers, there is no diversity of tongue or language that hath invited or provoked this ancient separation or divorce.' Further, the separateness of the two kingdoms did not originate in a breaking off of the one from the other, leaving, as disruptions invariably do, a rankling soreness behind if not a positive hostility; but merely in the accidental circumstance that each nation grew round a centre of coalescence, the one in the north of the island, the other in the extreme south.

There was, then, in the early history of Britain none of that international animosity between England and Scotland which we have come to suppose sums up the history of the one country and most of that of the other. Even the Norman Conquest, which by giving the throne of the southern kingdom to a foreign dynasty threatened to introduce an alienating factor in the relations of the two kingdoms, in the long run only served to bring them closer. The Scottish Court was Normanised; intermarriages between the royal houses of England and Scotland were frequent; still more frequent were the intermarriages of the higher nobility, especially where there were heiresses to be carried off in either country. Thus it came about, as Robertson says in his *Scotland under her Early Kings*, that three-fourths of the greater nobility of Scotland were derived from the Scoto-Norman race; and as most of these nobles had large estates in both countries, we may well believe what Fordun says, 'Towards the end of the twelfth century, the two nations seemed one people; Englishmen travelling at pleasure through Scotland, and Scotchmen in like manner through England.' Politically as well as socially the two countries were intimately connected; the Scottish King was frequently at the English Court in his capacity as an English nobleman, and for nearly a century before the troubles of the disputed succession there was unbroken peace. This close connection was naturally reflected in the laws and institutions. Burton says, 'It was not till after the War of Independence that the laws and institutions of Scotland took a direction of their own, which separated them by material and fundamental differences from those of England.' And, therefore, on

all these grounds we may adopt Burton's conclusion, that 'a nationality distinct from and antagonistic to that of the English people had not been made before the time of Alexander III.'

The absence of any national jealousy was shown by the manner in which the Scots received Edward I.'s proposal for a marriage between his son Edward and Margaret, the Maid of Norway, heiress to the Scottish throne. The Marriage Treaty of Brigham (July, 1290) by which the Scots accepted that proposal, was virtually what Defoe has called it—the first Treaty of Union between England and Scotland. It is true that this Union did not go beyond a personal union in the sovereign; it was stipulated that the kingdom of Scotland was for ever to remain separate and divided from England, free in itself and without subjection; that the Scottish Parliament was always to be held in Scotland; and that elections by cathedral chapters, homage by military tenants of the crown, and the administration of justice should be performed wholly within the kingdom. These reservations show that Scotland was to continue a separate, self-contained state; the nation already arrived at a consciousness of its existence is not prepared to part with it. Yet the mere fact of assenting to subjection to a common sovereign implies a good deal: for at that time a feudal monarch who summed up in himself the whole government would have been able to unite two nations that had not yet become sharply distinct in their separation, much less antagonistic.

When everything thus seemed ripe for a union, a force came into play which not only arrested unification but carried the two nations far apart. The eagerness of Edward I.—one of the earliest and greatest of Unionists—to bring about so desirable a consummation as a United Britain, led to an attempt on the part of the English Government to rule Scotland as a dependency. However much Scotsmen may detest the means which the English king adopted to secure his aim, they must admit that that aim was in itself a noble one, and that the inducements to it were many and strong. This island, cut off from the rest of Europe, seemed intended by Nature for the chosen home of peace; as Shakespeare put it, 'in a great sea, a swan's nest.' That one corner of this should be insecure was intolerable to any king

who was bent on insuring security for his people at home or who was anxious to carry on war abroad. Hence, it is the ablest of English kings who laid their hand most heavily on Scotland—Edward I., Edward III., and Henry VIII.; and it was those English statesmen most distinguished for their foreign policy—Edward I., Cromwell, and William III.—who were most eager to have a United Britain, which they saw was an indispensable basis for the success of their designs on the Continent.

But when Edward determined to secure a United Britain by conquest, other means having failed, he adopted the surest means of defeating his own ends, and overlooked the consideration to which Bacon afterwards gave expression, that it was with nations as with trees; where force would only destroy, the working of the *vis naturæ* through grafting would bring about an incorporating union. In such a struggle victory was as powerless as defeat to advance his ends; and Falkirk was even more fatal than Stirling Bridge to the project of a United Britain. It was in vain that Edward after repeated conquests of the country summoned ten representatives from Scotland to the first British Parliament, which met in September, 1305; and published an Ordinance or Constitution for Scotland drawn up by a joint committee of these representatives and twenty of the English members. Though the system of government thus promulgated was meant to win the support of the conquered, it contained those provisions in connection with the administration of justice which seem inseparable from every system that denies self-government to a people,—such as change of *venue*, and the appointment of resident sheriffs, removable at pleasure. The very excellence of many points of the Constitution only serves to emphasise the lesson that the most perfect of systems from a theoretical point of view is absolutely worthless when that system is based upon distrust of the people and upon outrages on the men whom the people love. By the execution of Wallace about the time of the publication of the Ordinance, Edward destroyed any chance he might ever have had of conciliating to himself, by wise legislation and just government, the men whom he had already exasperated by a ten years' war—a war which had done more to kindle the national self-consciousness of Scot-

land than the previous ten centuries of its history. Philosophers tell us that individuals become conscious of the ego by coming in contact with the non-ego; similarly, a nation only arrives at full self-consciousness when, like Greece in the ancient world, and Germany in the modern, it meets with an opponent in a life-and-death grapple. It is to the War of Independence—not to anything before or since—that Scotland owes its intense nationality feeling—a feeling so strong as to be almost without parallel. The birth of such a nationality feeling was proclaimed to the world by ever-memorable deeds at Bannockburn, and in words as memorable and worthy to stand side by side with those deeds in a letter from the Scottish Parliament at Arbroath in 1320; ‘To our king are we bound both by his own merit, and by the law of the land, and to him as the saviour of our people and the guardian of our liberty are we unanimously determined to adhere; but if he should desist from what he has begun, and should show an inclination to subject us and our kingdom to the king of England, and his people, we would immediately expel him as an enemy, and the subverter of his own rights and ours; and would choose another king to rule over us who would be able to defend us. For as long as a hundred of us are left alive we never will in any degree be subject to the dominion of England. It is not for glory, riches, or honours that we fight, but for liberty, which no good man will consent to lose save with his life.’ Against men thus resolute the arms and the craft of the Edwards were alike vain; and the two countries settled down into a fixed deep-rooted hatred of each other. Hatred to ‘the auld enemies of England’ was the legacy bequeathed by every Scot to his son—even by those who had nothing else to bequeath. That this legacy was an ever-accumulating one is shown by the conduct of some Scottish soldiers in the last war in which they had to resist the southern invader. A French historian, who accompanied the army on that occasion, tells us that the soldiers slew every English prisoner they took, and bought the prisoners taken by the French auxiliaries, eagerly giving up all their money and even their horses, in order to have the pleasure of wreaking their vengeance on those who had wronged their country so deeply. Now when we find Scotchmen parting with their money for an

object on which to spend their hatred, what stronger illustration could be desired of the intensity of that hatred ?

After the attempt at Union, by conquest and intrigue, had ended only in raising so strong a barrier in the way of Union, two influences came into play about the middle of the sixteenth century which not only tended to heal old differences but to draw the two countries closer together. First: the English practically abandoned the attempt to reduce Scotland to a dependency, and reverted to the old plan of seeking Union by intermarriage of the royal houses. The marriage of Margaret Tudor with James IV. in 1502, and the attempts of Henry VIII. to marry James V. to his daughter Mary, and subsequently to marry Mary of Scotland to his only son Edward VI., show the anxiety of the English kings to secure, by peaceful means, what the wars of the Edwards had been putting ever further off. How well the English had learned to respect the national feeling of Scotland is best seen in the proclamation * issued by Somerset after

* 'That though it would seem most proper for the Scots to sue to us who are superiors in the field and masters of a great part of their realm ; yet, that our charitable mind and brotherly love might be known, we do by all means possible provoke and call you to your own commodity and profit, as the father does the son, or the elder brother the younger, and invite you to amity and equality ; because as we inhabit in the same island, there is no people so like one another in Manners, Customs and Language. But because some object that we do not seek equality nor the Marriage, but a Conquest, and that we would not be friends but lords ; yet here we declare to you and all Christian people, that it is the King's mind, by our advice and counsel, not to conquer but to have in amity ; not to win by force, but to conciliate by love ; . . . not to dissever and divorce, but to join in marriage, from high to low, both the realms : to make one isle, one realm in love, amity, concord, peace and charity. We offer love ; we offer equality and amity ; we overcome in war and offer peace ; we win holds and offer no conquest ; we get in your land and offer England. What can be more offered than intercourse of merchandises and interchange of marriages, the abolishing of all such laws as prohibit the same or might be impediment to the mutual amity ? We have offered not only to leave the authority and name of conqueror but to receive that which is the shame of men overcome—to leave the name of the nation and to take the indifferent old name of Britains again : because nothing should be left on our part to be offered, nothing on your part unrefused, whereby ye might be inexcusable. What face hath this of conquest ? We intend not to disinherit your Queen,

his victory at Pinkie in 1547. It is one of the most important documents concerning the relations between England and Scotland: it contains not only the spirit but most of the principal points of the Treaty of Union concluded in 1707; such as, the adoption of a common name *Britain* to the subordination of the old names of *England* and *Scotland*, entire free trade between the two countries, and the retention by Scotland of its own laws and institutions.

The old counteracting force having been displaced by a wiser

but to make her heirs inheritors of England. We seek not to take from you your laws nor customs; but we seek to redress your oppression which of divers ye do sustain. In the realm of England divers laws and customs be according to the ancient usage thereof, and likewise France, Normandy, and Gascony have sundry kind of orders. Have all the realms and dominions that the Emperor now hath, one custom and one sort of laws? These vain fears and fantasies of expulsion of your nation, of changing of the laws, of making a conquest, be driven into your heads by those, who indeed had rather you were all conquered, spoiled, and slain, than they would lose any point of their will, of their desire of rule, and of their estimation which they know in quietness would be seen what it were, as it were in a calm water. If we two, being made one by amity, be most able to defend us against all nations, and having the sea for the wall, mutual love for garrison, and God for defence, should make so noble and well-agreeing Monarchy, that neither in peace we may be ashamed, nor in war afraid of any worldly or foreign power; why should not you be as desirous of the same and have as much cause to rejoice at it as we?

And for a more sure proof and plainer token of the good mind and will which we bear unto you, (that which never yet was granted to Scotland in any league, truce, or peace betwixt England and Scotland) because ye shall have proof of the beginning of love and amity of both the realms, the King's Highness, considering the multitude of them which are come to his Majesty's devotion and of them that be well-willers and aiders of this godly enterprise, hath by our advice and counsel granted, and by these presents doth grant, that from henceforth all manner of merchants and other Scotsmen, who will enter their names with one of the wardens of the marches, and there profess to take part with us in this before-mentioned godly purpose may lawfully and without any trouble and vexation enter into any port, creek, or haven of England, and there use their traffic of merchandise, buy and sell, bring in the commodities of Scotland and take and carry forth the commodities of England as liberally and as freely, and with the same and none other customs therefor than Englishmen and the King's subjects do at this present.—Hollinshed, *History of England*, III., p. 998.

policy on the part of the English, the way was clear for the operation of one of the most powerful forces in history. When the Reformation spread over Europe in the first half of the sixteenth century, Scotchmen, in virtue of their successful resistance to foreign domination, were able to receive the Protestant doctrines with an open mind, unprejudiced against the religion of detested aliens. This brought Scotland at once into line with Protestant England, and rudely severed the old alliance with France. The influence of a common religion did as much to bring the two countries together as the war of conquest had done to separate them. As early as 1559, we find Knox writing to Cecil : ' My eyes have long looked to a perpetual concord between these two realms, the occasion whereof is most present if you shall move your hearts unfeignedly to seek the same. For humility of Christ Jesus crucified, now begun here to be practised may join together the hearts of those whom Satan by pride hath long dissevered.' The first fruits of this mighty influence were seen in the Treaty of Berwick (January, 1560), when the English sovereign entered into an alliance with the Protestant party of Scotland. When this alliance was crowned with success, and the Treaty of Edinburgh was signed six months later (June, 1560), Cecil * wrote to Elizabeth that ' the treaty would finally procure that conquest of Scotland which none of her progenitors with all their battles ever obtained, viz., the whole hearts and goodwills of the nobility and people.' Henceforth Elizabeth had a surer foundation for a pro-English party in Scotland than the intrigues or bribery of her father had been able to acquire : the Protestant party were unchangeably English in their sympathies. The Regents Murray and Morton were almost as much Elizabeth's ministers as Cecil and Walsingham ; and King James himself in 1586 became the pensioner of the English Queen. In that year a defensive league was entered into between the two sovereigns, and from that date to the death of Elizabeth, the two countries were practically one in their foreign policy.

* It is not a little curious to observe the Cecil of Elizabeth's reign using almost the very expression, ' union of hearts,' which the Cecil of Victoria's reign makes the butt of many a sneer, e.g., in the Exeter Speech.

The Union of the Crowns in 1603 did not create—it merely strengthened—that movement towards a closer union which had become apparent, especially since the Reformation. The golden link of the Crown, though not so powerful a bond as it had been when feudalism was in its zenith, was yet stronger than it became at the end of the century, when Parliament had asserted its strength and made and unmade kings. As a unifying factor, its importance lay in this circumstance that there was now one powerful interest which must desire the well-being of both countries equally: the King of England could not be benefitted by what was loss to Scotland, nor could the King of Scotland be benefitted by what was loss to England. The Union of the Crowns, therefore, naturally gave a great impetus to the desire for a more complete union of the nations, and no one was seized with this desire more strongly than King James; it became his ruling passion. In January, 1604, he said: ‘Our fame and reputation through the world, our honour to be the worker of it in our time, and the unspeakable benefit that must redound thereof to this whole Isle, goes so deeply in our conceit as in the greatest subject we can put our hand.’ And Bacon, after his first interview with King James, said, ‘He was hastening to a mixture of both kingdoms and nations, faster perhaps than policy would conveniently bear.’ But, if James’s desire was characterised by intensity, it was equally marked by vagueness. The only hearty supporter of his plans among Englishmen was Bacon, while the Parliament showed its dislike even at the initiatory measure of appointing Commissioners to treat, by haggling over the name of Britain as involving with its use the unsettlement of the whole of English law. The Scots were as lukewarm in the matter; in connection with the Pigott incident the Privy Council wrote to the King: ‘There be among us not a few of the best sort who are as alien from union as any of the Lower House, and have more just causes to be discontented with so easy obliterating of bygone wrongs. Gif your Majesty would be pleased to desist from any further moving of that union, we doubt not they would require from your Highness what they now refuse.’

With such a temper on both sides no progress could be made, and though Commissioners from both countries sat for six weeks

(20th Oct.-6th Dec., 1604), and agreed upon a Draft Treaty, the chief articles of which were abrogation of Hostile Laws and the Border Code, mutual naturalisation, and a limited Free Trade, the English Parliament refused to ratify them, with the exception of the abolition of the Hostile Laws and the Border Code, which were already, by the King's accession, practically abrogated. The cause of all this backwardness was the trade jealousy of the English, to which expression was given in the House of Commons by Fuller, a prominent member on the Opposition side: 'Suppose one man is the owner of two pastures with one hedge to divide them, the one pasture bare, the other fertile and good; a wise owner will not quite pull down the hedge, but make gates to let the cattle in and out at pleasure, otherwise they will rush in multitudes, and much against their will return.' Not only was the English merchant jealous of the 'hungry' Scots, but English statesmen saw that while they withheld English citizenship from the Scots, with its rights of free trade and holding offices in England, they held in their hands a lever by which they could force Scotland into a union. This sentiment was expressed by a member: 'If the Scots should at first have all our privileges and benefits, it may be feared they will never proceed to the perfect Union;' and embodied in a resolution, which practically closed the first attempt at union through negotiations, 'That an uniformity of laws was an indispensable preliminary to the naturalisation of Scotchmen.' In the anxiety of the Scotch to enjoy the trading-privileges of Englishmen, and the determination of the English Parliament to deny those privileges until a complete union was brought about, we have the key to all the other attempts at union in the seventeenth century, and the answer to those who then and since have asked why Scotland did not make a Federal instead of an Incorporating Union. England would not grant privileges which would enable a people to grow rich who might at any moment turn the wealth so acquired against herself; the Union must be made complete and irrevocable by the sinking of every separate interest in one common British interest, to be guarded by one British Parliament.

The force which England could thus bring to bear upon

Scotland was not fully exerted or felt till the middle of the seventeenth century. Then the Navigation Act was passed by Cromwell who, however, recognised the consequent necessity of union by at once establishing an Imperial Parliament in which thirty representatives from Scotland sat. The Union was dissolved by the Restoration, but the Navigation Act was re-enacted, and the hardships to which the Scots were thus exposed by their exclusion from the trade-privileges of the English led to the second attempt at union in the seventeenth century. But though the Scottish Parliament, eager to secure the old privileges at any price, nominated Commissioners in 1668, the English, who as yet only saw the loss a Union would cause through increased competition in trade, delayed appointing Commissioners till 1670. After seven weeks' negotiations the main articles of later Treaties were agreed to, such as Free Trade, one King and one Parliament; but the demand on the part of the Scottish Commissioners that the Parliaments should be united by simply transferring all the Scotch Members to the English Parliament took the English Commissioners by surprise. 'Such a proposition had never been in their view,' they said, and the negotiations were broken off.

After this failure, the Scotch felt more and more the restrictions imposed on them by the Protective Commercial Code of England; and when the crown of Scotland was offered to William by a deputation in London, the matter of a Union was again broached, the initiative (be it noticed) being again taken by Scotchmen. William adopted the scheme with as much eagerness as King James had ever displayed; 'he was often heard to say,' writes Defoe, 'that this island could never be easy without a union of the two peoples, and if either of them understood their own happiness, they would never rest till it was brought to pass. I have done all I can in that affair, but I do not see a temper in either nation that looks like it. It may be done, but not yet.' William's view of the situation proved correct: for though the Union formed the subject of his first and last messages to the English Parliament, nothing was done by the English to promote it during his reign. The Scotch, indeed, appointed Commissioners in 1689, but not meeting with any response from the English,

they turned to the only other alternative,—the building up of an independent commerce with colonies and trading companies of their own. The failure of the Darien Expedition—the one great scheme of the Company they formed—brought matters to a crisis. If, as the disaster proved, the King of England was forced in the interests of that country to act in a manner prejudicial to Scotland, then the golden link of the Crown must be broken, and the Kingdoms become entirely separate. Henceforth, therefore, the proposals of the Scotch fluctuated between the only two alternatives they had—complete union or complete separation. In 1702, both Parliaments passed Acts under which Commissioners met in November, and sat till February, 1703. The Scotch showed their eagerness for union by agreeing to the English demands of an incorporating union and the same regal succession; but the English were yet lukewarm, and were so lax in their attendance at the meetings of the Commission that the negotiations fell through, and the Scottish Parliament in September, 1703, passed the emphatic resolution that ‘the Commission was terminate and extinct, and not to be renewed without consent of Parliament.’ After this third failure on the part of the Scotch to solve trade-complications by negotiations for Union, the only alternative was fallen back upon, and the Act of Security passed in 1703, and again in 1704, provided that Scotland ‘should choose a different Sovereign from that chosen by England, unless such conditions of Government were enacted as should guarantee the religion, liberty, and trade of the nation from English influence.’ The retaliatory Act of the English Parliament in 1604 narrowed still further the alternatives before the Scotch to war or union. For the last time, Commissioners were appointed by both Parliaments in 1705; they sat from April to July, 1706; the Treaty they drew up was discussed in the Scottish Parliament from October, 1706, till it was ratified in January, 1707; and on its ratification by the English Parliament in March, the Union was successfully consummated on the 1st of May, 1707.

To those who bear in mind the cogency of the circumstances which thus led up to the Union, and to all who read the speeches made in Parliament in furtherance of it,—full as they are of

solid argument and the soundest common sense—it will appear unnecessary to seek an explanation of how the Treaty was carried by assuming bribery to have been practised on the Scottish representatives. Such a charge would be unworthy of notice were it not that Unionists, who claim to be for the present the sole guardians of political morality, and Scottish Home Rulers, who claim to be in a peculiar way the keepers of their country's honour, have persistently reiterated accusations which are based not at all on proof but solely on prejudice. On looking over all the literature connected with the Union, we find four different circumstances which may be alleged to justify the charge of bribery.

1. In an anti-Unionist pamphlet it is said that 'the native Parliament had been exchanged for hogsheads of sugar, and for stinking tobacco;' and indeed no one need object to patriots in high-flown speeches, saying that the Scottish Parliament was sold for trade-privileges, provided one remembers that the expression is a rhetorical one, and therefore does not mean anything.

2. The sums of money voted to the Commissioners of the Treaties of Union were said at the time to be excessive, and even Burnet speaks of them as 'extravagant allowances,' while Defoe says 'the proposal was ill received indeed, and a horrid clamour raised at it without door; now the nation might see what they had been doing at London, that they had sold their country for a sum of money, and they were beginning to share it among them, etc.' But anyone who takes the trouble to estimate all the labour and expense of the Commissioners, and compares their remuneration with the sums paid at the present day to municipal deputations to Westminster, will find that even after making allowance for the difference in the value of money at the different times, there is no ground for believing that the prospect of obtaining such a remuneration operated as an inducement to the Commissioners to support the Treaty.

3. Considering that Scotland was to be subjected to the same taxation as England in the matter of Customs and Excise—a step clearly inevitable if free trade was to be established between the two countries—and that a national debt incurred by England alone was now to be borne by Scotland as well, the Commis-

sioners thought it fair that an equivalent—amounting as nearly as possible to the exact sum that would thus be raised in Scotland to benefit the English—should be transmitted to Scotland, and accordingly the sum of £398,000 was sent. Of this sum £200,000 was spent in buying up all the shares of the African Company at par, and as their market value was nil, it is plausibly asserted that this transaction was tantamount to bribery. Lockhart says, ‘it was the cleanliest way of bribing a nation to undo themselves;’ and Scott has re-echoed this opinion, speaking of ‘the golden chain of the Equivalent.’ But these patriots forget that the African Company was legally constituted under an Act of the Scotch Parliament, and that the ruin of its great enterprise, the Darien Colony, was due partly to the action and partly to the inaction of the Government. The reimbursement to the shareholders of the money they had contributed was therefore an act of justice, whether it influenced a section of the people in favour of the Union or not. Of the rest of the Equivalent about £20,000 went to the Commissioners, and the remainder was to be devoted to the fostering of manufactures, etc. This charge so slenderly supported has perhaps received its notoriety from a saying of Harley’s in Parliament in 1711: ‘Have we not bought them, and have we not a right to tax them? Pray, for what else did we give them the Equivalent?’ We should be ashamed to mention such accusations, were it not to accustom the reader to the meaning of the word ‘bribery’ when it is used by patriots whether Unionists or Home Rulers. Keeping this meaning in mind we may now consider the only serious charge that has ever been brought against the men who carried the Union.

4. This charge was made public in Lockhart’s *Memoirs*, published in 1714, and was based on an Inquiry made by a Parliamentary Committee in 1711, when the Tories on coming into office brought home charges of corruption against some of the Whigs, the most famous of whom were Marlborough and Walpole. It was proved that the sum of £20,540 17s. 7d. had been sent by the English Treasurer, Godolphin, not through the usual channel but secretly. This money was distributed among thirty-two recipients by the Earl of Glasgow, who gave into the Committee a minute statement of the payments made to each indi-

vidual: Queensberry, the High Commissioner, for example, receiving for equipage and daily allowance £12,325; Marchmont £1104 15s. 7d., and Banff £11 2s. It is contended that the charge that these sums were distributed in the way of bribery is supported by the secrecy of the transaction, and by the fact that all but three of the recipients were in Parliament. But both these facts are compatible with another explanation which rests on strong evidence. It is admitted that the salaries and pensions of many Scottish officials were at the time of the Union in arrears; so high had party spirit run that in 1703, for example, the Opposition refused all supply; while, according to Burnet, 'Queensberry had begun a practice of drawing out the sessions of Parliament to an unusual length, by which his appointments exhausted so much of the revenue that the rest of the ministers were not paid.' In the letter to the English Treasurer the money was applied for as a loan to pay such arrears, so that if this was a screen for bribery, it was one not devised afterwards to explain away a charge, but carefully contrived before Parliament met. The necessity for payment before the extinction of Parliament was clearly seen by the officials, for it seemed improbable enough that the servants of a Parliament would receive payment of arrears after that Parliament had ceased to exist. The expediency of immediate payment was as clearly seen by the English Ministers, for they knew that an unpaid Scot was as unprofitable a servant as an unfed Englishman was a poor fighter. The necessity for secrecy was quite as apparent; for the money could not be raised by taxation or sent openly by the English Treasurer without raising an outcry among those who were already wildly throwing about charges of bribery on the flimsiest foundation. This view is borne out by passages in the letter to Godolphin: 'We would not have it known that Her Majesty lends any money to Her Treasurer.' 'We have been obliged to give promises to several, for a considerable part of arrears, and without the sum desired they would be disappointed, which may prove of bad consequences.'

The evidence is so overwhelming that the money was paid at least under the pretext of arrears of salary and pensions that anti-Unionist writers have based the charge of bribery not on the

distribution of the money, but on the alleged fact that repayment of the English loan was not demanded by the English Government or made by the Scotch. But it is admitted by Lockhart on the Earl of Glasgow's evidence that Queensberry repaid the £12,325 he had received, and that he was offered it by the Queen as a reward for good services in carrying on the Union. If the other officials did not act likewise—and there is no evidence that they did not—they took advantage of the clandestine nature of the transaction, and were paid a second time in the ordinary way. Even were this assertion proved it does not show bribery, for it simply amounts to this, that the Scotch took advantage of the English Government at a time subsequent to that at which bribery could influence their votes. To base a charge of bribery on such evidence would be absurd; and so it appeared to those who instituted the Inquiry, for though they were animated by the warmest political hatred against the opponents they sought to disgrace, they abandoned the investigation without carrying it to a conclusion. Yet on such evidence (if it be deserving of the name) the accusation of bribery has been re-echoed by many historians, and has been accepted almost as an article of faith by some parties and politicians. The Jacobites led off by Lockhart have clung to this belief, while Scott has displayed in the matter the same powerful imagination which has given to his romances a world-wide fame. Unionists like Finlay, and Scottish Home Rulers, thinking to strengthen their case by proving immorality in the means by which the Union was carried, have not scrupled to affix this stain on their countrymen. These are the men who arrogate to themselves the exclusive possession of loyalty and patriotism, thinking forsooth that loyalty lies chiefly in libelling all who refuse to shout their shibboleth, and that patriotism consists in blackening the fair fame of their country's benefactors.

JOHN DOWNIE.

ART. IX.—SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN REVIEWS.

GERMANY.

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (April, May, June).—With its April number, this magazine begins the new quarter in a manner fully worthy of its well established reputation. In the first place we have the conclusion of Theodor Fontane's excellent novel, 'Frau Fanny Freibel, oder, Wo sich Herz zum Herzen find't.' It is an admirable picture of Berlin life, and is characterized by an interesting plot, as well as by some clever portraiture, and an attractive style.—In his essay, 'Zur Schulgesetzgebung,' Professor W. Rein, of Jena, deals with the burning question raised by the proposed Bill on elementary schools. The result or conclusion of his paper is the expression of a wish that the 'family principle' (familien princip) should be, if not absolutely recognized, at least given a fair test.—A third instalment of the historical study by Ludwig von Hirschfeld, 'Ein Thronerbe als Diplomat,' gives an interesting sketch of the last diplomatic missions of the hereditary prince Friedrich Ludwig of Mecklenburg, during the wars of the great Napoleon.—'Homer als Charakterdarsteller,' that is, Homer as a delineator of character, is the title of an exceptionally brilliant essay by Professor Herman Grimm, who bases it more particularly on the tenth book of the Iliad.—In the April and May numbers. Dr. Richard Preusz gives a number of letters—twenty-seven altogether—written by Carlyle to the German historian and biographer Varnhagen von Ense. The originals are preserved in the royal library in Berlin, and if the translator's statement that they are now published for the first time refers to the English originals as well as to his German version, it is to be hoped that we may, before long, get an English edition of them.—In 'Umbrische Lyrik,' Herr Franz Xaver Kraus gives an interesting sketch of the literary career of Alinda Bonacci-Brunamonti, whom de Gubernatis styles 'la plus illustre des femmes écrivains de l'Italie.' The many extracts which the author gives, and which are amongst the interesting features of his study, seem to justify this judgment, and make one wonder that the gifted lady's works should be so little known in this country.—The May number also brings an abundance of attractive matter. Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, one of the most distinguished writers of the day, and a constant contributor for many years, gives a legend which she entitles 'Prinzessin Leiladin.'—In a paper entitled, 'The Connection between Form and Function in the Vegetable Kingdom,' Professor Reinke, taking

the idea from Goethe's 'Metamorphosis of Plants,' gives us an insight into the innermost secrets of the life of plants.—Questions of political economy not appealing directly to any but German readers, are treated in Professor Cohn's 'Ueber den Haushalt des Deutschen Reiches.'—Finally, Lady Blennerhassett contributes an essay on Talleyrand's memoirs.—An excellent little sketch of Hamburg life, 'Capitän Feddersen's Kummer,' with which the June number opens, is followed by a reproduction of an address delivered in Tübingen. Its subject is, 'The Kinds and Degrees of Intelligence.'—In his paper on 'Colonial Policy and its Means,' Admiral Batsch does not pretend to discuss the question of colonization itself. He simply considers, from the point of view of a seaman, a number of things which he thinks should be borne in mind by those who believe colonial expansion to be useful and desirable.—The erection of a bust to Anastasius Grün is used by Herr Seuffert as a peg whereon to hang an interesting literary essay, in which he appreciatively reviews the poet's work.—One of the most generally interesting contributions to the number is that in which Herr Kock gives a history of the horses and lions of Venice.—In his paper, 'Die Herabsetzung der Menschenverluste im Kriege,' Professor Richter considers the various means by which, through careful tending of the wounded and through the adoption of sanitary precautions, the loss of life may be reduced in time of war.—Finally, in an article to which he gives the title 'Zur neusten Wallenstein-Literatur,' Herr Kluckhohn gives the substance of the latest historical researches on a subject to which Schiller's famous trilogy has helped to give considerable interest—the question of Wallenstein's treasonable designs at the time of his death.

WESTERMANN'S MONATS-HEFTE (April, May, June).—Very special artistic interest and value is given to the numbers for this quarter by a study for which they are indebted to Herr Cornelius Gurlitt. It is devoted to the pre-Raphaelite school, of which it traces the rise and development. It runs through all the numbers, of each of which it takes up a considerable part, and is not yet concluded. The profuseness and excellence of the illustrations deserve special notice, and really constitute an exceptionally striking feature. There are 46 engravings, giving examples from Rosetti, Blake, Madox Brown, Watts, Sir Noel Paton, W. Dyce, Cave Thomas, Holman Hunt, Burne Jones, Arthur Hughes, Spencer Stanhope and Sir J. Millais.—As compared with former quarters, these numbers do not give special prominence to articles of travel. 'Through Languedoc and Provence' runs through the first two parts, and fully makes up by the excel-

lence of both text and illustrations for any diminution in quantity—should anybody be disposed to find fault with it. The other paper is descriptive of Ravello, on the coast of Amalfi.—Light literature is represented by three instalments of a serial which promises to be exceptionally interesting, 'Jenseit des Wassers.' The author is Herr Jensen. In addition to this there are several minor contributions, 'Leben fur Leben,' by A. Fromm; 'Die Erlösung des Brahmanen,' by R. Garbe; 'Alte Leute,' by Luise Haidheim; 'Seine Muse,' by Feodor Helm; and 'Es ist eine alte geschichte,' by Arpad Imre.—Turning back to the first of these numbers, we have to notice a biographical sketch of Mirabeau. If it does not contain anything very new, it has the merit of making excellent use of the old material.—Two literary and critical essays, both in the third part, are well deserving of attention. One of them has for its subject Hoffman, the German Poe; the other deals with Le Sage. It is on the whole a very fair exposition and appreciative estimate of the works of the author of 'Gil Blas.'—In addition to these contributions, there are, in the April part, a botanical paper, 'Die Ruheperioden der Pflanzen,' and an architectural article, descriptive of the building of the new House of Parliament in Berlin.—May has a very peculiar contribution in the shape of a treatise on Italian door-knockers; it also commences a series of American sketches, of which the first is devoted to the American woman.—'Social Condition' follows in the June number.

PREUSSISCHE JAHRBÜCHER (May, June).—Both these numbers open with instalments of Mr. Marion Crawford's 'Zoroaster.' Through both of them, also, a very interesting and instructive paper, by Herr Dr. Neumann runs. It is entitled 'Die Markuskirche in Venedig,' and is at once a description and a history of the basilica of St. Mark in Venice; it is based on Ongania's monumental work, 'La basilica di San Marco.'—Dr. Philippi contributes a paper of considerable value, of which the object is to show that the artisan guilds of the middle ages, of which it is customary to speak so disparagingly, really exercised great influence in the economic development of Germany.—Students of Goethe will be interested in the short paper which Herr Albert Bielschowsky heads 'Lili und Dorothea,' and in which he adduces additional and convincing proof that it was the adventures of Lili Goethe which suggested those of Dorothea in the celebrated poem.—The same number contains a curious article in which Herr von Wulf sets forth the military tactics which made the Hussites such formidable enemies.—A very quaint but most entertaining production is Herr Kawerau's 'Lob und Schimpf

des Ehestandes in der Litteratur des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts,' a paper in which he brings together what the writers of the 15th century set down in praise or blame of marriage, and, indirectly, of women.—In 'Zur Pflege der deutschen sprache,' Herr Logander criticizes a number of expressions which are now commonly used in German, and which he considers incorrect.

R U S S I A.

ROOSKAHYAH MYSL—*Russian Opinion* (March, April and May).—'The Literary Remains of Kavelin' (1847 to 1884), prefaced and annotated by D. A. Korsakoff, are still continued. 'Yad,' a Norwegian romance, by Alexander Killand, translated by E. R., is brought to a close in six remaining chapters.—'The Name Day,' a short religious tale, by O. Zabyty, is given complete.—'Poetry' is represented by A. Nezvahnoff, V. L. Velichko, A. M. Fedoroff, L. M. Medveydoff, and L. I. Palmin.—'The Disciples of Garrick,' an historical romance, from the French of Augustus Filon, translated by V. M. Remezoff, is completed in eight remaining chapters.—'Lyouboff,' a lengthy romance by I. N. Potapenko, is continued to the fifth chapter of part ii.—Seven further 'Letters from Africa,' by Henry Senkevich, translated from the Polish by V. M. L., completes the series, twenty-three in all.—'A New Work of Herbert Spencer' is a review of the fourth part of Mr. Spencer's work on Ethics, entitled *Justice*. At least this is what the reader can alone learn from the able paper of L. E. Obolenski, as Russian reviewers do not, as a rule, give *in extenso*, with publisher's name, date, etc., the title of their author's works. This is, as we think, to detract considerably from the value of a review, since it adds to the difficulty of the reader who may desire to confirm or correct what is written concerning the work.—'Europe and Revolution' is a review of the third volume of Albert Sorel's work with the above title, devoted to *La Guerre aux Rois*, 1792-3, by Zh. L.—'The Founders (Rodonachalniki, or Family Stock) of English Radicalism,' by M. M. Kovalefski, is brought to a close.—'A few Years in the Country' is a lively tale of domestic life, by N. Garin, of which we have the first seven chapters only.—'Locke' is a review of Thomas Fowler's work on our great Somersetshire philosopher, but as before regretted, no clue is given to the date, publication, or edition of the work reviewed.—'A Memorial of Emile de-Lavelle,' who died on 23rd of November last, is written by A. A. Isaëff. 'Foreign Review,' by V. A. Goltseff, contains notices of a pretty quarrel between the reviewer and Mr. Ilovaiski of the *Moscow Gazette*, on their differing views of the policy of foreign countries,

notably France, the United States of America, and of Persia, whose recent tariff changes are freely criticised; of the Greek ministerial crisis; the anarchist scare; Mr. Chamberlain and his anti-Gladstonianism; Lord Salisbury and his out-spoken utterances; Belgian, Italian, German, and Papal affairs, etc.—‘Scientific Views’ contain papers on ‘Immediate (Neotlozhnost) Scientific working of Rural Economical Knowledge in Russia,’ by V. D. Sokoloff; ‘Nutrition of the Famine-stricken,’ by F. F. Erisman; and ‘Social Predictions,’ by L. E. Obolenski.—‘Home Review’ contains, as per title, notices of the chief current affairs in Russia.—‘Contemporary Art,’ as usual, is devoted to Moscow theatrical reports.—Two more articles on ‘Literature and Life’ are furnished by N. K. Michaelofski.—The ‘Bibliographic Division’ contains notices of 95 works, two only of which are from the English, (1) *The Working-class Movement in America*, by Aveling; (2) *An Introduction to Political Economy*, by Professor Ely. Both are American publications. We have frequently dissected this ‘Bibliographic Division,’ but for space-saving reasons have lately ceased to do so. Our readers will remember how the list of items in the ‘Division’ always closed with *Periodicals*. But we never mentioned how liberally the Russian editors of rival works treat each other, excepting once, in April 1890, when we quoted our present *Rooskahyah Mysl’s* epithet applied to the *Vestnik Evropy* of ‘The Prince of Journals.’ We venture now on another tribute of congratulation, by stating that in the present numbers under notice the *Rooski Vestnik* for January and February is honoured with a notice of upwards of ten pages of fifty-three lines each, and the *Vestnik Evropy* for February and March with nearly eight pages of the same solid matter.—A novel by E. P. Karpoff entitled ‘Nah Pakhotey,’ a tale of rural life, is commenced and carried on to the twenty-third chapter.—‘Roza and Nineta,’ a contemporary romance by Alphonse Daudet, is translated from the French by M. N. Remezoff, and given complete.—‘Protectionism and Rural Economy’ is a political paper of much interest, by V. V. Biryukovich.—‘A New Investigation of the Reforms of Peter the Great’ is a review of P. N. Milyoukoff’s work on this subject, by V. A. G.—A. S. (not A. C. as in our last) Okolski’s ‘Reform of the English Universities in the Nineteenth Century’ is brought to a close.—‘Marie Konopnitski’ is an outline of contemporary Polish literature, by V. Myahkotin.—‘A Memorial of Yan Amos Komenski’ is a tercentenary tribute, by V. A. Goltseff, to a national literary worthy who was born in 1592.—An article based on the journal, letters, and romance entitled *Artistka*, of the celebrated Marie Bashkirtseff, is furnished by M. A.

Protopopoff, under 'A Mart of Female Vanity.'—Another Norwegian romance by Alexander Killand, entitled 'Fortuna,' translated also by E. R., is commenced and carried on to chapter v.—A posthumous tale by Ernest Algren, entitled 'In Darkness,' is translated (it is not said from what language) and given complete by V. M. S., the charming translator of Mr. Marion Crawford's English novels.—'The Brightening of the Haze of Youth,' a short tale by V. S. Solovieff, is given complete.—'The Armenian Question in Turkey' is part of an important contribution to current foreign politics, by D. G. A.—A review of Mrs. Oliphant's 'Sheridan,' taking note also of Thomas Moore's and Professor Sanders's *Memoirs and Life*, respectively of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, is furnished by A. B. P.

VOPROSI PHILOSOFII I PSYCHOLOGII (Questions Philosophical and Psychological) opens its eleventh number with the continuation of M. Tchicherin's articles on 'The Positive Philosophy and the Unity of Science.' In the last paper we gave the summary of, he was occupied with perhaps the most satisfactory part of the so-called Positive Philosophy, viz., the Mathematical part. In that Comte was to a large extent dealing with subject-matter, with which he had a considerable acquaintance, although even here his leading disciples, such as M. Littre and John Stuart Mill, have not fallen in with all his views, *e.g.* in the identification of Logic and Mathematics. M. Tchicherin's present paper extends to 48 royal octavo pages. Yet even this length can scarcely be considered excessive when it is remembered that Comte has given three thick octavo volumes to the outlines of *physique sociale*. According to his view, Social Science is concerned with all matters having to do with man. Thus the structure of human society, the laws of its development, the history of religion and philosophy, the development of the arts and sciences, all have found a place here. Philosophy might have been added, but has not. The personal properties and peculiarities of humanity find their place not in Sociology but in Biology. In dealing with Sociology, Comte did not follow the usual course of positive science. This begins by expounding the parts, or each single science, and then uniting them by a common method. But Comte does not follow this course in the study of Sociology. He adopts the method of treating the science as a whole, passing over the sectional parts of which it is made up. He seems to consider this to be in some sort a speciality of sociological method! It is clear, however, as M. Tchicherin points out, that this mode of proceeding is identical with the much reprobated 'metaphysical' method. Theoretically one proceeds from the whole to the parts,

but in positive or experimental science from the parts to the whole. Comte, no doubt, notices that there has been no previous scientific treatment of this part of his work and that all had to be begun *ab initio*. But how is it possible to begin an examination of the scientific structure of society but by a previous examination of its component parts? Unfortunately Comte was very ill prepared by his previous experience for this very important work. Of the science of law so important for such a work, he does not appear to have possessed even the most rudimentary notions. He gets over the difficulty by rejecting this and some other of the sciences with which he was unacquainted by disparaging them as belonging to 'metaphysics:' but this summary method of getting rid of difficulties is one characteristic of the *charlatan* rather than of the serious student. Amongst the other sciences which he rejects in this summary fashion, is Political Economy, in which, however, he makes some little exception as regards the great work of Adam Smith, in which he finds some precious preliminary observations. Mill, who was a specialist in this science, takes occasion to make the justifiable remark, that all acquainted with the writings of economists may from this example apprehend the superficiality of Comte. Specialists in other sciences can only confirm this judgment. A most important part of Sociology turns on the religious and philosophical systems which have played such an important part in moulding human society, but Comte was pretty nearly ignorant of the whole subject. Regarding the whole as a phantasmagoria, he did not even take the trouble to examine it. He was ignorant of the German language, and the vast collection of German metaphysical literature was a closed book to him. Not only were so many fields of thought and experience closed to him; he held it as a rule to limit, rather than extend his reading, believing that casual reading disturbed the 'proper development of his own thought.' He believed that this strict abstinence from new research insured the clearness, energy, and sequence of his thought, which otherwise would have been damaged by 'a dangerous erudition' (VI. 758). This goes in the face of his own recommendations as to say the study of biology, which must begin with the careful review of existing types, as the basis of comparison and then gradually follow the development of each organ from the lowest to the highest and *vice versa*. M. Tchicherin holds that much of this unsound element is the result of his relationship to St. Simon and that the Utopian element in Comte was the result of this relationship. In M. Tchicherin's opinion it is doubtful whether this part of the positive philosophy differs so much from the 'metaphysics' which Comte and his fanatically dogmatic fol-

lowers are so fond of reprobating.—The article which follows is the conclusion of M. Stein's examination of the 'Pessimism of Leopardi.' The Platonic or rather Socratic reasoning against suicide appears to have influenced the poet from taking up this remedy against the ills of life. In his 'Dialogo di Plotino e di Porfirio,' he appears to regard the reasoning of the former as decisive. Yet he holds that the ancients were more manly as to their views on this point than the men of modern times. M. Stein proceeds to compare the pessimism of Leopardi with Arthur Schopenhauer's, and takes occasion to observe that they did not regard sorrow and pain as a special privilege, indicating them to belong to the number of the chosen, probably referring to the Christian view regarding the ills of life, but as universal world-phenomena. The cause of the universal suffering was regarded by Schopenhauer as resulting from the action of the universal 'will,' by Leopardi as the results of 'force' constituting an inexplicable, irreducible element, or something manifesting itself in time and space. Caro in particular, who has written a book on Pessimism, shows that Leopardi differs from Schopenhauer both as to the cause of evil and the means of its prevention. Critics in later times have differed as to the literary and philosophical position of Leopardi, but their objections are shown to be equally fatal to the reputation of certain French and other moralists, beginning with Montaigne and ending with Schopenhauer. M. Stein holds him, however, to be fairly representative of a certain class of literary men, if not thinkers, who appear like a red thread in the warp and woof of the age in which he lived, who were burdened by *Weltschmerz*, and who consequently adopted certain despairing or pessimistic views as to the world-problem.—The paper which follows upon this is a continuation of M. Mensbir's article on 'Man's place in Nature.' In the first part of the section he occupies himself with the views of Goethe, Cuvier and St. Hilaire. Thence he passes on to discuss the position of Lamarck, who held that there could be no doubt as to the unity of the organic world, and that in its lowest forms it had sprung from non-organic matter by spontaneous generation. The non-acceptance of Lamarck's theory he accounts for by regarding it as due to the conservative tendency of the age and a certain non-acceptable character in the doctrine itself. He points, moreover, to the fact that certain prominent individualities seem to incarnate in themselves the spirit of the time. Sir Charles Lyell took up the uniformitarian view as against the catastrophists, and it may be shown that Lyell's views were a first step towards the development theory, from the field which it furnished for the constant and uninterrupted development of organisms.

Passing over the new form in which the Lamarckian hypothesis was unfolded by Wallace and Darwin, M. Mensbir comes to Spencer's theory of the development of mind, or rather *Reason*, for it is an equivalent word to this which he uses. Here we have first of all the presence of feeling as the elementary phenomenon of mind, and it is taken for granted that this is identical with consciousness, will, and reason. We have the sensibility to light in the animal regarded as equivalent to the action of light on the vegetable, and the localization of this sensibility in certain cells which contain the well known red matter which is the fundamental element of the eye. Finally, it is asked, what is consciousness? No more than a form and outline of the world which we preserve (we presume the impression or photograph of it in our organism). Everything becomes so easy that we need not go farther to show how easily such abstractions as 'space' and 'time' may be evolved. Have we not already evolved reason out of the feeling to be found in an earthworm, and what more can be wanted? What Spencer and Darwin have not made sufficiently clear about the deepest mysteries of mind has it not been expounded by Romanes? The next paper is an examination of the whole art and mystery of what is more difficult to explain than the formation of reason, viz., the origin of Moscow Slavophilism. We agree with the concluding words of the writer, M. Vinogradoff, that the world—historical vocation of nations including also Slavophiles, is centred in the one process—to proceed as fast as may be 'out of the dark and into the light.'—To this succeeds a paper which is perhaps of a more truly philosophical character, the conclusion of M. Vvedenskie's paper on 'Fouillée and the Metaphysics of the Future.' This concluding part is taken up by some criticisms on his views of philosophy as a whole. M. Vvedenskie, while he admires the powerful grasp which M. Fouillée takes of the subject, the breadth of view, energy and vivacity of judgment which he manifests, finds, nevertheless, some defects of treatment. First of all, our critic objects to the term 'Metaphysic,' which M. Fouillée uses as an equivalent for philosophy without clearly explaining what he means by either, or wherein they differ from each other. Further, our critic finds fault with the formulæ employed in such as the following: the 'problem of Metaphysic, to form the way of systematizing and criticising our knowledge, or a conception concerning the union of all actually existing: and our relations to these.' Our critic does not, moreover, think that M. Fouillée is justified in protesting against what Kant names 'transcendental ontology.' Finally, M. Vvedenskie sums up the results of his examination of Fouillée in the four follow-

ing positions: (1) The term 'philosophy' ought to be strictly distinguished from the relative term 'metaphysic,' by separating both in their specially scientific designation from the more general term 'knowledge,' and contemplating them in the light of history. (2) The independent, specially scientific character of metaphysic should be secured by its special subject, (the world in its aim, in the concrete unity of its primary grounds, its problem, the determination of the relation of existence to its ideal element or aim and its method (the theory not excluding, moreover—experience). (3) The determination of metaphysic ought to be—metaphysic is the scientific understanding and appreciation of the union of the essential from the point of view of its ideal elements. (4) To benefit by every means for the completion of its problems of a living and intuitive knowledge (*i.e.*, inner experience) metaphysic cannot, nevertheless, proceed without theoretical treatment, but so that it should preserve the objective, scientific synthesis from going over into the form of subjective speculation.—The article on 'Telepathy' is drawn so exclusively from English sources and the Society for Psychological Research that it may be taken for granted that the English reader will already have obtained some knowledge of its contents. This concludes all but the special part, yet there is a particularly interesting paper by Professor Kozloff on recent investigation regarding Plato, more especially in regard to the late Professor Teichmüller of Dorpat, who in his 'Literary Feuds of the 4th Century, B.C.' made good a variety of points against Zeller, who is so well known as the historian of Greek philosophy.

VOPROSI PHILOSOFII I PSYCHOLOGII (Questions Philosophical and Psychological) begins its 12th number by a continuation of M. Tchicherin's papers on Comte. These, so far as the Sociology is concerned present the same tone of wonderment not unmixed with contempt which we have given full expression to in our last summary. The same spirit prevails in this article, as may be seen from the translation of the following sentences: 'In man from the first step we meet with phenomena which are not to be found in physical nature. Here we find law, morality, religion, science. All these specially belong to the human spirit. How are these to be brought into the domain of positive science? Obviously they ought to be studied as phenomena; their laws ascertained; compared between themselves and with results obtained elsewhere. Thus only is it possible to pronounce a final judgment. But Positive Philosophy frees itself from this labour. Straightway on the ground of non-existence not having produced a proper biological theory of human nature, Religion and Metaphysics are declared to be

empty creations of the imagination, and on this Comte builds all his own peculiar doctrines. If the judgments of Comte concerning the sciences little known to himself were often frivolous, here frivolousness reached unimaginable proportions.' And here M. Tchicherin proceeds to expose remorselessly the self-contradictions, the nonsequences, and self-involved circles of our Positive Philosopher. Thus page 3 (on Vol. IV., 660-711) our critic remarks: 'In the deduction of this speculative theory all is wrong from beginning to end. It contradicts Comte's own doctrine, which, as we have seen, denies all possibility of internal observation.' It being impossible to follow M. Tchicherin further in his careful analysis of Comte's Sociology, we in turn may be allowed to express our wonder that our English expounders of Comte, *e.g.*, G. H. Lewes and Miss Martineau, have found nothing of all this! Mill, as we have seen, occasionally marvels over the superficiality of Comte. M. Tchicherin exposes elsewhere, what we have had experience of, the superficiality and incorrectness of Lewes in his *History of Philosophy*, but certainly if M. Tchicherin be correct, the English expositions of Comte cannot be worth much. If M. Tchicherin's work were translated it might give our English Positivists some employment!—This is followed by a religious article by the Archimandrite Antonii on the question: How is the service of the public weal related to the salvation of one's own soul? The insertion of such an article may probably be explained by the peculiarities of the censorship.—Next follows an article on Professor Huxley, as the representative of the contemporary scientific views of the world, by N. Ivantzoff. It refers mainly to Prof. Huxley's minor articles, of which, as well as of his scientific reputation, M. Ivantzoff treats with much appreciation. It opens by referring to his general reputation as a man of science, and then goes on to examine his scientific views and conceptions of man and nature, the signification of natural science in education, his scientific method, and his views of the unity of the order of the world. His method is thus described, which he considers common to all the sciences: (1.) Observation of facts, including the artificial observation which goes by the name of experiment. (2.) The process of uniting similar facts into groups, or, it might be said, bundles, ticketed and ready for use. This process is named Comparison and Classification, while the results of the process or the ticketed bundles should be named General Positions. (3.) Deduction, leading us from General or Common Positions anew to facts which repeat and enable us to divine through the general conclusions with which the bundles of facts are ticketed, the results to which

they tend. (4.) Experimental proof or verification, that is, the process assuring us as to the conclusions to which the collated facts tend. The unity of the order of the world is founded on the axiom which expresses the unity of the order of nature, and is expressed in a sentence from Spinoza's *Ethics*; Preface to Part Third: *Naturae leges et regulae, secundum quas omnia fiunt et ex unis formis in alias mutantur, sunt ubique et semper eadem.* Finally, Huxley's views are expounded as to the Unity of the Organic World, the Unity of Nature, organic and inorganic, and lastly, concerning Abiogenesis or the possibility in certain relations of organic and inorganic matter leading to spontaneous generation.—A continuation of the former article on 'Telepathy' is here taken up, but is merely indicated, for the reasons already given.—The last article in the number is by the editor, M. Grote, and treats 'The Foundation of Moral Duty.' The first part of the article occupies itself with the *status questionis* or the exact bearing of the subject.—Moralists have seldom discriminated clearly between two essentially different questions: first, 'What must one do to be moral?' and second, 'Why ought one act morally?' The difference between these questions was first emphasised by Schopenhauer. They were even mixed up by Kant in his doctrine concerning the Categorical Imperative, or, in other words, Kant, as Schopenhauer remarks, confounded the conceptions as to the *principle* and the *foundation* of ethics. The *principle* is the highest rule of ethics for the determination of what is ethical, or the briefest form of expression for the form of activity which is prescribed as, or admitted to be, moral. The foundation of ethics is the ground-work of the obligation or desire to act morally. The aim of the author is to solve the *antinomy* which arises as follows. The consideration of personal advantage or profit excludes the idea of moral action or of all moral validity of conduct. On the other hand, it is impossible to find any foundation or sanction of moral conduct or the idea of moral duty without some relation to the personal welfare of the moral subject. The object of Prof. Grote's inquiry is to investigate and reduce to the simplest possible form this fundamental contradiction. We should have appended a brief statement of the results of the enquiry, but the article is not concluded in the present number.—The rest of the journal is occupied by an enquiry, by M. Radloff, as to the ethical fragments of Democritus.—This is followed by an article of a special character, entitled, 'One of the possible world conceptions.'—This is followed by reviews and bibliographical matter.

ITALY.

LA RASSEGNA NAZIONALE (May 1st).—After a lecture given at Milan by L. Vitale, on 'Antonio Stoppani,' there comes an account by A. Poppi of 'Professor Benedetto Prima,' an Italian poet and savant who died at the end of last year.—Signora N. Anzoletti writes a paper on the 'Different Translations of Homer,' and praises that of the *Odyssey*, by Alfonso Piccolomini.—The publication of the 'Letters of Niccolò Tommaseo, from '63 to '69,' are continued.—'The Letters of the Craven Family' here relate to the death of the young daughter of their editor, Duchess Ravaschieri, and contain a letter from Father Lacordaire to Pauline Craven.—(May 16).—P. Mannassei writes on the 'Interest given on Funded Property.'—P. E. Castagnoli's instalment of 'The Roman Poets of the Latter Part of this Century,' gives a short biography of Ludovico Parini, who died in 1868, and quotes many of his poems, as well as one or two of his wife Carlotta. Teresa Gnoli Gualandi is the next poetess mentioned; she also died early, and there is a melancholy tone in a poem of hers quoted here, entitled 'Night.' Ferdinand Saittini, who died in middle age of consumption, has an honourable place in the article.—Niccolò Tommaseo's 'Letters' are concluded.—G. Prinetti discusses 'The Financial Question.'—A. Foperti writes on 'Papal Independence and Crispi.'

LA RASSEGNA NAZIONALE (June 1st).—A. V. Vecchi's 'General History of the Italian Navy' is noticed by V. D. Aristo.—A. Brunialti talks of 'Travel Round the World,' apropos of E. Cavaglione's book.—A. Paglicci describes the 'Italian Possessions in Africa.'—P. P. contributes a paper on the 'Question of Banks.'—P. writes on 'Monsignore Zim.'—In this number's instalment of the 'Correspondence of the Craven Family,' Duchess Ravaschieri gives a picture of the life led by Madame Craven at Castagneto, a village between Naples and Salerno. Madame Craven's letter, dated from Chateau de Dangu, the residence of Count Lagrange, on the 23rd September, 1865, describes the effect of the victory of 'Gladiateur.' Duchess Ravaschieri goes on to tell how Madame Craven's book, *Le Recit d'une Sœur*, came out, and the bewilderment of its author at its great success.—The number closes with various continuations, and a paper on the 'Italian Agrarian Federation' by Volpe-Landi.—(June 16th).—G. Strocchi fills up a gap in the 'Story of the Life of Garibaldi,' by relating an incident, hitherto undescribed, of his flight across the Apennines, from Modigliano to Cerbaia, which Signor Strocchi heard from the lips of Teresa Baldini, daughter of the host of the *Santo Lucia*

Allo Stale, on the road from Filigare, where Garibaldi was obliged to stay on the 24th August, 1848, the Austrians having blocked the road. Then, as now, this inn was besides a salt and tobacco shop, and Garibaldi and his companion Leggiere there furnished themselves with cigars. Garibaldi asked for a cup of coffee. He was dressed in the long cloak used by the mountaineers, and a kind of ribbed blouse. Leggiere wore a thick beard, Garibaldi only his moustache. While coffee was preparing, Garibaldi conversed with Teresa, an intelligent girl, who did the honours instead of her mother, who was in bed upstairs. Teresa told Garibaldi that German and Tuscan soldiers were seeking for him on land and sea. 'Do you know me then,' asked Garibaldi in surprise. 'You are Garibaldi,' answered Teresa. 'Where have you seen me before?' 'Don't you remember that you passed here with your volunteers last November, the day of the fair of Galliana?' said Teresa. 'Enough, enough,' replied Garibaldi, in a tone that interdicted further conversation. Soon after Garibaldi fell into a slumber, and meanwhile an Austrian sergeant, accompanied by several Croats, entered the inn, and asking for a glass of wine in broken Italian, threw himself into a chair at the same table as the fugitives. Leggiere touched Garibaldi to awaken him. On seeing the Austrians, Garibaldi made a sign to Teresa to question them, and rising, he went to light a cigar at the wick of a lantern, taking the opportunity to turn his back on the light from the door of the inn kitchen, which had no window. In reply to Teresa's questions, the Austrian sergeant said that he came from Barbarini, in advance of a corps of three thousand soldiers sent to arrest the 'infamous Garibaldi,' and that he was charged to make preparations on the route. Meanwhile Garibaldi smoked his cigar with an air of indifference, and the Croats, having finished their wine, went away. Then Garibaldi asked whether he and his companion could be hidden in the inn until able to continue their journey. 'In the inn you cannot hide,' was the reply, 'but quite near we may find a place of concealment.' At this moment a loud knock was heard at the door, which had been closed when the Croats left. The avantguard of the troops had arrived. As soon as the door was opened, the soldiers rushed in to obtain drink, and while the host was trying to keep them back, saying that he had no more wine, and that his wife was lying sick, Teresa and her brother Angiolo led away the fugitives, profiting by the noise and confusion. They went down the road where, as Garibaldi says in his *Memoirs*, he sought and found refuge in a peasant's house on the left of the road. The fugitives, however, hid, not in the house, but in a hut near, where a sheet brought by Teresa, and spread on a bundle of straw,

formed their bed. The next day Teresa and another girl brought their breakfast, consisting of coffee, milk, and bread and butter. Garibaldi asked whether there was no place from which he could see the Austrians pass on their march. A low hill called the *Poggiotino* was indicated, and there he went with Leggiere, and, standing under a chestnut tree, which is still shown to tourists, he watched through his field-glass the passing of his deluded pursuers. Garibaldi had a long metal pin stuck in his left sleeve, which glittered in the sun, and attracted the attention of Teresa, who asked what the General meant to do with it. 'Don't touch it,' he replied; 'if I fall into the hands of the Germans, this pin shall save me;' and he made a gesture as if thrusting the pin into his ear. When the fugitives returned to the hut, Leggiere seemed very uneasy, and, in a language unknown to Teresa, said a few words to Garibaldi, who answered in Italian, 'Be quiet; we are in good hands!' Towards midday Teresa and her girl companion brought a meal of cold turkey and sausages. Garibaldi was surprised at the intelligence and vivacity of the two girls, and pointed out to Leggiere the treasure of talent buried among these mountains. He then asked Teresa whether there was no one who could guide them to Val di Bisenzio, where, as he said, he would find friends. 'Revigiani might do it,' she replied. 'Revigiani!' exclaimed the General. 'What is his other name?—perhaps Giuseppe?' Giuseppe Revigiani had been one of Garibaldi's most devoted volunteers. Teresa did not know whether the Revigiani she had mentioned was called Giuseppe, and so a messenger was sent to inquire. He returned saying that the man was really Giuseppe, but that unfortunately he was just then absent. Another guide was found, but he was very reluctant to run the risk of accompanying the fugitives, and Leggiere then spoke for the first time in Italian, exclaiming, '*Dio!* what are you afraid of?' A conveyance was presently found, and the two fugitives were driven by the guide on by-roads to Villa Mongara, where they were disappointed by the refusal of the owner, Signor Betti, a timid man, to give them shelter, or to point out their further route. Going on they halted near the house of a peasant in Val di Bisenzio to eat a little bread; and at last arrived safely at Molino di Cerbaia, or Pispola, on the 26th August. From this point the adventures of Garibaldi and his companion are related in the 'Autobiographical Memoirs' and other histories of Garibaldi. Signor Strocchi points out some discrepancies in various histories, and concludes by saying that, on August 24 of this year, an inscription is to be placed on the inn of *Santo Lucia allo Stale*, as a record of Garibaldi's taking refuge there. Teresa has been married many years. She

never saw Garibaldi again.—A. Valdarmin gives an account of Ferrante Aporti, a distinguished patriot and professor.—C. Fortebracci contributes twelve sonnets.—U. P. compares the ‘Different Systems of Insurance Companies in America and Europe.’

LA NUOVA ANTOLOGIA (May 1st).—F. P. Cestaro contributes a paper on history as treated by Manzoni in his ‘Betrothed.’—A shorter but pleasing article is one by A. Venture on ‘Spring as Represented in Heathen and Christian Art.’—C. Boglietti, writing on ‘The Imprisonment of Don Carlos according to Recent Publications,’ says that the truth about the character of Carlos, as revealed by the dusty folios of the Archives, is even more interesting and instructive than his character as invented by the great German poet. The truth now revealed is human truth. It has the eternal and immutable elements of human nature, not the fugitive traits of an epoch, though that epoch was great and celebrated. What can be more powerfully instructive, asks Signor Boglietti, than the few facts of the Prince’s life? A youth born on the steps of the throne, heir of the greatest empire in the world, but struck from his very birth at his vital source; he lives a few years in a mad but impotent pride of his house, his name, and his grandeur, but never even tastes one of the human joys granted to the least of his father’s subjects. What more instructive than this father reduced to regard this abortion of nature as a misfortune, a blot, a scandal, a sign of the expiation of his own guilt before God and man? The paper closes with a short description of the six months passed by Carlos in prison; of his alternate resignation and resolve to commit suicide; of his sleeping naked under the open window in winter; of his putting ice in his bed, flooding his room with icy water and walking in it with bare feet. It was to such excesses that the unhappy prince succumbed on the 24th July, 1568, after receiving the comforts of religion, and asking pardon and granting it, of his father and to his enemies.—C. Donato has a short novelette called ‘In the Abyss,’ while the tale ‘First Love’ runs its course through all the numbers.—‘Woman and Her Future’ is a lecture which was read at Verona by Signor Bonghi; very genial in its argument, and concluding that even if the woman of the future differ from her of the present, she will always be a harmony and not a dissonance in the human concert. She will be vivacious, intellectual, loving, full of sentiment, rapid in conception, fine in discernment, compassionate, pious, suave and spiritual as she is now, and at the same time she will have what she has not now, an active share in the factory, the office, the lecture-room, and the market,

and expand, as she cannot now, the treasures of her soul.—There follows a paper by A. Avanzero on the political crisis.—May 16.—The principle article here is ‘The 1st May and Socialism,’ by S. Bonghi. The writer sums up his arguments as follows: Perhaps the real solution of present difficulties would be that masters and employees, rich and poor, should all become *better* in the most intimate and serious sense of the word; perhaps there is no other way that more directly leads to the salvation of society than this, the simplest of all. Let us be good; no one is ignorant of what it is to be so. Perhaps it will happen that one will return to the world, who will go from city to city with blessing, preaching to all classes: ‘Be all brothers, for you are the children of one father; purify and elevate your souls; renew your inner man, renounce all cupidity, all pride; begin at the beginning and re-enter the paths of love and goodness.’—There follow ‘Guido Montefeltro in Dante’s Divine Comedy,’ by F. D. Ovidio, and ‘Co-operative Societies,’ by V. Ellena, who, after alluding to what has happened in other countries, gives an account of the societies of Italy, the difficulties to be overcome, and the privileges accorded by Government.—The ‘Court of Parma in the Eighteenth Century,’ by C. Pigorina-Beri, is the story of the now forgotten Duchess of Parma, Marie Amalia, daughter of the Empress Marie Therese.—‘Twenty years after,’ by an ex-Deputy, is a comparison of Italian finance from 1852 to the present day.—In the bibliographical bulletin, two English publications receive praise; they are G. J. Holyoake’s ‘Co-operative Movement of to-day,’ and Miss Potter’s ‘Co-operative Movement in Great Britain.’

LA NUOVA ANTOLOGIA (June 1st).—After the first part of ‘European Equilibrium,’ by G. G. Goiran, and ‘Aristodemus,’ by A. Zardo, we have here ‘Economical Italy,’ by Senator de Gambay-Digny, who discusses the means to be adopted to restore his country to prosperity. Among other things, he declares the only way to increase the revenue is to reduce the tax on corn to three francs, and re-establish that on grinding, when the Exchequer would lose about ten millions on the first but gain eighty millions by the latter, without raising the price of bread a centime. He ends by reminding Italian financiers of Huskisson’s words on the 25th of March 1820, twenty years before the reform introduced by Peel: ‘The Continental Governments do not know how wise and economical is the policy which increases the public revenue by reducing the aliquot of the taxes; and how much they would gain by allowing the people more latitude in trading with their neighbours.’

—There follow 'Marshall Macdonald according to recent biographers,' by A. Franchetti, 'The Celestial Space,' by O. Z. Biango, and 'The English in India,' by C. Tagliabue, who sketches briefly the history of the English dominion, and shows that at present England has a better position in India than ever. She should now aim at the final regeneration of that country by educating its people to govern themselves, so that they may acquire the independent position to which their ancient blood and history entitle them.—Some verses by G. Marradi close the number.

L'ARCHIVIO STORICO PER LE PROVINCE NAPOLITANE (Year 17, No. 1).—'The story of Richard Filangiere in the time of Frederick II.,' by G. del Giudice, is continued, as well as the account of the residence of Boccaccio in Naples, by G. de Blasiis.—'The Dukedom of Naples,' by B. Capasso, is the first instalment of a history which the author says is the history of Naples *par excellence*, yet has a value far exceeding the narrow limits of that city, and of the territory on which its events took place. The present portion consists of three chapters, each divided into two or more parts; the headings being as follows: Chapter 1st, Greco-Roman period; 1, the primitive city. 2, The remains of the Greco-Roman period. Chapter 2nd, The first century of Christian Naples; 1, The first Neapolitan bishops; 2, The Barbaric domination. Chapter 3rd, Arrangement of the city under the Byzantines; 1, Second Period of the Neapolitan Episcopacy; 2, Naples and Gregorio Magno; 3, The Perils of Imperial Italy.—Follows 'The Challenge of Barletta,' in an inedited contemporary poem, by G. Sanesi.

LA RIVISTA DI SCIENZE SOCIALI E POLITICHE (April 1, 16, May 1,) contain 'Joseph Chamberlain and John Morley,' by G. Boglietti, 'who calls the two English politicians "new men," examples of the new institutions and new ideas that have arisen of late years,' giving a brief account of their lives, opinions, and acts.—'The origin of the Monte dei Paschi in Siena,' by F. Virglii.—'Memoirs and Impressions of Aurelio Saffi,' by L. Rossi.—'The Crisis,' by the Editor.—'Italy and France,' by D. Zanichelli.—'A Refutation of the principal attraction to the principle of non-intervention,' by J. Cocrao.—'The recent Strikes,' by A. de Johannes.—'The office and political value of statistics,' by F. Colletti.—'Liberty of instruction and the improvement of the higher studies,' by a Professor.—(May 15, June 1.)—'Waiting,' by the Editor.—'On Condemned Deputies,' by F. Genala.—'Thoughts on University Reform,' by E. Gorrini.—'Finis,' by the Editor.—'The

Reform of Electoral Laws,' by A. Brunialti.—'William Booth and the Social Question,' by G. Boglietti,' giving a sketch of Booth's theory and practice.—'Positive Morals and Educational Magistracy,' by G. Marchesini.

IL PENSIERO ITALIANO (May).—'Will a Real Economic Social Arrangement be made in our Century?' by U. Pisa.—'Woman according to Science,' by A. Brunialti.—'Leopardi and Swinburne,' by R. Fiocca.—'A Song in time of Revolution, by Swinburne,'—'The Left Hand, by R. Vertua.—'Science in the Administration of Schools and in the System of Law,' by A. Pilo.—'Normal Action as the Base of the Responsibility of Criminals,' by F. Luzzatto.—'Meteoric Phenomena and Agriculture,' by E. Pini.—'About Medicine,' by A. Fitte.—'New Studies on Character,' by M. Pilo.

RIVISTA ITALIANI DI FILOSOFIA (May, June).—'The Moment of Observation,' by V. Benini.—'On Sensitive Conscience,' by L. Ferri.—'On Some Italian Commentators of Plato,' by R. Bobba.

L'ARCHIVIO STORICO ITALIANO (1892, 1).—Begins with a description of the 'Feast of the Assumption at Brescia in the Middle Ages, where it was celebrated with immense pomp, an enormous outlay in wax candles (which had to be restricted by law) with gorgeous procession, races, bull fights, and so on.—The administrative orders of the communes of Garfagnana in the eleventh to the eighteenth centuries, by C. De Stefani.—In the 'Varieties,' there are 'The Departure of Malatesta Baglione from Florence,' by C. Sanesi; 'Lagrangna the Mathematician and the University of Pisa,' by C. Sforza; and 'An Apologetic Letter of Carlo Botta,' by A. Neri.

G R E E C E.

ATHENA (Vol. III., pt. 3).—The k. Basès continues his 'Roman Questions' with brief discussions on the terms *patres conscripti*, *intercessio*, and on the *Leges Porciae*.—The same writer also continues his criticism on the new edition of Plutarch's *Morals*.—The greater part of this number is occupied by a collection of Greek inscriptions of the Christian era, made by the k. Zésios, which includes inscriptions from Monembasia, Servitsa, Sparta, and from Mystra, which, 'after Constantinople and the Holy Mountain, may perhaps be reckoned the richest place in Europe for the abundance and beauty of its Christian monuments.' Others are from Nauplia, the monastery of Asterion, relating to the Venetian attack on Athens in 1687, and from the church of Kamoukarea.—The number concludes with 'Philological Miscellanies,' by the k. Kontos.

FRANCE.

REVUE DES RELIGIONS (No. 3. 1892).—M. Abbé de Broglie in this number concludes his series of papers on 'La loi de l'unité de sanctuaire en Israël.' Here he passes under review the history of Israel, so far as its religion was concerned, from the foundation of the monarchy to the captivity in Babylon. His object is to show that there is nothing in that history that is absolutely inconsistent with the traditional opinion as to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuchal Laws, and even of those laws which prescribe the one place of worship for all Israel, and limit the priesthood to one family, the direct descendants of Aaron. He takes the narratives regarding the period here defined that are given in the books of Kings and Chronicles, (the period he here examines is really from the reign of Solomon), and supplements them with the testimony of the prophets, Joel, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. Of these prophets, the only one whose date, he says, is seriously disputed is Joel. The Chronicles, he acknowledges, is of a much later date than the captivity, and was written in order to present the history of Israel prior to the captivity, in a light favourable to the the priestly pretensions and ritual of the age in which the author lived. M. de Broglie, however, does not admit that that necessarily implies that the writer of the Chronicles perverted, or transformed in any way, the facts of that earlier history. He had the narrative of the Kings before him, but he was in possession also of other and more elaborate histories of that age. He drew from these other sources facts omitted by the writer or writers of the Kings, and set many of those facts in the light in which he there found them. They may appear to us perhaps at variance in his record with what we fancied them in some particulars to be as we read the books of the Kings, but in reality they do not prove, when carefully examined, to be in contradiction with each other. Our author sets himself to prove this in detail, and his arguments are certainly plausible and ingenious, if not always conclusive. They are worthy certainly of patient attention.—M. R. Renouard gives an excellent summary of Sir Alfred Lyall's Rede Lecture on 'National Religion in India,' indicating, of course, his dissent from the lecturer's standpoint and conclusions, but dealing very fairly with them.

REVUE DE L'HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS (No. 2, 1892).—Critics of the late M. Ernest Havet's book 'La modernité des Prophètes,' have, as a whole, been somewhat impatient with it; both with its conclusions and with the arguments advanced in their support. They have not deemed it worthy of detailed

refutation, and we know of only two who have said anything in its praise, M. Vernes and M. Bellangé. Those who have felt it necessary, in order to justify their condemnation of it, to enter into any detail, have expressed the inclination to apologise for having done so. The reviewer *e.g.* in the *Academy*, after giving some examples of M. Havet's choicest arguments, asks forgiveness for troubling his readers with such 'trumpety nonsense.' M. L. Horst in this number of this *Revue*, though he has not a much higher estimate of M. Havet's book, subjects it to a detailed examination, and shows on how frail a foundation the whole structure built up in it rests. M. Havet's memory perhaps deserved this, for within his own province he was an able and even brilliant teacher. But M. Horst, after patiently examining section by section of M. Havet's argument, can only join in the chorus of disapprobation that has almost everywhere greeted it. He believes, however, that the book will serve one good purpose—it will give a fresh impulse to the researches that are now being made into the constituent parts of the Bible, and will thus further the interests of Biblical and Historical Science.—M. L. Feer reviews three recent French works on Buddhism, that by Ryauon Fujishima 'Le Bouddhisme japonais;' that by Soubhadra-Bhikshou, 'Catéchisme bouddhique, ou Introduction à la doctrine du Bouddha Gotama;' and that by M. Augustin Chaboseau, 'Essai sur la philosophie bouddhique.' M. Feer first gives a summary of the contents of each of these works, and then takes up some of the most interesting points discussed in them, and shows what the writers teach regarding them. The points cover most of the doctrines that go to form Buddhism, and so we have here a very succinct summary of the views now taught by its leading spirits. They embrace such questions as whether it is a religion or a philosophic system? What constitutes orthodoxy? What makes books sacred, when there is no deity to inspire them? What is meant by, and what is the value of, prayer? Is suicide lawful? What is nirvana? and a host of others.—There follows a French translation of an old treatise by a Japanese Buddhist priest, on 'The Doctrines and Sects of Buddhism.' It dates from 1289 A.D. It is here titled 'Sketch of the eight Buddhist sects of Japan.' The translation, which is not completed here, is by M. Alfred Milliaud, who furnishes also a short historical and explanatory preface.—Among the shorter reviews we notice Mr. Rochhill's 'The Land of the Lamas,' Mr. Tomkins' 'Life and Times of Joseph,' J. A. Robinson's 'The Passion of St. Perpetua,' Mr. Keary's 'The Vikings in Western Christendom,' J. A. Farrar's 'Paganism and Chris-

tianity,' and the new edition of 'The Religious Systems of the World.'

BEVUE CELTIQUE (Avril, 1892).—This number, which is of almost more than usual interest, great as that always is, opens with a remarkably well argued article by M. Salomon Reinach under the title 'L'art plastique en Gaule et le Druidisme,' the purpose of which is to show that Druidism was averse to visible representations of the divinities, or, in other words, that the druids had no idols and that in their religion they were distinctly prohibited. The argument is ingenious and forcible, but unfortunately M. Reinach is unable to bring forward a single text as evidence, and until he does the question must be regarded as open.—M. F.-M. Luzel contributes the text and translation of an entertaining Breton story entitled 'The Winding Sheet' (Le linceul des morts).—M. Kuno Meyer prints the text of the story of Baile Binnbérlach as it exists in the British Museum Ms. Harl., 5280, f. 48 a. The same story is given by O'Curry in his MS. Materials. The peculiarity of the text given by M. Meyer is that it contains a number of extinct forms of language, antiquated native, and even foreign words. The story is translated, and a glossary of the old and rare words is added.—'Sur la rime intérieure en breton moyen,' by M. E. Ernault, discusses the curious style of rhyming indicated in the title, and furnishes numerous curious examples of it.—The remaining articles are 'The Luxembourg Fragment' by Professor Rhys, 'On the Irish Text, Togail Bruidne da Derga, and connected stories,' by Dr. Max Nettlau, and 'La terme *iarmbérla*' by M. Thurneysen.—In the 'Chronique' the Editor pays a graceful tribute to the memory and scholarship of the late Dr. Reeves, by whose death Irish archæology and Celtic literature have lost one of their greatest students. Among other things attention is especially called to the freedom and grace with which the late learned Bishop placed the vast stores of his information at the service of others. The Chronique is, as usual, full.—In this number a new section has been added, viz., 'Periodiques,' in which an account is given of the chief articles bearing on Celtic studies appearing in the Transactions of learned bodies and in the magazines.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (May, June).—M. Ernest Lavisse who, for several years past, has published in this review instalments of the 'Life of Frederick the Great,' of which the first part appeared in book form some months ago, contributes another portion of it in the first of the numbers before us. It brings Frederick down to the eve of his accession.—An anonymous article, called forth by the forthcoming revision of the constitu-

tion of Belgium, deals with the question of the 'referendum,' which has been proposed as a desirable reform. The writer is, on the whole, favourable to the measure.—M. Charles de Contouly continues the series of articles which he is devoting to Cape Colony. His present paper deals with its material and moral progress, and also considers the question of language.—'The Institution of the Deaf and Dumb in Paris,' is the subject of a most interesting sketch by M. F. Deltour, who shows the immense progress which has taken place within the last twenty years, and which has transformed what was then practically a kind of hospital into an educational establishment.—The second of the May numbers opens with a further instalment of M. Taine's history of the 'Reconstruction of France in 1800.' The subject dealt with in this new section is the reorganization of the educational system; and the author shows by what means Napoleon made the school an ante-chamber to the barracks.—Art-criticism is represented by an important article which M. Gabriel Séailles devotes to Leonardo da Vinci, and in which he shows that the great master did not sacrifice art to science, as some of his contemporaries, and others since them, reproached him with; but that his supreme excellence consists in the union of art and science which his works display.—A notable article is that entitled, 'British Australasia,' and contributed by M. E. Marin La Meslée. Its general tone may be gathered from the concluding lines: 'This new world begins where the old worlds finish; isolated at the extremity of the earth, without enemies and without a past, peopled by a race to which no one can refuse energy, good sense, and moral rectitude, the future opens out for it through the beams of the most brilliant dawn, and the true friends of humanity can only unite their prayers for the prosperity and the ultimate success of an enterprise in which all classes of modern society, and especially men sprung from the ranks of the people, have participated. Who could desire a more valiant motto, a motto more full of energy and hope, than that "Advance, Australia," written beneath the rising sun, which bathes in its golden rays the folds of the flag of the Southern Cross?'—Two other readable articles are to be found in the same number, 'L'Angleterre au temps des invasions,' by M. Jusserand, and a sketch of Madame de Genlis by M. Victor du Bled.—In the last number the most important article is the conclusion of M. Taine's study of Napoleon's scholastic system. The writer is very severe on the French boarding-school, from which, he says, youths take away a sufficient provision of Latin and mathematics, but where they have been deprived of two indispensable experiences. At the moment when he is about to enter the world, the young man

is ignorant of its two principal personages—man and woman.—The only other contribution of general interest is the paper in which M. Binet gives an account of a wonderful ‘calculating-man,’ M. Inaudi, whose memory for figures appears, from the examples given, to be absolutely marvellous.

REVUE MENSUELLE DU MONDE LATIN (May, June).—Each of these numbers is headed by an instalment of a most interesting essay. It is entitled ‘A Pagan Martyr,’ and is a very able sketch of the life and philosophy of Hypatia.—In the first of them there is a further instalment of a sketch—begun some months back—of Don Pedro II., Emperor of Brazil.—Apart from these two contributions, the other items are not of considerable importance. The ‘Causeurs Parisiens’ really gives no information, not even anything like a vivid sketch of the persons dealt with.—‘Le Gouvernement et l’Anarchie,’ treats a serious subject in a trivial tone.—In the next number there is a very readable article on the poet André Chénier, whose tragic fate is one of the crimes which have left the deepest stain on the Revolution of a hundred years ago.—‘Le Département de l’Isère sous la Restauration,’ is not without importance, and contains some interesting documents, but it in no way appeals to English readers.—There are two capital novelettes, one ‘La Ressuscitée,’ simple but touching; the other, ‘La Vengeance de la Duchesse,’ tragic, almost to excess.

REVUE PHILOSOPHIQUE (May, June).—In a former paper, M. G. Mouret set forth the general principles which should be followed in the analysis of the fundamental notions of the exact sciences, and by the application of these principles, he reduced to its elements the relation of mathematical equality, a notion of which the decomposition is usually considered impossible. In the present paper, following on the same lines, he examines the relation of inequality. He shows that this relation of inequality includes, and supposes the existence of a certain number of axiomatic facts.—In a late number, M. Paulham began an investigation of the problem of life; after a summary examination of the materialist and vitalist solutions given of it, he discussed the Leibnizian theory, which he did not find satisfactory. In a further article he showed that instead of making life proceed from a world of phenomena pre-existent to it, life is to be considered as being the primordial reality, and the phenomenal world as the simple expansion of its metaphysical unity. He now goes a step further, and in this concluding part, develops his theory more fully, by the examination of some of the problems which it suggests.—Many psychologists suppress the will as a fact distinct from sensation. They reduce the state of consciousness which

precedes voluntary action to an anterior remembrance of this same act and of the sensations which accompany it, and they thus represent it as a purely representative state of consciousness. Remembrance consisting only of weakened and recurring sensations, will would therefore be nothing more than a 'complexus of sensations,' all having a 'peripheric' origin. In other words, will does not exist, since it is thus reduced to transformed sensation. Against this theory M. Foulée has written a long and closely-reasoned paper, in which he establishes that all the phenomena of the intellect and of the senses are inexplicable without the existence of the will.—M. Lalande and M. Soul contribute respectively a paper, in which some of Holbach's ideas are considered, and another in which the philosophy of Proudhon is criticised.

The REVUE ARCHEOLOGIQUE (1891, Vol. II.), contains a note by M. H. D'Arbois de Jubainville on the 'Celtic Oath.' The formula is rarely found, the phrase generally employed being 'I swear as my nation,' but in the Book of Leinster we find it in full: 'The sky is above us, the earth beneath us, the ocean all round about us. May the heavens fall, and cast from its high strongholds a shower of stars on the face of the earth, may an earthquake rend the earth itself, may the ocean with its blue depths overwhelm the richly clad face of living things, if I by my victory in war-combats and battles, do not restore the cows to stable and stall, and the women to house and home who have been taken away by the enemy.' Similar phrases are found again in the same book, and in the *Scriptores Alexandri Magni*, p. 87, and Aristotle, Vol. III., p. 32, (Didot).

SWITZERLAND.

BIBLIOTHÈQUE UNIVERSELLE ET REVUE SUISSE (April, May, June).—An important contribution to the first two numbers deals with Bosnia under Austria's protectorate. The author is Mr. Houston Stewart-Chamberlain, whom a thorough knowledge of the subject in all its details enables to speak with considerable authority. While recognizing all that has already been achieved by Austria, he indicates certain points of weakness in her policy, one of these being her opposition to Free Trade.—In the part for April, we find the concluding instalments of Dr. Suchard's history and exposition of hydrotherapy, and of Mr. Jean Menos's excellent little story, 'Deux feuilles au Vent.'—Running through both the April and May numbers there is a well-written essay on Vives; it is entitled 'Un moraliste du xvi^e siècle,' and bears the signature of Mlle. Berthe Vadier.—Exclusively of its entertaining

'chroniques,' the April number further contains two articles which will well repay reading. One of them deals with amber, indicating where and how it is obtained, and the manner in which it is worked; the other is a biographical sketch of the Mirabeau family.—May is largely made up of continuations or conclusions; of complete papers the most notable is political, and considers the Swiss Catholic party in its relation to social questions.—There is also an instructive article on artesian wells.—'Au cœur du Caucase' heads the table of contents of the June number. It contains the notes and 'impressions' of a botanist.—'Proper Names and their Meaning' is exceedingly interesting and instructive, but, unfortunately for readers in this country, does not deal with British names.—M. Auguste Glardon brings an excellent literary essay, 'A travers la littérature Anglaise.' It is not complete in this number. The greater part of the present instalment is devoted to Mr. Wallace's 'Ben-Hur.'

SPAIN.

LA ESPAÑA MODERNA, *Revista Ibero-Americana* (April).—The customary translations from other languages, Russian, French, and English, occupy the first place. Turgeneff, Tolstoi, Daudet and Zola, with Stuart Mill as ballast.—'The Music of the Castillian Tongue,' is a very interesting article by Francisco Asenjo Barbieri. 'Its musical elements of the first importance rest in the five vowel letters of the alphabet.' This is especially true. Again: 'almost all the Spanish grammarians, ancient and modern, have confounded the *accent* with the *quantity* and the *tone*, because educated in the study of Greek and Latin, they have not noted the great difference that exists between these languages and ours; these were essentially rhythmic, their syllables had a determinate value, were long or short, so that their language became much more measured than ours, and subject, so to say, to an invariable rule (*pauta*) not clearly found out, all the same. Our language has also its rhythm, but it is not identical with that of the ancients, from which fact we lose somewhat, but in exchange have gained much in melodious accentuation, enabling us truly to say that the Castillian language is a veritable melody.'—'The Spanish Woman in Sant Fé de Bogota,' is an account of the first Spanish females who went thither, showing that they were persons of repute and not camp followers.—'Critical Review of the Centenary,' is the first of three papers giving an account of the preparations for the holding of the quatro-centenary of the discovery of America all over the world, in every department, from statues and books to exhibitions.—'The International

Chronicle of Castelar touches on the Copenhagen meeting, and the change in fortune of the family that has given queens-to-be, or actual, to England and Russia, since the days when the King taught drawing. He ridicules the 'unhappy' who would make a State for themselves, although modern States have arranged themselves for the benefit of all classes. He takes a gloomy view of England's difficulties in Asia, Europe, Africa, and America, difficulties which we happily make light of and decline to see; and speaks of the added 'inseparable difficulty' of Ireland.—In 'Literary Impressions,' the devotion of art to science, in place of 'Art for Art's sake,' is specially noted in Spain as elsewhere. The economic situation is noted as bettering.

LA ESPAÑA MODERNA, *Revista Ibero-Americana* (May).—The principal place among the Spanish papers is given to Martin Alonzo Pinzón in an attempt to show that this navigator, who was under Columbus, has been neglected, and that his skill, knowledge, and courage, were large elements in the success of the Admiral. He was about fifty in 1492, was a skilled navigator, who owned his own vessels, and the result of his meetings with Columbus was, that he embraced the idea of the discoverer with enthusiasm, and negotiated to join the projected discovery with his vessels, his means, his person, and those of his brothers and friends. Still, at starting, none of the vessels were those of Pinzón. But 'he had facilitated the arrangement, difficult or impossible without his assistance, the means for which he alone could supply.'—'The Music of the Castilian Language' is the subject of another paper by M. Menéndez Pelayo, who supports the views and highly eulogises the work of Barbieri, but condemns the recent words in science and art as 'a dark thicket of barbarous locutions, creaking gallicisms, and insufferable pedantries.'—In 'The Critical Review of the Centenary' we learn that the corpse of Pizarro has been disinterred and placed in the chapel of the kings in Peru. The mummy has also been photographed, and all the wounds received in his assassination are seen, and prove the personality of the conqueror. It shows a man of large stature and strong constitution.—The 'International Chronicle' deals with the socialist contagion which looms so large on the Continent. The Radical ex-Minister is very severe on the idea that society and nature are to accommodate themselves to the particular interests of the Socialists, and fulfil their arbitrary fancies, 'as if a desire could conquer fate, and a sophism correct the universal laws of logic, and the impositions of a necessity were not to be eluded.' He considers the Irish crisis very grave, but the Italian crisis more so: 'If

the Catholic clergy of France were more republican, and the republican party of Italy were at the same time on its side more catholic, already we should have seen an end to the problem presented by the inexorable logic of facts.' But Castelar, like most Spaniards, is drunken with the pan-Latin craze. The extremely French character of the neo-Spanish writers is admitted, while the Gallic sympathy of the nation is shown in the great space always devoted to French translations.

LA ESPAÑA MODERNA, *Revista Ibero-Americana* (June).—'The Critical Review of the Centenary' describes the efforts of Paris to claim a foremost place through the discoveries of Cartier, Champlain, and other navigators. They are re-producing ancient America—in a street of Florida, constructed 1592; another of Boston, with the Municipal Buildings, erected 1647; Broadway, New-York, as it was in 1792, with the Dutch houses, the taverns, and the city gate, showing the development of the centuries.—The excitement of the centenary produces strange declarations; some claim Columbus as a Socialist, others as a painter, others as a brother of a religious order. Melvil Dewar, director of the New York Library, announces that he will irrefutably prove from MSS., 'obtained strangely!' that Columbus was not the first who reached the New World. Which is very likely, but little to the point.—The life of Pinzón is continued to the point when he returns to Palos the evening of the same day that Columbus arrived, although they had separated long before, and each supposed the other destroyed. Pinzón seems to have died within a few days of grief, and even his biographer and eulogist does not attempt to deny his having rebelled so far against his commander.—Castelar considers that Italy suffers for want of a new external policy, and Portugal for want of a new interior one. Italy should draw closer to those who buy her produce and give her work, not to those from whom, in case of war, she can alone aggrandise herself. Portugal ought to look to junction with Spain now, and not expect to have her sympathy otherwise in the day of disgrace. He does not consider a European war imminent, the journey of President Carnot to Nancy and of the Czar to Copenhagen strongly proving the contrary.—In 'Literary Impressions,' Emilia Pardo Bazan is compared favourably with Maupassant, Daudet, Bret Harte, and Rudyard Kipling. 'Señora Pardo Bazan does not require to produce extraordinary appeals and marvellous descriptions to move and delight her readers. With serene aspect, free from all sorts of hysterics or epilepsies, she contemplates the reality of life, and represents it introspectively with wonderful

verisimilitude, and expresses it with such artlessness, and at the same time with such exactitude of colouring, that the characters limned, as well as the places painted, become so familiar to the reader, that at the end of a very few pages one fancies himself introduced to the first and living in the second.'—The tales translated include works by Tolstoi, Zola, Prosser, Merimée, and Daudet, monopolising too much of a Spanish magazine, so-called.

HOLLAND.

DE GIDS (May)—Dr. Meijboom gives a translation of a considerable portion of Edwin Arnold's 'Light of the World,' a poem which he seems to think is not appreciated in England as it ought to be.—'The Gold Fish,' a play in three acts by Nouhuys, shows a good deal of dramatic power. A woman, whose husband has married her to save himself from financial ruin, is the gold fish, so called by him and his mistress, between whom and the wife there are passionate scenes, ending in the former casting him off as worthless, while the injured wife ends by forgiving him and devoting all the wealth secured upon herself to the payment of his creditors. As a foil to the odious character of the husband, there is a brother of his, a doctor, who takes high and serious views of life.—An interesting article by Dr. Brandt is entitled 'God, Worship, and Religion,' and consists of the review of two recent books, one 'The Doctrine of God,' by an orthodox Professor Doedes, the other, a popular work on 'The Existence of God,' by Dr. Bruining, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, belonging to the 'modern' school. Both are very dogmatic, and in this paper the one is played off against the other to the advantage of neither. Doedes' position and arguments are not new. Bruining, while he begins by saying that the existence of God is the most pressing question of the day, does not give a very satisfactory answer, but only gives reasonable grounds for believing in God's existence. This belief, he says, is clearly demanded by the phenomena of the world, it does not conflict with science and it is strictly arrangeable. Popular and eloquent in style, there is a want of arrangement in the structure of the book, and he is sometimes downright illogical, as when he says that our senses can perceive nothing of God's actual working, but only the effects of it on matter, since God is invisible and does not work by visible means or instruments, but this is hardly reconcileable with 'belief in God clearly demanded by the phenomena of the world,' and is far from not conflicting with science. His arguments are rather a repetition of old ones, no longer used by the learned, but useful to refute untenable positions much held by half-

educated materialists. The book is certainly weak as a proof of the existence of God. The writer of the article protests against people constructing a hypothetical God, whether of wood, stone, or of reasonable considerations. God, if accepted at all, should be taken as He manifests Himself through the expressions of the religious faculty in man, whether through imagination or by the direct impression of His presence on the religious mind, or through conscience and in love. To determine whether these are creations, merely of phantasy or manifestations of a transcendent being, is the work of philosophy, and must be left to it. The God who is a mere reasonable hypothesis, and about whom it is a question whether he is an object of worship, is only a hindrance to a religious mind.—A good service is being rendered to Dutch literature by the Willems-Fund, which has just published a second volume of the Netherland book of songs, ballads, love songs, comic songs, student songs, and nursery rhymes, about fifty in all, with music. Some of these are very old, and of great interest and beauty, and it is a great matter to have them preserved and popularised in this form.—Byvanck has a bright clever paper, 'Varia,' in which he runs over the latest French literature in an agreeable way, taking up especially Estainie's 'Bonne Dame,' and Jules Renard's 'Ecornifleur,' both rather noticeable works.—The prolific pen of Helène Swarth contributes a series of graceful verses, on such subjects as Sleep, Twilight, January, March, April, A Dream-garden, etc.—(June)—This number begins with a continuation, from April 1891, of 'Conversations,' by Dr. Pierson, very clever in their way though a little desultory. The main subject this time is the French Revolution of '89, and some of its principal actors, with the reflex influence of the events on Holland.—'Little Enigmas,' by Louis Conperus, is a paper in the form of a diary, relating various mild stories about spooks, or rather about rooms that retained an invisible but perceptible impression of former inhabitants and their doings.—'A Genuine Colleger,' is a curious account of an old, very long, very diffuse pamphlet, written in the beginning of the seventeenth century by a member of one of the societies founded by the brothers van Kodde, and known as Rhynsburgh, and which existed from 1619 till the beginning of the present century. They are supposed to have picked up some of their notions from refugee Brownists from England. The pamphlet is very quaint, and is in the form of a dialogue between a Remonstrant, a Mennonite, and their entertainer who represents the author, and who, while making a polite show of adopting some of their arguments, in the end gets thoroughly the better of his guests, converting them to his own views. He begins by saying, that as God in the Old Testament

classes beasts that do not chew the cud among the unclean, it is therefore a duty to turn over everything again and again, and thoroughly get to the bottom of it. Practically, his aim is to denounce the office of preacher. That office belongs to, and is incumbent on, all Christians, and official preachers are superfluous. They are proud and insolent, and the more learned they are the more heretical they show themselves. If the system of colleges, that is, meetings of Christians for exposition, preaching, and administration of sacraments, were adopted, there would be an end to all the hateful strife and division in Christendom. He ends by telling his guests that even very clever men make mistakes in important matters, and now they have been set right.—‘Columbus before 1492,’ by J. F. Niermeyër, is an excellent and most careful study of the early period of Columbus’ life. Considering the scarcity of material, and the doubtful character of many stories told, it is wonderful how clear a picture is given in this unpretending but admirable paper. Especially interesting are some conjectures as to how the conception of another continent to be discovered came to the hero.—‘An inquest,’ by Dr. G. Kalf, is based on a rather absurd book, *Enquête sur l’évolution littéraire*, by Jules Huret, who collected and published opinions on the condition and prospects of French literature from all sorts and conditions of French authors. Kalf is of opinion that literature is slowly, though surely, moving upwards to a higher and better level, in spite of *naturalisme* and *décadents*, and others of similar type.

DEMARK.

AARBÖGER FOR NORDISK OLDKYNDIGHED OG HISTORIE (Vol. VI., Part 4. 1891).—The first two articles are contributions to the study of the almost inexhaustible remains of prehistoric Denmark. The first of these, ‘Researches in Ribe district,’ by A. P. Madsen, relates to Western Jutland, and deals especially with the stone age. The investigations here recorded extend over an area about 8 miles square, containing some 748 mounds from the stone and bronze age, besides hundreds of later ones. Among the finds are some good specimens of amber ornaments, and several axes of which illustrations are given. The other, by A. Reeh and G. V. Smith, treats of some peculiar graves, also of the stone age, in East Jutland (Aarhuus).—Kr. Erslev has a long article on the proposals for a union of the Scandinavian kingdoms made at Kalmar in 1397; but it is entirely a polemic against the views of Hr. Rydberg, and the *holmgang*, as the author himself calls it, does not add much to the question itself.—A Swedish article by

Elis Wadstein, on Olaf Trételgja and his surname, is a piece of textual criticism on part of the *Ynglingatal*, with intent to prove that Olaf's name of the 'wood-cutter' rests on a mistaken reading. Unfortunately most old Scandinavian texts are in such a state as to lend themselves to any amount of emendation, but Hr. Wadstein's are very ingenious.—The two last articles are a curious contrast; both relate to the rough flint implements known as 'triangular axes,' and both turn on the late Hr. Sehested's view that they could not have been used as axes. Captain G. V. Smith from actual experiments seeks to prove that they were employed as such, while Prof. Petersen maintains that they were not, and inclines to the view that they were a kind of digging implement. As the two papers are quite independent, the last word on the question is yet to come.—Vol. VII., Parts 1 and 2 are occupied with a long examination of the sources of Saxo's chronicle by Axel Olrik. *Quellenkritik* is usually very dubious work, but the writer has a good case here. He seeks to show that Saxo's accounts are not, as commonly assumed, of purely Danish origin as opposed to Icelandic and Norse, but are partly from both sources. The idea is not new, but the proofs are original, and are divided according to (1) material and style, (2) forms of proper names, and (3) the list of Danish kings. In the first of these he notes the differences between Icelandic and Danish forms of legends as well as modes of thought and expression, especially in reference to religious views and popular customs. Under the third head the various lists of Danish kings are thoroughly discussed. The article is a valuable contribution to the study of old Northern literature and history.—Professor Fenger writes on the date of the so-called 'Attila's hoard,' the gold vessels found in 1799 at Great St. Micklos in Hungary, and now in Vienna. The proofs are not very strong, but from a comparison of Sassanid and Byzantine art the date he advances is one somewhere between Justinian I. and Charlemagne.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

The Soteriology of the New Testament. By WILLIAM PORCHER DU BOSE, M.A., S.T.D., Professor of Exegesis in the University of the South. London and New York : Macmillan & Co. 1892.

The doctrine of salvation, while one of the principal doctrines of Christian theology, is one of the most difficult to handle. Not only are its aspects and relations manifold ; the terms which are used in connection with it, are, from the use which has from time to time been made of them, in many instances either ambiguous or wanting in precision. The author of the present volume seems to have felt this, and has apparently done his best to make his own meaning as clear as possible. Whether he has succeeded is a question which every reader can only answer for himself. It may be doubted, however, whether he has adopted the best method of making the pages of what is certainly an able book, altogether attractive. The multiplication of words does not always conduce to clearness. It has often the effect of making a book heavy. Professor Du Bose's book is scarcely so able as Butler's *Analogy*, but it continually reminds one of it. There is in it the same evident struggle after clearness of expression and the same consequent tendency to obscurity. To say the least, the volume is hard reading. All the same, there is in it much frank expression of opinion and a good deal of solid thinking. The author has studied his subject closely, and whether the reader is able to follow him or not, he is evidently in possession of very clear and distinct ideas of what he wants to say. As for the definition of salvation, he adopts the Aristotelian method of defining it by its end, and says :—'It is deliverance *from* the actual evil or evils to which we are subject, and *to* the good or goods for which our nature designs us.' With respect to the meaning of salvation in the New Testament, he observes : 'A divine salvation is an absolute salvation. Such a Salvation for man must be not only from *his* evil to *his* good, but from *all* his evil to *all* his good.' And continuing, he remarks : 'It is natural enough that in the New Testament the word should not be used in every instance in the whole length and breadth of its meaning. Any part of Salvation is Salvation, and in this or that connection the word may mean any one or other aspect of its whole significance. For example, it may mean only a present forgiveness of sin, or exemption from some consequence or consequences of sin. But Christian Salvation must mean *all* Salvation.' It will thus be seen that of the doctrine itself Mr. Du Bose takes a very large and comprehensive view. As for his mode of dealing with it, it will, at least for those who are acquainted with discussions of this kind, be sufficiently indicated if we say that he treats of Christ as our Salvation, Reconciliation, Redemption, Resurrection and Propitiation, and that after the chapters dealing with these topics come the necessary chapters on New Testament Christology and others on the Sacrifices of Christ, the Flesh and the Spirit, Christ our High Priest, Salvation in the Church, and Of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Mr. Du Bose discriminates sharply between the actual and the ideal, and makes considerable use of the distinction. He distinguishes also between testimony and authority on the one hand, and the evidence of personal experience on the other. On a number of points the reader may be disposed to differ from the learned

Professor, but there can be no doubt that his book is in many respects a scholarly and able contribution to the study of a very difficult and important subject.

The Canon of the Old Testament: An Essay on the Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture. By HERBERT EDWARD RYLE, B.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, etc. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

The Scriptures of the Old Testament have during recent years attracted a very great amount of attention. Much critical ability has been expended in their study, and many speculations have been adventured as to their origin and the formation of the Canon. As yet, however, the attempts to provide the student with the results arrived at in anything like a compendious form have, at least in English, been somewhat rare. The history of the New Testament Canon is comparatively well known, but the history of the Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures is not. Very few, it would seem, even among theologians, have any very accurate conceptions as to what it has been. The reason may be that the study as now understood is, in a measure, if not altogether, new. At any rate the account which Professor Ryle here gives of the origin, growth, and formation of the Old Testament Canon is very different from that which but a few years ago was generally accepted. What this was may be seen by consulting the valuable excursus which Professor Ryle has appended to his volume. As for his own treatment of the subject, it may be said to be based upon the results of the most recent criticisms. The stories respecting the formation of the Canon by Ezra and the Men of the Great Synagogue, he sets aside as fictitious, and begins his narrative at a much earlier period. Very wisely he points out that the discussion of his subject involves no question as to the authority or inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures. With Canon Driver and other writers, he maintains that the question is of a purely historical and literary character. At the same time, he assumes that the entire bearings of the Canon are religious, and that the idea on which it was formed was religious. The suggestion that the Canon contains merely the relics of Hebrew literature, which, having survived the ravages of time, were on that account regarded by the Jews as sacred and authoritative, is set aside as unwarranted. So also is the supposition that the Old Testament is merely an anthology or a choice selection of the gems of Hebrew literature. 'We assume,' says Professor Ryle, 'that the writings included in the Canon of the Old Testament were brought together for a special purpose, and that that purpose was a religious one.' The chapter on the preparation for a Canon will probably be found the least satisfactory, not, however, from any inadequacy of treatment, but on account of the intricacy and obscurity of the subject. That the formation of a Canon of Scripture presupposes the existence of a community of believers, and that there was a Hebrew literature before there was a Hebrew Canon, are general propositions which do not admit of being questioned; but to what extent the pre-existing literature was adopted into the canonical writings, or what was the relation between them, are questions which are not easily determined. This is especially the case in respect to the legal writings. Dr. Robertson Smith's theory is not altogether above criticism, and Professor Ryle adds nothing to it. That many of the old social and religious customs were adopted into the Sinaitic legislation is probably beyond question, but it is not so clear that all that that legislation did was to 'give a new significance to that which had already long existed among Semitic races,' and to

'lay the foundation of a higher symbolism, leading to a more spiritual worship.' The probability is, we should say, that it did more, but how much it is impossible to say, with anything like exactitude. The beginnings of the Canon, Professor Ryle finds in the Book of the Law discovered by Hilkiah in the Temple, in the reign of Josiah. This he regards as 'substantially identical with the Deuteronomic portion of the Old Testament,' and inclines to the opinion that it was compiled in the latter part of Hezekiah's or in the early part of Manasseh's reign. With other writers he assigns the completion of the first Canons or 'The Law' to Ezra, and gives as the approximate date for its completion the year 432 B.C., the year in which the grandson of the high priest Eliashib was expelled from Jerusalem by Nehemiah. The grounds on which these opinions are based are discussed with candour and at considerable length. The same may be said in respect to the grounds on which Professor Ryle bases his opinions as to the contents and formation of the second and third Canons. Here, however, we can do no more than allude to them. We can only add that the volume, containing as it does a large amount of information which to most readers is new, and being written throughout with admirable scholarship and in a reverent and in some respects conservative spirit, is deserving of the most careful study, not only by preachers and students, but also by every one who desires to obtain an intelligent understanding of the origin, growth, and fortune of the most remarkable of the ancient literatures, and next to New Testament, the most important collection of writings in existence.

Regni Evangelium. A Survey of the Teaching of Jesus Christ.

By the Rev. EDWIN PINDER BARROW, M.A. London: Williams & Norgate, 1892.

It is often asserted, and indeed is generally admitted, that Christianity, though constantly multiplying and vigorously directing its home agencies and its missionary enterprises, is losing its hold on great masses of intelligent people in all classes of our society. It is not the idle and dissipated, the ignorant and unthinking, only that absent themselves from the churches, and treat with either indifference or scorn the teaching of the pulpit. Those who do so are to be found in large, and, we are told, in ever-increasing, numbers among the skilled, industrious, and intellectually inquisitive working men, as well as among the monied and highly-cultured classes of both our cities and our rural districts. What is, or are, the causes of this? and, by what means, if any, can these people be won back again to Christian worship? These are questions which are exercising all the Church courts, and every individual man and woman of earnest mind in all our churches. By many of our most thoughtful writers it is being advanced, as one of the most fertile causes of this modern disaffection towards our religious services, that the Christianity of to-day, both in its worship and in its doctrines, is a sad mixture of Christian truth and heathen superstition, of fact and fiction, of sweet reasonableness and repulsive absurdity, the latter elements preponderating and engaging attention to the detriment of the former. And persuaded of this, some of the best of these writers are endeavouring to separate again the pure gold of the Gospel from the manifold alloys that have got mixed up with it in our creeds and in our Church services—to present to us, in short, 'the Christianity of Christ' as it lives in the Gospels, and is testified to in history; in other words, as it was before it became corrupted in passing through the minds of half-Christian, but still half-heathen, converts, who were placed in positions of authority in the Church. Of all the books we have seen directed towards this object, that

of the Rev. E. P. Barrow is, we think, one of the soberest and best. It is written in a spirit of the deepest respect for the Christian faith, and in the earnest desire to conserve all that is best and noblest in it. There are no fierce philippics in the volume against any of the phases of our modern Christian life. It is a quiet, scholarly, and devout effort to portray the Christ of history, and show what His ideal really was of God's reign in the mind and heart of the individual, and of society as a whole, what the world would become under the inspiring influence and guidance of the Spirit of God in the hearts of men. 'The Gospel of the kingdom,' says Mr. Barrow, 'is the announcement of a new principle of life in the individual, of a new rule of conduct in society, of a new soul relationship to God,' and the purpose of his volume can hardly be better described than in his own words as an attempt to gather from the teaching of Christ 'this system of divine order under the three heads of Moral Reform, Social Reform, and Spiritual Reform.' He takes the message of Christ, that is to say, and shows its bearing on the complicated relationships of society and on the life and work of the Church. In three appendices he deals with special problems that bear closely on New Testament exegesis, (1) the passages where prophecies are quoted in the Gospels as 'fulfilled' in the incidents of Jesus' life; (2) passages that seem in conflict with one another; and (3) the Christology of the New Testament. Whether the reader approves or disapproves of Mr. Barrow's standpoint, he cannot but find this work most stimulating, and, on many points, most instructive.

The Apology of Origen in Reply to Celsus: A chapter in the History of Apologetics. By JOHN PATRICK, B.D. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1892.

Among theologians on the Continent, the monograph is a favourite form of writing. Among ourselves it is somewhat rare. Still more rare are monographs written with the care, thoroughness, and ability of the one before us. The subject Mr. Patrick has chosen for treatment is in every way worthy, and the wonder is that it has not attracted as much attention here as it has in Germany or France. Whatever may be thought of the *True Word* as a literary or philosophical performance, there can be no doubt that in its day it was an important document. It was so regarded by Ambrose and Origen, and the simple fact that these two thought it worthy, after it had been abroad some seventy years, of a careful and elaborate refutation, is an ample proof of the effect it was having. Origen's *opus aureum* in reply to it, on the other hand, notwithstanding its shortcomings, is deserving of all the praise which has been given to it. In spite of its antiquity there is still a certain air of modernness about it, and it may still be regarded as 'a rich storehouse of arms' for the Christian apologist. Mr. Patrick would have done a good work if he had contented himself with merely giving an account of Origen's arguments. But he has done more. In order to make the reply as intelligible as possible, he has exhumed from the text of Origen the arguments of Celsus, and put them together with considerable skill. This in itself, in the absence of the *True Word*, is a decided gain, and not the least noteworthy feature of the volume. Mr. Patrick's estimate of Celsus, while by no means extravagant, does ample justice to his ability and acquirements. We can scarcely accept his opinion as to his skill as a controversialist, and are disposed to think that he did not take all the trouble he might have taken in order to inform himself respecting the real character of the religion he assailed. Mr. Patrick's fairness, however, is in striking contrast to the prejudice with which many

have written. When dealing with Origen he is equally impartial, and while approving all that is good in the Reply, and no one knows better than he does how much that is, he points out the defects with which it is marred. As to the date of the Reply, Mr. Patrick suggests the year 248, when Origen was more than sixty years of age; and by a series of cogent arguments he is able to fix the date of the appearance of the *True Word* at the year 176. The greater part of the work is, of course, taken up with the analyses of the two works with which it deals; but the chapter on the 'Culture of Celsus,' and the various introductory and other remarks scattered throughout the pages of the volume, are additions which bear witness to more than ordinary scholarship, and will be read with interest. The analyses themselves are done with rare ability, and the work is one that ought to find a place in every theological library.

The Spirit of Modern Philosophy: An Essay in the form of Lectures. By JOSIAH ROYCE, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. 2nd Edition. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1892.

If we mistake not Dr. Royce was first made known on this side of the Atlantic by the publication a few years ago of his volume entitled *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, in which with considerable acuteness and insight he treated of the philosophical bases of conduct and faith. Since then he has turned aside to other work of a different kind; but here he returns to his original line of study and with increased vigour. The lectures before us are called an essay we presume, because they are all bound together by a purpose which rounds them off into a unity. They are in all thirteen, and are divided into two series; the first dealing with thinkers and problems, and the other, which consists of four lectures, with what Dr. Royce calls 'suggestions of doctrine.' The lectures in the first series are historical. In these Dr. Royce expounds the doctrines of modern philosophy beginning with Spinoza, whose attitude towards the great problems of existence he ingeniously compares with that of Thomas à Kempis in the *Imitation of Christ*, and ending with Mr. Herbert Spencer, or more properly with the doctrine of evolution. His aim, however, is not to tabulate the doctrines of each of the philosophers of the period. Many of them he passes over, and some of the greatest he merely mentions. For instance, the doctrines of Descartes, Malebranche and Leibnitz, are not so much as enumerated. Dr. Royce's plan is to take out the leading figures, those who set out some great truth and gave it a prominence which it had not before, and then, besides expounding it, to trace its history or to show its 'linkages.' The names he selects in addition to Spinoza, are, as might be expected, Kant, Fichte, Hegel and Schopenhauer, and between his lectures on Fichte and Hegel he has intercalated, one on the Romantic school. According to his view, the doctrines taught by these illustrate the development of modern Philosophy as it has found itself in its three great periods. The first of these he describes as 'naturalism, pure and simple,' and assigns it to the seventeenth century with Spinoza as its leading representative on the continent, and Hobbes in England. Of the second period, which originated with Locke, the chief representative is Kant. The philosophy of this period is regarded by Dr. Royce as 'a sort of new humanism.' The third period is as yet incomplete. Its origin was contemporaneous with the French Revolution, and has for its distinguishing feature the doctrine of evolution. The problem which it is attempted to solve in the second series of the lectures is, what is the fundamental postulate of Philosophy? The answer which Dr. Royce gives

is closely akin to that given by Hegel. It is the real Self, 'Logos, problem-solver, all-knower.' 'The world,' he remarks, 'is such stuff as ideas are made of. Thought possesses all things. But the world is not unreal. It extends infinitely beyond our private consciousness, because it is the world of an universal mind. What facts it is to contain only experience can inform us. There is no magic that can anticipate the work of science. Absolutely the *only* thing sure from the first about this world, however, is that it is intelligent, rational, orderly, essentially comprehensible, so that all its problems are somewhere solved, all its darkest mysteries are known to the supreme Self. The Self infinitely and reflectively transcends our consciousness, and, therefore, since it includes us, it is at the very least a person, and more definitely conscious than we are; for what it possesses is self-reflecting knowledge, and what is knowledge aware of itself, but consciousness. Beyond the seeming wreck and chaos of our finite problems, its eternal insight dwells, therefore, in absolute and supreme majesty. Yet it is not far from every one of us. There is not the least or most transient thought that flits through a child's mind, or that troubles with the faintest line of care a maiden's face, that does not contain and embody something of this divine Logos.' This is but one of many eloquent passages scattered through Dr. Royce's pages. His style is remarkably free, while his skill as an expositor is eminently fair and lucid. The lectures may be read with pleasure by all. Dr. Royce is so well acquainted with the doctrines he deals with, and has so thoroughly mastered them in their various relations that the student of philosophy, whether he agrees with the criticisms and remarks in which Dr. Royce freely indulges or not, may learn much from the pages of these eloquent and richly suggestive lectures. They are inspired throughout by the best spirit of these modern days.

Social Statics Abridged and Revised: Together with The Man versus The State. By HERBERT SPENCER. Fourth thousand and twelfth thousand respectively. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. 1892.

Forty years have elapsed since the first of the above named treatises was originally published. Since then the opinions of its author on many points discussed in its pages have undergone considerable change. Hence the work is now issued, not as it originally appeared, but in a revised and abridged form. The fundamental idea is the same, though one of the bases assigned for it has been given up by the author. The alterations are in the deductions made from the first principle, and in some of its applications. For the purely systematic part, Part IV. of *The Principles of Ethics: Justice* has been substituted, and to that volume the reader is constantly referred. The changes are very considerable. Sections, paragraphs and sentences have been remorselessly cut out, and the work has shrunk to about half its original size. As an illustration of the change which has come over the author's opinion may be instanced, the chapter on the *Evanescence of Evil*. In the first edition the disappearance of evil is regarded as a necessity, and most readers will remember the concluding paragraph of the chapter in which it is dwelt upon with almost prophetic earnestness—a paragraph which appears also in *First Principles*. The chapter is still retained with certain omissions, but a note is added to the effect that though the evanescence of evil will ultimately take place, its consummation can be reached only in an infinite time, and the revised heading of the chapter is 'The Evanescence [?] Diminution] of Evil.' Students of the Synthetic Philosophy, however, who are not in possession of

the original edition, will hail the issue of the work in its present form with pleasure. There is much in it which is not to be found elsewhere in Mr. Spencer's now voluminous writings, and which is well worth careful attention. Some recent experiences have shewn the accuracy of a number of his provisions. The treatise here bound up with the revised version of *Social Statics* remains as hitherto, with the exception of an important illustration, a small correction of fact, and various verbal improvements.

Lancaster and York: A Century of English History (A.D. 1399-1485). By SIR JAMES H. RAMSAY of Bamff, Bart., M.A., etc. 2 vols. Maps and Illustrations. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1892.

It is not often that the fifth act of a drama is published first, nor that the final volumes of an extensive work are issued before the rest. That, however, is what has happened in respect to the volumes before us. They are the last of a work on which Sir James Ramsay has been engaged for the past twenty-one years. The aim of the work is to supply a verified connected narrative of the first 1500 years of English history. Of the success of the experiment as a whole it is too early to speak. It may be said, however, that an experiment on so large a scale and with so commendable an aim deserves to succeed, and that if thoroughly worked out, it can scarcely fail to be of very great assistance to the student of history. Objection may be taken that it does not always shew the opinion of the original authorities. That, however, as we understand it, is not the intention. It is rather to indicate the original sources for the purpose of enabling the student to follow up any particular line of investigation for himself. Save him the trouble of personal research it will not, but it will conduce to the saving of his time and probably of his temper. The period covered by the two volumes before us is at once important and difficult to manage. Sir James Ramsay has dealt with its conflicting interests in the spirit of fairness, and has arranged his materials in a methodical and lucid way. The lines he has attempted to fill out or to indicate are as wide and manifold as those of the life of a great nation. While devoting considerable attention to military matters, he has treated others with not less care. Foreign policy, the history of the constitution, finance, domestic policy, social and commercial and industrial affairs, art, literature, and religion, all come within his purview, and by giving specific references to the original authorities, he has laid the foundation upon which specialist and others coming after him may build. Scottish affairs also, when they come in contact with English history, are very closely attended to. The references here are as full as may be. Altogether the two volumes give very considerable promise, and awaken one's interest. Every care seems to have been taken to insure the accuracy of the references, and the notes are very frequently of equal importance with the text.

Letters of Samuel Johnson, LL.D. Collected and Edited by GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL, D.C.L. 2 vols. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1892.

Next to his very admirable edition of *Boswell*, students of Johnson will regard the letters which Dr. Birkbeck Hill has here brought together as the most important publication which has seen the light for a long time, perhaps since *Boswell* first gave his incomparable volumes to the world. They are edited in the same way as the *Life*, and, full as that work is, form an indispensable companion to it. Johnson's correspondence was much more

extensive than is, perhaps, generally known. He wrote unwillingly, and with more difficulty, he used to imagine, than some other people who wrote nothing but letters; yet his letters to Mrs. Thrale alone number more than three hundred. Dr. Hill does not suppose that he has succeeded in making a complete collection of all the letters he wrote or even of those which are in existence; but he has managed to collect, not counting the three hundred and forty or so included by Boswell in the *Life*, some six hundred and seventy more. Some of them have of course already appeared in various publications, as for instance, in the two volumes of correspondence published by Mrs. Piozzi in 1788, in the editions of the *Life* by Malone and Croker, and in *Notes and Queries*. In these and in the *Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society*, indeed the greater number of them, has appeared, but counting the fifteen first given in his edition of the *Life*, Dr. Birkbeck Hill has been enabled to enrich his collection with no fewer than between ninety and a hundred new letters. This is no small gain, and apart from the advantage of having the letters separate from the *Life*, is the most striking and valuable feature of the volumes. In addition to the letters of which he has been able to find either printed or unprinted, Dr. Hill has given notes of a number of which he has found indications in catalogues, but has been unable to trace to their present owners or beyond the places where he has found them mentioned or the names of their purchasers and the sums paid for them. It is to be hoped that if they are still in existence, his notes will lead at least to their discovery, if not eventually to their publication. The gem of Dr. Birkbeck Hill's collection is a letter from Johnson to his wife, the only one known to exist. It has been admirably reproduced in facsimile, and the public is indebted for its publication to the liberality of Mr. W. R. Smith of Greatham Moor, West Liss, Hampshire, a descendant of the Rev. George Strahan, to whose vicarage at Islington Johnson in the last years of his life occasionally went for the benefit of good air. In this letter, full of tenderness, 'the fond and youthful husband,' as Dr. Hill observes, 'addresses his wife, who was but four days short of fifty-one, as "my dear girl," "my charming love," and as "the most amiable woman in the world."' She was twenty years older than Johnson, 'and no doubt,' as Dr. Hill further observes, 'deserved some of the ridicule which Lord Macaulay has so lavishly cast upon her,' but not it all. He is perhaps not far wrong, when he conjectures that if she had belonged to a different class the great Whig historian would probably have painted her in very different colours. As it is almost needless to say, the letters, besides being extremely varied in their character, are full of fine and weighty passages treating of the greatest of all arts, the art of living. Frequently also they are playful, light, and amusing. As for the editing of them, having said that they are edited in the same way as their editor's edition of the *Life*, we have said all that need be said. It is to be hoped that we shall soon see the work on which he has spent so much skill and patience completed by the issue of his new edition of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*.

James Gilmour of Mongolia: His Diaries, Letters and Reports. Edited and Arranged by RICHARD LOVETT, M.A., Portraits, Maps, and Illustrations. London: Religious Tract Society.

Mr. Gilmour became known to the world by the publication of his little book on the Mongols, about ten years ago. It attracted considerable attention, and has passed through several editions. He was one of that somewhat numerous band, among whom have been such men as Moffat

and Livingstone, whom Scotland has sent out to the mission field. His death, from typhus fever, on May 21, last year, cut short a useful and in many respects brilliant career. Born in the parish of Carmunnoch, about five miles from Glasgow, in 1843, he was educated at the neighbouring university, and removed thence in 1878 to Cheshunt College, and in the following year entered the missionary seminary at Highgate where he received his training for his future labour. He set foot in Peking, May 18, 1870, and by the end of July in the same year had reached a fixed resolution to go to Mongolia, as soon as the necessary arrangements could be made, for the purpose of disseminating the knowledge of the Gospel. His adventures in that vast and little known country have been told by himself in the volume referred to above. Here Mr. Lovett confines himself to supplementing what is there told from Mr. Gilmour's diaries and letters, and to giving an account of his inner and private life. This he has done with praiseworthy skill. The narrative he has written is not without its incidents of more than ordinary interest, while the life it discloses is one of extreme beauty, by reason of its utter devotedness amidst many and great difficulties and discouragements to a sacred cause. Mr. Gilmour made no great geographical discoveries, but as a missionary he deserves to rank with the noblest Scotland has produced.

Julius Cæsar and the Foundation of the Roman Imperial System.

By W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A. New York & London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1892.

Within the limits at his command, Mr. Fowler has here tried to explain to those who are unfamiliar with classical antiquity, the place which Cæsar occupies in the history of the world. What he claims for him is not that he was the founder of the Roman Empire, and still less that he was the organiser of it, but that he laid the foundation of the system which was subsequently organised and developed by Augustus. That system, he points out was partly the result of pre-existing tendencies, and partly due to the will and intellect of Julius Cæsar, and hence along with the biography of Cæsar we have a constant reference to the tendencies of his age. Mr. Warde Fowler has of course drawn largely from Cæsar's own writing, and from those of Cicero. What has been said by later authorities he has for the most part passed over preferring to found his narrative as far as possible on contemporary evidence. Limitations of space have also compelled him to pass over many points of controversy, and numerous details both in connection with Roman constitutional law and the geography of the Gallic and Civil Wars. The book in fact is essentially of a popular character. At the same time it is none the less a piece of scholarly and skilful writing, full of accurate information and bearing every evidence of being the work of a master hand. The volume is freely illustrated. The representations of Cæsar are numerous and somewhat confusing. If the bust in the British Museum is genuine, some of them are certainly not, still it is well to have them.

The Land-Systems of British India: Being a Manual of the Land-Tenures and of the Systems of Land-Revenue Administration prevalent in the various Provinces. By B. H. BADEN-POWELL, C.I.E., F.R.S.E., M.R.A.S., etc. etc. 3 vols. Maps. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1892.

This is one of those books to which it is impossible to do justice within the limits at our disposal here. Though described as a manual, it extends

to three bulky volumes containing in all more than two thousand pages, and deals with a subject which is at once large and extremely complicated. Its learned author professes to deal with his subject in only a general way, and that he does not claim to do more will be readily understood by those who have any acquaintance with India, its soil and climate, history, races or customs. The first volume is divided into two parts, the first containing a variety of introductory matter arranged in five chapters, and intended to prepare the way for that which follows. The first chapter is purely introductory, and treats of such matters as geographical terms, certain features connected with the land, the agricultural and the 'faste' year, irrigation, the orthography, pronunciation and employment of vernacular terms, and the connection of the Land-revenue administration with other branches. The second explains how the several provinces of India came into separate existence for the purposes of administrative government. In the third the Indian legislatures and the laws by which the country is governed are described. The fourth gives a general view of the Land-tenures of British India, while in the fifth we have an outline of its various Land-revenue systems. The second part of this volume is devoted to an account of the Land-revenue system of Bengal. This is followed in the second volume by an account of the system of village or mahál settlements in the North-western Provinces and Oudh, and of the systems of Ajmer-Merwára, the Central Provinces and the Panjab. The third volume deals with the systems peculiar to Madras, Bombay and Sindh, Berár, Assam, Coorg and Burmah. This extremely brief summary of the contents of the volumes, while it may serve to indicate the comprehensive character of the work, affords little or no indication of the vast amount of information which the author has gathered together from innumerable, and in many cases, well-nigh inaccessible sources, and here put before the reader in the briefest and most lucid way. The work is truly monumental in its character, and its learned and distinguished author deserves to be congratulated in its completion. It is designed we are told for the home reader and the non-official student. It may be commended to the politician, and as well to the attention of the general reader. For the latter it has many attractions, as notwithstanding its title and legal character, it is scarcely possible to open any one of its volumes without coming across some curious or valuable piece of information, either of an historical character or in connection with the manners and customs of the people. To the former it is indispensable; for, as Mr. Baden-Powell observes, 'any one who aims at understanding India, its people and its requirements, and who would gauge at their real value the outcry of half-educated newspaper writers and students of the colleges at the great capitals, and who would understand where there is really a reform to be wisely introduced, and where there is a mere clamour and the expression of a natural discontent and aspiration that does not really know what it wants, or what is best for it,—it follows that for him, at least a general idea of the land-system and of the land-tenure cannot fail to be of primary value and importance.' To those who are engaged in the government of India, the volumes will commend themselves as the work of an author whose reputation is justly and indisputably great.

The Foresters: Robin Hood and Maid Marian. By ALFRED LORD TENNYSON, Poet Laureate. London & New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

Lord Tennyson, as is well known, is a close student of mediæval literature, and while wedding many of its most touching episodes to noble

verse, has done much to call attention to it. In the volume before us ample use has been made of the Robin Hood ballads as well as of some of the legends still current in the district of Sherwood Forest. Specialists will have no difficulty in pointing out the source of each scene, and of apportioning to each ballad or geste its contribution to this lovely play. The skill with which the venerable *disjecta membra* have been selected and welded together is exquisite, and it may safely be said that a more charming presentiment of England's great hero outlaw has never before been made. The play is neither tragedy nor comedy, though it contains the elements of both, and materials which might be used for either species of composition. It is what has not inaptly been termed a 'picture-play.' The scenes are sylvan and for the most part in the open air. Passages of rare beauty occur, and several exquisite songs. Its reception when placed upon the stage in America was enthusiastic. Whether it will be received in the same way on this side of the Atlantic remains to be seen. Be that as it may, the play is one of the finest of the many charming poems Lord Tennyson has written.

Reliquiæ Celticæ: Texts, Papers, and Studies in Gaelic Literature and Philosophy left by the late Rev. Alexander Cameron, J.L.D. Edited by ALEXANDER MACBAIN, M.A., and Rev. JOHN KENNEDY. Vol. I., Ossianica, with Memoir of Dr. Cameron. Inverness: Northern Chronicle Office. 1892.

The contents of this volume are amply sufficient to exonerate its editors from any charge that may be brought against them for undue delay in its publication. Both of them are men with their hands full of their ordinary duties, and three years, though a considerable period to the impatient or unthinking, is a very moderate space for the preparation of a volume such as this. The editors, in fact, have evidently worked with a will, and with an enthusiasm and devotion tempered only by a very laudable desire to be accurate. Dr. Cameron was known to be as full of Gaelic as an egg is full of meat. It was his first thought and it was his last. No doubt he was a capable and efficient minister, an acute theologian, even if a little old-fashioned, and a good preacher, but he was first and chiefly a Gaelic scholar. During his later years, whenever his face was seen turned from Arran it was pretty well known that, before it was turned homeward, it was sure to be seen in Edinburgh and in the Advocate's Library, and that the bag he was in the habit of carrying would have the numerous papers it contained enriched with innumerable notes, corrections, and additions. He was unquestionably a great scholar. It is questionable whether Scotland has yet produced his equal. At the same time he was one of the most modest and diffident of men. This, together with his somewhat defective acquaintance with English, his remoteness from great libraries, and, perhaps, the consciousness that he was working on an unpopular subject, made him for these times of rapid writing and publishing, slow both as an editor and an author. His work was also unremunerative, which means, as many are aware, that it was carried on at a loss to himself both of time and money; and now that he is gone most will read the statement, made by his editors, with surprise that the only published literary work for which he ever received remuneration was a contribution of two ballads from the Dean of Liamore's Book, which appeared, with modern renderings and translations, in this *Review*. Truly Gaelic Scotland seems to take less interest in its language and literature even than Lowland Scotland

does in the language and literature of the Lowlands. Perhaps, however, we have here another beginning of better things, and that before long the munificence which has made the publication of these posthumous remains possible, will not be without the desired fruit. The volume before us, which is the first of two, divides itself into two parts. In the first we have a memoir of Dr. Cameron from the hand of Mr. Kennedy, one of the editors, running to one hundred and seventy pages, in which ample justice is done to his attainments and aims in connection with Gaelic literature. Perhaps the memoir errs in giving too much prominence to certain controversies in which Dr. Cameron was unfortunately engaged. These are now mostly forgotten. They are of no general importance or interest, and might have been allowed to bury themselves. As with most scholars, Dr. Cameron's life was for the most part uneventful. He was born near Kingussie in 1827, began attendance at the University of Edinburgh when about twenty years of age, started missionary work at Renton in 1855, and was ordained minister of the Gaelic Church there in 1859. Fifteen years afterwards he was translated to Brodick Free Church, and remained minister there until his death. As a Gaelic scholar he distinguished himself as early as the year 1848, and soon began to be known both as an original writer on Gaelic philology and as a translator. He took a leading part in the debates in the Free Church Assembly in 1867 on the proposed revision of the Gaelic version of the Scriptures, and in the session of 1866-7 commenced a Gaelic class in the Free Church College, Glasgow, and continued to teach it down to the year 1880, with an attendance of sometimes over seventy. The *Scottish Celtic Review* was started by him in 1881 and was well received both here and on the Continent. For a long time Dr. Cameron meditated the publication of an Etymological Dictionary of the Gaelic tongue, and had made considerable preparations for it. Perhaps his greatest disappointment was in connection with the chair of Celtic Philology at Edinburgh.—Of the contents of the second part of the volume, which are very numerous, we can give but the barest outline. Together they form, as the editors remark, a complete *corpus* of Ossianic poetry. All the Ossianic poetry of the Dean of Lismore's Book is given in full, with transliterations and in some cases translations. The text of the Edinburgh Gaelic MS. marked XLVIII., a paper MS. written by one of the M'Vurichs, the hereditary bards of Clanronald, and belonging to the seventeenth century, is given next, and is followed by MS. LXII. This belongs to the last century and forms one of the Turner's Collection of MSS. Next follows the Rev. Alexander Campbell's Collection of Ossianic ballads made about the year 1797, and printed here for the first time. This is followed by another hitherto unprinted collection of Ossianic ballads taken from the MacLagan MS., and known as the MacFarlane Collection. Other ballads of the same kind taken from the MacLagan MS. follow; then the Sage and Sage-Pope Collections, next Sir George Mackenzie's Collection, and finally a number of corrections of the text in the MacNicol collection. The notes are numerous, and the volume contains an abundance of raw material waiting to be used. The second volume, containing, among other things, a glossary of Gaelic Etymology, is promised shortly.

The Works of William Shakespeare. Edited by WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT. Vol. VI. and VII. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

The first of these volumes of the 'Cambridge Shakespeare' includes the four plays of *Troilus and Cressida*, *Coriolanus*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *Romeo and Juliet*, with the usual complement of notes both at the foot of

the pages and at the end of each of the plays. There is also the usual preface. The notes are if anything of almost more than usual importance, more especially those given to the first and last of the plays. The text of the first quarto edition of Romeo and Juliet is reserved for the last volume, where it is to be printed *in extenso*, it being impossible to record its variations from that of the second quarto in the footnotes. The very remarkable discrepancies between the quarto and folio texts of Troilus and Cressida are noted, and in the preface, which is that of the 1865 edition, there is some curious information respecting the history of the printing of this play. The text of Coriolanus is far from satisfactory. The editor, however, has done the best that can be done under the circumstances to enable the reader to come as near to what Shakespeare wrote as possible. In addition to the readings of the folios, he has given the almost innumerable conjectures of other editors, and has contributed a number himself. The plays in the other volume are Timon of Athens, Julius Cæsar, Macbeth and Hamlet. While Julius Cæsar has the distinction of being the play which of all was the most correctly printed in the Folio Edition of 1623, Timon of Athens has that, probably, of having left the press in the most inaccurate condition. To the editor, however, the task of arranging the text of Macbeth and Hamlet presents quite as many difficulties, if not more. More than in any other of the plays does the student here require the aid of a skilful editor and a knowledge of the different readings, and all that can be done for him is here done by Mr. Aldis Wright. It is impossible not to admire the care and patience which are manifest on every page of this and the accompanying volume.

The Barren Ground of Northern Canada. By WARBURTON PIKE. London and New York, 1892.

Mr. Warburton Pike has avowedly written for sportsmen, but his volume will be read with much more than ordinary interest by all who care to read of foreign lands or unknown tracts of country and thrilling stories of adventure and peril. His main object in setting out for the Barren Ground of Northern Canada was to make the acquaintance of the musk-ox. He had other objects in view, such as seeing an almost unknown country, or rather a country of which Europeans know next to nothing, and indulging in his love for sport; but his chief purpose was to see and hunt this animal of which he had heard much, but which few, so far as he could learn, had ever seen. The journey from Calgary, close under the foothills of the Rocky Mountains, to its favourite feeding-ground in the far north, was not easy. The difficulties encountered were enormous. He accomplished his purpose and seems, notwithstanding the risks he ran owing to the perfidy of the natives and one or two narrow escapes from starvation, to have had a right royal time for a hunter in the wilds. While in the country of the caribou food was abundant, and in the country of the musk-ox there was no lack of it. Mr. Pike does not tell us much about the habits of the latter animal, and, so far as we can remember after a careful and pleasant perusal of his volume, does not offer us anything like a description of it. Of the caribou he tells us much more, and, with others, laments its indiscriminate slaughter by the Indians. While in the country of the musk-ox Mr. Pike made an attempt, if we may so say, to reach the Arctic Ocean, but unfortunately the natives whom he employed as his guides refused to accompany him beyond Lake Beechey. The most perilous part of his experience was while attempting to reach Fort Macleod from Hudson's Hope on his way to Quesnelle and civilization. The time was mid-winter; his guides lost their way, and the party only succeeded

in retracing their steps after enduring almost incredible privations from the severity of the weather and the want of food. At the beginning of their journey they had spent a night at the house of Tom Barrow, not far from Hudson's Hope, and Mr. Pike thus describes their return to it: 'I pushed open the door, and shall never forget the expression of horror that came over the faces of the occupants when they recognised us. We had become used to the hungry eyes and wasted forms, as our misery had come on us gradually, but to a man who had seen us starting out thirty-two days before in full health the change in our appearance must have been terrible. There was no doubt that we were very near the point of death. For my own part, I felt a dull aching in the left side of my head; I was blind in the left eye, and deaf in the left ear; there was a sharp pain on each side just below the ribs; but my legs, though not well under control, were still strong. We had all completely lost the use of our voices, and suffered greatly from the cracking of the skin on hands and feet, which always results from starvation in cold weather. To say that we were thin conveys no idea of our miserable condition.' There were five of them in all, and five men never ran a harder race for life. The strange thing is that three of them had gone over the ground before. One of them was a half-breed, and the other a full-blooded Indian. For sportsmen and others meditating a visit to the Barren Ground, Mr. Pike's book is simply invaluable. He has many hints to give, many of which are based upon a very bitter experience. For the general reader it may be added that the book is full of incident, has not a single dull page, and is well and, what is a little rare in books of the kind, concisely written. It has just one drawback, the want of a good map and illustrations, but a reliable map is not procurable, and the sketches Mr. Pike made were unfortunately lost.

Pauperism: a Picture; and the Endowment of Old Age: an Argument. By CHARLES BOOTH. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

Mr. Booth, whose name is associated with more than one able volume on the labour and people of London, presents us here with a picture and an argument. The picture is drawn mostly from the east end of London. Though instructive, it is by no means pleasant. In one part of it, he sketches what may be called the biography of a number of paupers and pauper families, and shows the way in which they have been treated or in which their wants have been relieved. The facts are taken from official records and are eminently instructive as to the real causes of pauperism. These Mr. Booth discusses in a very temperate and judicial way. One remarkable feature is that drink does not appear as the cause of pauperism so largely as has generally been supposed. But while this is the case, Mr. Booth is careful to point out that in many instances it is difficult to trace its influence, and that as a matter of fact, it may after all be the real, though not the apparent cause of much more than it seems to be. The other sources to which he attributes pauperism are those with which we are acquainted. The value of Mr. Booth's statistics and tables lies in their shewing to what extent each of the causes prevails or appears to prevail in the districts he deals with. In the second part of his volume Mr. Booth passes in review the schemes which have been put forward in connection with the much discussed question of the endowment of old age. He has a scheme of his own, in which he advocates universal compulsory endowment, and the pension to begin at sixty-five.

The Progressiveness of Christian Thought, by James Lindsay, M.A., B.D., etc., (Blackwood) is a critical and apologetical work, and apparently owes its existence to the fact that its author has not met with a book in which the subject of which it treats has been adequately dealt with. There is a good deal of hard thinking in it, and not a little solid writing. The style is somewhat lumbering, and Mr. Lindsay has the habit of strewing phrases from foreign languages over his pages. All the same he has a considerable acquaintance with modern theological literature, though mainly of one class, and knows a good deal of what has been written in recent times on the chief problems of theology. That there is such a thing as progress in Christian thought most who have any acquaintance with it are aware. Those who are not acquainted with it and desire to see what progress has been made in the Protestant Church during recent years may learn something about it from Mr. Lindsay's pages. He does not go very largely into his subject. At most he touches but its fringe. Still, what he has said is suggestive, and though differing from him on a number of points, the reader may obtain no small help from his pages.

A Modern Disciple, by Arthur Jenkinson (Nisbet & Co.) is a series of sermons written in the interest of young men and young women, more especially of those who are living amid the temptations and perils of a great city, and are dismayed and bewildered at the rush of new thoughts, the throng of competing opinions, the depth and seriousness of modern speculations, and the vastness of the issues at stake. For those who are thus tried and tempted Mr. Jenkinson has an abundance of sympathy, and writes here a series of wise counsels for their guidance. He deals with such topics as the disciple's ideals, beliefs, dangers and possibilities. Mr. Jenkinson is himself thoroughly conscious of the stir and pressure of modern thought, and strives to make his counsels as practical as possible. He writes clearly and freshly, is a vigorous thinker, and not afraid to grapple with some of the most difficult problems which are likely to trouble the young and are now exercising the minds of many who are not young. It may be that his mode of thought is pitched a little too high for those whom he seeks to reach, but whether or not there are many lines of thought in his sermons which may be studied with profit by readers of all ages.

Recent Explorations in Bible Lands (Young & Co., Edinburgh), by the Rev. Thomas Nicol, B.A., is intended as a class-book, and a very useful little volume it is likely to prove. In its clearly-written pages Mr. Nicol has gathered together most of the information which has been brought to light by the recent researches in Bible Lands. An account is given of the various attempts at exploration, such as the Palestine, the Egyptian, and those which have been carried on in Babylonia, and we have chapters not only on Egypt and the Route of the Israelites, Jerusalem, the Jordan Valley, Babylon and Persia, but also on the Hittite Empire, the Moabite Stone, the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets, the Siloam Inscription, the Gospel Sites, and Ephesus. Small as the volume is, it contains a large amount of information, all of which is brought down to date.

In the Days of Thy Youth, *Saintly Workers*, and *Ephphatha* (Macmillan) are the most recent volumes of the new and cheaper edition which is now appearing of Archdeacon Farrar's works. The first is the volume of sermons delivered so far back as the years 1871-76, at Marlborough College, during the time their author was the master there. The subjects dealt with are almost exclusively practical. The popularity of the volume is shewn by the fact that it is here reprinted for the ninth time. The workers treated of

in the second volume are, as we need hardly say, the martyrs of primitive Christian times, the hermits, monks, early Franciscans and the missionaries of the Christian Church. The volume is in its fifth edition. The third volume consists of what are usually called 'Sermons preached on Special Occasions.' They all centre round one idea, and discuss the problem of the amelioration of the world.

The Rev. W. Nicholson's treatise, *Myth and Religion* (Helsingfors) is an enquiry into the nature of the two subjects named on its title page, and the relations existing between them. It is a rather bulky pamphlet, and, as we learn from the slip prefixed to the table of contents, it has been accepted by the Alexander-University of Finland as an Academical thesis forming part of the qualification entitling its author to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It is divided into three parts; the first dealing with the myth, the second with religion, and the third with the myth in its religious relation and in its practical bearing on life. As might be expected from the wide reading and large knowledge of its author, the thesis is exceedingly learned. The illustrations are drawn, so far as the chapter dealing with the myth are concerned, chiefly from the ancient classical and Scandinavian mythologies, though in the chapter dealing with the dawn of the myth considerable use is made of the Rig-Veda. The longest chapter is devoted to the Baldr myth. Here the views recently advanced by Bugge and others respecting the origin of this myth are summarised and discussed. The myth in general, Mr. Nicholson maintains, has, like speech, more of a generic and tribal than an individual origin, and is one of the products of the mystical side of human life. In character it is essentially religious. This together with its early appearance in the psychical history of humanity, he regards as among its most notable features. The treatise opens out many new lines of speculation, and is altogether a very scholarly production.

In Scottish Ministerial Miniatures (Hodder & Stoughton) by Deas Cromarty we have a series of pen and ink sketches of a number of Scottish ministers. Some of the individuals portrayed are widely known; others of them are probably little known beyond their own parishes or presbyteries. The authoress of the sketches is a clever writer, and her pages are always sparkling and attractive. The portraits have evidently done duty in the columns of one or more newspapers, and as conveying the impressions produced by their subjects on the mind of the writer may be commended.

Mr. A. Taylor Innes' *Studies in Scottish History, chiefly Ecclesiastical*, (Hodder & Stoughton) is another series of essays, some of which are reprints. All of them bear more or less upon the Church history of Scotland. Exceptions are the papers on Sir George Mackenzie, though even that is scarcely an exception, and the paper on Edinburgh and Sir William Hamilton. Mr. Taylor Innes is a stout Free Churchman and a strong advocate of the voluntary principle, and his views in connection with the Disruption of 1843, its leader, and the present position of the Free Church and its policy find ample expression in his pages. Those who wish to learn something about the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland will here find a good deal of what they are in search of as it has presented itself to the author. Mr. Innes, however, cannot always be accepted as an authority either as to facts or opinions. For the former recourse will require to be had to other sources, while many of the latter are strongly contested.

Les Femmes Ecrivains œuvres choisies (Paris, Librairie de l'Art) is the latest addition to the excellent series of selections from French writers

which is appearing under the title 'Bibliothèque de la Famille,' and under the editorship of M. F. Lhomme. As the title indicates the selections here given are from the female writers of France. In two branches of literature the women of France have specially excelled. The volume therefore has a quite peculiar value. Its contents cover a wide field and are extremely varied. For the skill with which the selections have been made great credit is due to M. Lhomme. To each set of extracts he has written a short preface fixing the position of the author from whose writings they are taken, and containing brief critical estimates. At the end of the volume brief notes are added, chiefly historical and explanatory; and an essay of some length dealing with the history of female authorship in France is made to serve as an introduction to the volume.

Les Artistes Célèbres (Paris, Librairie de l'Art).—The most recent issues of this series are *Les Audran* par Georges Duplessis, Membre de l'Institut; *Les Clouet et Corneille de Lyon* par Henri Bouchot; and *Raffet* par F. Lhomme. In the first of these M. Duplessis deals with the whole of the members of the Audran family who distinguished themselves whether as engravers, painters or sculptors. The notices of each are necessarily short, but what little is known of them is clearly told, and lists of their works are given. M. Bouchot's monograph on the Clouet family and Corneille de Lyon is a work, short as it is, of considerable research, and for the first time sets before the reader some interesting facts concerning the several artists dealt with. Of the three issues M. Lhomme's is the bulkiest and will probably attract the most interest. The subjects with which Raffet dealt were, as need hardly be said, chiefly military. Perhaps the best known of his works are the drawings he prepared in illustration of the wars of the first empire. In this department he is held to have surpassed his master, Charlet, while in the representation of Oriental types and scenery he was the rival of Decamps, Delacroix and Marilhat. Each of the volumes is profusely illustrated, and in these and other respects they fully maintain the reputation which the series to which they belong has acquired.

Phaon and Sappho and Nimrod (Macmillan), by James Dryden Hosken, contains two dramas marked by very considerable ability. As the productions of an author whose educational advantages have been of the slightest, they are remarkable. At present Mr. Hosken is an auxiliary postman. Born in 1861, he was educated at an elementary school, and has always been in delicate health, so delicate, indeed, that he has never been able to learn a trade. The two dramas or tragedies before us, however, show none of the defects which might under the circumstances have been expected. One thing is manifest on every page, and that is that they are the work of a thoughtful, highly cultured, and essentially poetical mind. The two plays are full of action, the characters are living, and the plots effectively laid and worked out. The principal characters are drawn with singular power, while the interest their various situations excite is often intense. Mr. Hosken has a large acquaintance with human experience, more especially on its suffering side, and makes good use of it. Scattered throughout the volume is a large number of excellent passages, excellent both as to their form and contents, which readily lend themselves to quotation. Here, however, we must deny ourselves the pleasure of citing them, and can only refer the reader to the volume itself. No one can read it without rising from its perusal with a very high opinion of Mr. Hoskin's ability, both as a play-wright and as a poet. A work so rich in promise and performance deserves every success.

The Dawn of Love (Alex. Gardner), by Colin Rae-Brown, is a complete collection of the author's poems. Most of them have already been published more than once. All that we need do here therefore is to chronicle their reappearance in their present form, and to add that a biographical notice, covering close on forty pages, has been prefixed to the poems by Mr. John Muir. From this much interesting information may be gleaned both as to Mr. Colin Rae-Brown's relations with De Quincey and other literary men of the last generation and his connection with the Press, as also respecting the active part he has taken in a number of popular Scottish movements, as for instance that which was started some twenty years ago for the completion of the Scott Monument, which forms so distinguish- ing an ornament to Princes Street, Edinburgh.

Life in Motion or Muscle and Nerve (A. & C. Black) is a series of six lectures delivered before a juvenile auditory at the Royal Institution, London, during last Christmas holidays, by Professor M'Kendrick. Those who have heard the author of this little volume lecturing need not be told that its pages are as lucid as possible and have all the charms of simplicity, and, for juveniles, novelty. The written page is and cannot be so attractive as the spoken word, more especially when the latter is accompanied by beautiful experiments, but an attempt has here been made, and not without very considerable success, to make up for any defects in that way by an abundance of illustrations. Professor M'Kendrick leads his readers step by step, and almost imperceptibly, along the path he has laid out for himself, illustrating each point and making out its connection with the next in a way that only an accomplished teacher can. Juvenile readers cannot fail to be interested in what he says; and those who are not acquainted with the mysteries with which he deals will read his lectures with pleasure. They are entitled to take rank with some of the most famous lectures which have been delivered to children in the Royal Institution.

Elements of Economics of Industry (Macmillan) by Alfred Marshall, is an attempt to adapt the first volume of the author's well known *First Principles of Economics* to the needs of junior students. The plan adopted has not been to write a condensed summary of that work, but that of simply omitting the discussions it contains in many points of minor importance and on some difficult theoretical investigations. The wisdom of omitting these in a manual such as this is intended to be is obvious. Equally commendable is the retention of the full text of such of the argumentative parts of the *Principles* as it has been thought desirable to present to the student. The plan of making a manual sketchy is to be avoided. The student is likely to learn far more of a science and to obtain a larger and more intelligent apprehension of its principles from a full discussion of them than he is by having them presented to him in a bare and fragmentary way. An important chapter has been added on Trade-Unions and their influence on wages and workers and their effect on trade and commerce.

Professor S. S. Laurie, as is well known, takes more than a merely professional interest in education, and is one of those who for some years past have been doing all they possibly can for the advancement of secondary education in Scotland. Unlike many he is not of opinion that Parliament has done all that needs to be done when it has established Free Elementary Education. He desires to see secondary education established on an equally solid foundation and placed within the reach of all. With that object in view he has here in his *Teachers' and Guild Addresses* (Percival)

printed the evidence he gave last year before the Parliamentary Select Committee in support of the Teacher's Guild Registration Bill. Along with it he has included a number of addresses delivered before various associations of teachers, and three essays or addresses on Montaigne, Ascham and Comenius. The subject of each address or paper is connected with education. Professor Laurie is, as we need hardly say, an authority in all matters educational, and whatever he has to say in connection with them is deserving of the most careful consideration, more especially at the present moment.

Messrs. Macmillan & Co. have issued the Second Part of the Third Volume of Mr. Hamilton Fyfe's *Annals of Our Own Time*, a day-to-day record of events social and political, home and foreign. The present part begins with January 1, of last year, and comes down to December 30, thus giving a condensed and yet minute summary of the history of the past year. As usual the Part is supplied with an ample index, which, as need hardly be said, very materially increases the usefulness of this well established publication.

The Slave of the Lamp (Smith, Elder & Co.) by Henry Seton Merriman, is a story in two volumes, cleverly written and not a little exciting. There is a number of striking episodes in it, but for the most part it is pure romance. Its geography and chronology are a little confusing. A voyager, who, while on the coast of Brittany, can hear the waves beating upon the shores of Cape Finisterre must be endowed with remarkable powers of hearing. There have been plenty of insurrections in Paris, but its a little puzzling to make out the one to which Mr. Merriman refers, or in which the Society of Jesus had so large a hand as they appear to have had in his. Some of the things Mr. Merriman represents as happening are now-a-days simply impossible. The story, in short, though cleverly written, is fanciful, and its most sensational incidents improbable. At the same time it is impossible to refuse to the author the credit of having told his story well.

Riches or Ruin, a story by the author of 'The Prigment,' etc. (Kegan Paul, Trench), is a curious psychological study. It has the merit of being short. At the same time it is graphically written. It is one of those stories which, when they are once begun, are not laid down till the end is reached. To give an outline of it would scarcely be fair either to the reader or author, but we may say that a large sum of money which involves the ruin or solvency of a large City house in a financial crisis is at stake, and the question is whether the dead owner's brother, who inherits it just in time, is guilty or not guilty of a serious breach of the moral law.

The third volume of *Igdrasil* (The World Literature Publishing Co.) contains a large and varied selection of attractive and instructive reading. As is well known it is devoted to the Ruskin cult and many of its pages are filled with 'Ruskiana.' Chief among them are three lectures delivered by Mr. Ruskin in 1854 at the Architectural Museum, Canon Row, Westminster, on 'Decorative Colour as applicable to Architectural and other Purposes.' They have never been printed by Mr. Ruskin in any of his works and form the second series of addresses he ever delivered, the Edinburgh 'Lectures on Architecture and Art,' being the first. They were reported at the time in the *Builder* and *Morning Chronicle*, from which the text here has been taken. Another notable contribution of the same kind are notes of three lectures delivered by Mr. Ruskin in the Theatre of the Museum at Oxford in 1871, on 'Landscape.' Contributions of a different kind are those on Ibsen, 'The Theory of Interest,' 'Practical Idealism,'

“The Restoration of Ancient Churches,’ ‘The Influence of Mountains on Men,’ ‘Goethe and Culture.’ Altogether the volume contains a large amount of healthy and thoughtful reading. Bound up with *Igdrasil* is the first volume of the magazine *World Literature*.

THE
SCOTTISH REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1892.

ART. I.—SCOTTISH HERALDRY.

1. *Alexander Nisbet's Heraldic Plates originally intended for his 'System of Heraldry' lately found in the library of William Elliott Lockhart of Cleghorn, Esq., now reproduced with introduction and notes genealogical and heraldic.* By ANDREW ROSS, Marchmont Herald, and FRANCIS J. GRANT, Carrick Pursuivant. Edinburgh: George Waterston & Sons, 1892.
2. *The Catalogue of the Heraldic Exhibition.* Edinburgh: 1891. Compiled by F. J. GRANT, Carrick Pursuivant. Illustrated edition, 4to. Privately printed: 1892.

IT is beyond doubt that there is a remarkable revival at the present time of interest in Heraldry and the studies pertaining thereto. This is shown by the numerous works on the subject which issue from the press at very short intervals and which evidently all find an appreciative circle of readers. It is good that this should be so, for since Planché published his *Pursuivant at Arms*, which was the first book of the kind which really treated the subject in a scientific spirit and did not merely copy the statements of previous writers, many authors of ability have taken it up and shown clearly that Heraldry, freed from the pedantries and conceits of the early writers, is an important factor in historical research, and does much to illumine the investigations of the student of family

history. But not only is it of importance to the historian and biographer, it appeals almost as strongly to the tastes of the artist and architect. It is not therefore surprising to find that the treatment of matters heraldic is improving in the same ratio as the interest in them is quickening. It is only recently that a work was reviewed in these pages which will probably be the standard authority on Heraldry for some time to come. Now we have to notice two books both, like the last, the work of Scottish writers. It is indeed singular to see how Scotland seems to be taking the lead in Heraldry at present, considering that with the single exception of Mr. George Seton's book on *Scottish Heraldry* no work of any importance on the subject has been published in that country from the days of Nisbet till the recent work above mentioned of Woodward and Burnett. Not only so but Messrs. Ross and Grant may claim to be the very first Scottish Heralds under the rank of Lyon himself who have ever contributed anything to Heraldic literature. We trust therefore that the publication of their work is of good omen for the future.

The Heraldic Plates of Alexander Nisbet, which form the foundation of the volume whose full title is prefixed to this article, were discovered a few years ago in the library of Mr. Elliott Lockhart of Cleghorn. A careful investigation of the available evidence goes far to show that the plates were originally intended to illustrate Nisbet's *System of Heraldry*, but that that work had ultimately, as we shall see, to be issued on a much less magnificent scale than at first proposed by the author. Nisbet tells us in his preface to the *Cadency*, which was published in 1702 as a kind of preliminary specimen of the author's ability to complete his larger treatise, for which at the time he was soliciting aid from Parliament, that it was his intention to insert 'a considerable number of Plates of the Most Ancient Nobility and Gentry who have cut their armorial bearings with all the exterior Ornaments of the shield. The nobility are ev'ry one of them on a Plate by themselves at 40 Shillings Sterlin Price, many of the Gentry by Two's on one Plate at 20 Shillings each.' Mr. Ross has come to the conclusion, and there is no reason to doubt its soundness, that the plates now

published were those here referred to. It is certainly to be regretted that they did not at last make their appearance in the volume for which they were originally destined. They would have made it so handsome, that to use Nisbet's own expression, every man would confess 'that Britain ne'er produced before this time anything on this science so splendid and so glorious.' Though it is probable that it was from lack of funds that they did not appear, it is difficult to understand why they were not utilised, at all events to some extent, as the author speaks of them as actually engraved in 1702 long before the *System* appeared: and the only expense which would afterwards have been incurred would have been the cost of paper and printing.

On examining the plates themselves, numbering seventy-six exclusive of the series of small plates prepared for, and some of which were issued with, the *Cadency*, it will be found that they do no discredit to the state of Scottish Art at the period. Perhaps Mr. Ross, with a pardonable enthusiasm for his subject, is inclined to glorify them overmuch; but it cannot be denied that they display an amount of spirit and character which lifts them out of the ordinary rut of eighteenth century heraldic art. The mantlings especially, though often somewhat heavy and wanting in detail, are very rich and give importance and distinction to the achievement. Owing to the author having employed several engravers on the work there is a variety of treatment which is very marked. The drawing of the animals which figure as charges on the shields and as supporters is, as might be supposed, of various degrees of excellence. Some are stiff and wooden, but many are spirited and life-like. The ermine-lined mantle which forms a background, so to speak, to the arms of the peers is always effective, and the repetition of the arms on the overlapping portions, though of common occurrence in heraldic designs of this period, gives character to the achievement. A fine example of a *cordelière* may be noted in the arms of the Countess of Winton (reproduced from a plate in the Advocates' library) and attention may also be directed to an elegant renaissance design containing the arms of the Earl of Perth: it is the work of an en-

graver of the name of George Main, and is distinctly different in style from any of the other plates.

Admirable however though these designs may be, the chief interest of this volume will to most readers be in the excellent introduction by Mr. Ross, giving the history of the Nisbet family and an account of the career of the Herald himself with a bibliography of his writings. Though somewhat diffuse in places it is on the whole a sound and scholarly piece of work, and a valuable contribution to family history. The editor begins at the very beginning by stating that Nisbet first occurs as a place name in the early part of the twelfth century as the designation of lands situated in the parish of Edrom—perhaps the oldest parish in Scotland—and county of Berwick. William de Nesebite witnesses a charter towards the end of the century, and the name occurs in many documents of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But it is not till the middle of the latter period that we pick up with certainty the ancestry of Alexander Nisbet. In 1442 mention is made of Adam Nisbet of West Nisbet, and from him can be traced with almost absolute certainty a series of heirs down to Sir Alexander Nisbet of that ilk, who succeeded to the family estate in 1630, and represented the county in the Parliament held at Edinburgh in that year. The family had by this time been growing steadily in influence and reputation: they were connected by marriage with the Rutherfords, Pringles, Cranstouns, and other notable families in their own county; and it is therefore not to be wondered at that Sir Alexander Nisbet also took for his wife the daughter of a Berwickshire laird. It was probably in 1609 that he married Katherine Swinton, the only daughter of Robert Swinton of that ilk, by his first wife, Katherine Hay, daughter of William, Lord Hay of Yester. She was by no means a 'penniless lass wi' a lang pedigree,' but brought her husband many broad acres of land. The couple were blessed with numerous offspring, some of whom, as we shall see, became eminent in their day; but none were destined to perpetuate the family name and honours in the direct line. The career of Sir Alexander himself is an interesting, indeed, a romantic one. A devoted Royalist, he was in 1633 appointed

Sheriff of the county of Berwick, and possibly received his knighthood at the same time. In 1641 he was deprived of his office, to which his brother-in-law Swinton, who was a supporter of the Covenanting party, was appointed. The knight and his sons then retired to England, where they joined the King's army and remained for four years. By this time Sir Alexander's affairs had become seriously embarrassed: between 1638 and 1640 he had borrowed large sums of money. As there is no evidence that either he or his family had any extravagant tastes personally, it may fairly be concluded that as he was an ardent adherer to the King's party, these sums found their way into His Majesty's coffers. As he could not or did not pay his creditors, he was duly 'put to the horn,' and when he returned to Scotland after the battle of Naseby in 1645, he was at once imprisoned in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh. He did not linger long in durance vile, as the victory of Kilsyth, a few months later, was the means of procuring his liberty. He returned to West Nisbet along with his son Adam, a writer in Edinburgh, and the father of our Herald. Then followed an extraordinary struggle with his creditors, the history of which is related by Mr. Ross with much minuteness and great picturesqueness of detail.

It was indeed, as he styles it, 'a civil war upon a small scale.' Apprisings, letters of horning, warrants for poinding, letters of caption, and, in fact, all the elaborate procedure which the old Scots law provided to enforce the claims of creditors, were employed against the old knight; but he, secure in his castle, actively supported by his neighbours, who, we may imagine, enjoyed the fun, and secretly connived at by his kinsman the Sheriff, successfully defied his enemies, and it was not till 1649 that he succumbed to a military force which, by order of the Government, was sent against him. Some time after this an arrangement was entered into, by which the lands of West Nisbet were sold to Mr. John Ker, merchant in Edinburgh, and they still remain in the hands of his lineal representative, Lord Sinclair. The old knight did not part from the property without a hard struggle, and so late as 1662, after the Restoration, we find him petitioning the Court of Session

for the restitution of his lands. The purchaser, however, had taken care that the alienation had been carried out too carefully to afford any loophole of escape, and Sir Alexander's last attempt to outwit his creditors was unsuccessful. He was now an old man and in very poor circumstances, though it is satisfactory to find that his services in the Royalist cause were not altogether lost sight of, as the King granted him one of those curious blank Patents of Baronetcy, which he was able to sell to a certain Robert Jocelin of Hide Hall, and no doubt received from that gentleman a substantial sum of money for it. The old man must have died soon after this, but neither the place nor the date of his death is known.

Of his sons three led adventurous lives and came to violent ends. Sir Philip was an officer in the army of Charles I., was taken prisoner at Philiphaugh, and executed at Glasgow in 1645. Colonel Robert, the third son, was also at one time in the English army, and was with Montrose when he was captured at Invercharron in 1650: he was taken prisoner, conveyed to Edinburgh, and there met with the same fate as his illustrious leader. Another son, Alexander, in like manner led a soldier's life, and met a soldier's death, being killed at the siege of York in 1644. Two sons were content with civil life; John, the second, lived quietly in England, and does not seem to have taken any part in the family strife; Adam, the youngest, was a lawyer, probably a Writer to the Signet in Edinburgh, and was his father's right hand man in all his contentions with his creditors. Apart from this, his life does not appear to have been a very eventful one. He died in 1674, considerably in debt: his principal claim to remembrance is that he was the father of Alexander Nisbet, the Herald, and it is in the latter, of course, that the interest of Mr. Ross's introduction chiefly centres. And yet we know singularly little of him as a man: he remained to the end of his days a modest and retiring student, not certainly without his ambitions, but never realising the attainment of his full desire. No portrait of him has come down to us, though it is curious that a man of good family, who associated so much as he did with artists and engravers, should never have had his portrait taken in

some style. Apart from his writings, all that we know of him for certain is that he was born in April, 1657, that he was for some years a student in the University of Edinburgh, and that he afterwards followed the profession of a writer in that city, perhaps being able to secure some of the clients of his father, who died only a few years before his son must have commenced business. Nisbet's legal practice never amounted to much: he was emphatically a student, and preferred hunting pedigrees and tracing out arms to drawing deeds and guiding his clients through the intricacies of the law. He practically devoted his life to the study of his favourite subject: wealthy he never was, but his tastes were simple and his personal wants few. There was not much luxury in Edinburgh in the beginning of last century, and poverty was not looked on as a crime. There is no information to lead us to suppose that Nisbet led an unhappy life: he was disappointed, no doubt, in not getting his works published on the scale which he should have liked, but in this he is not singular as an author. He lived to the respectable age of sixty-eight—'a worthy modest gentleman' George Crawford calls him. He was buried in the Greyfriars' churchyard, but no stone now remains to mark his resting-place.

His memory will not soon die. This modest gentleman who led such an obscure, uneventful life, was no mere plodding student. One subject had attracted him from an early age, and to Heraldry and its cognate branches he devoted all his powers: if it is permissible to talk of an heraldic genius, he was one. He tells us himself that he had scarcely left college before he commenced the study of Heraldry, and that he stole as many hours as possible from business to indulge in his favourite pursuit. Appetite grew by what it fed on, and in 1687, when he was about thirty years of age, he became so engrossed in the study that he gave up his legal practice altogether. Every page of his works speaks to his untiring industry and indefatigable research. It must be remembered that he was practically the first in the field: there were a few illuminated Scottish armorials in existence, and Sir George Mackenzie had published his *Treatise on Heraldry* in 1680.

That work, however, though leaving the impress of its author's genius, was no more than 'a masterly outline.' The great bulk of the sources of information remained unexplored: not only so, the national archives were in a state of absolute confusion: no Royal Commissions, as in later days, had rendered the task of consulting them an easy one. The student who wished to get his authorities firsthand had to burrow among countless documents heaped together without order or arrangement, and this fact being kept in view, it is wonderful to find how much Nisbet was able to get out of the chaotic mass. He had also access to the charter chests of many Scottish families, and made himself familiar with their contents. From his being referred to as a 'teacher of Heraldrie,' it is probable that he gave instruction to others in the science, without which, at that period, no gentleman's education was considered complete. It is evident from his writings that he was familiar with English and French Heraldry, and was not unacquainted with the systems of other Continental nations, though, as we shall see hereafter, he was principally indebted for his knowledge of foreign armory to the works of Menestrier. Thoroughly equipped then, thanks to his unconquerable enthusiasm and industry, with a knowledge of his subject, he steadfastly set himself to the production of a *Treatise on Heraldry*, which while devoting particular attention to Scotland, would be an authority, or perhaps *the* authority on the subject in general.

But ways and means had to be considered. It was impossible that a work of the proposed magnitude could be published by the unaided effort of an impecunious student. The scheme of the work is thus described in the proposals for publication which the author issued in 1699. It was to be a

'Treatise of Heraldry, Speculative and Practical, where at large, I will describe the Nature, Rise, Beginning, and diverse Species of Arms, various Forms of Shields, their Tinctures, Furrs, Partitions and Repartitions, Figures proper and Natural, with their Additional Forms, Significations, and Positions, after a method more exact and mathematical than any hitherto Printed, together with Reasons why these Figures and Pieces of Armory are carried. I shall likewise show by whom the Figures are, the Armorial Ensigns of our Kings and their Children together with their Devices, and many Coats of Arms, that are to be found upon Monuments,

Churches, Tombs and Seals of Honourable Families now extinct, yet worthy to be particularly notic'd because of that Alliance, which many noble Houses now in Being have had with them heretofore.'

This was a pretty comprehensive programme, but it was one which the author was never destined to see carried out in its entirety, and not indeed even partially for many years. An attempt to publish the book by subscription having failed, he applied for assistance to the Scottish Parliament, requesting that body to be at the expense of the paper, types and printing of the projected work. In proof of his capacity as a Herald and of his ability to do justice to the subject, Nisbet published in the early part of 1702 his *Essay on the Marks of Cadency*, a work which was really a part of his larger treatise, but adapted and added to, so as to render it complete in itself. 'Its accidental birth,' we are told, 'explains its unrepresentable form. It runs through 254 pages of text without subdivision of any kind. Detached from its context and published as a separate essay, it became necessary to insert those expositions of general principles which occur so oddly in its pages but which add so immensely to its value.' It was dedicated to the Lyon King of Arms, Sir Alexander Areskin of Cambo, and no doubt attracted a share of public attention at the time of publication. The Parliament of 1702 was, however, too much engrossed with state affairs to be able to bestow much care on the promotion of literature of any sort, and though the committee to which Nisbet's application was in the first instance referred, recommended a grant of £248 6s. 8d. out of the rate of tonnage imposed for the five years from 1st September 1702, the recommendation was passed over and nothing done that session. Next year our author resumed his application for assistance, and the same sum was once more recommended to be granted to him: but again he was doomed to disappointment, and very soon the Union, to which Nisbet was no friend, took place, after which there was no Scottish Parliament to which he could apply.

Nisbet seems to have suffered the fate of many an unappreciated genius, and to have retired to his books and studies for many years after these unsuccessful attempts at publication.

His spirit, however, was by no means broken and in 1718, when he was sixty-two years of age, he resolved to give to the world another part of his larger work, and issued proposals for publishing an *Essay on the Ancient and Modern Use of Armories*, in which he stated, that, despairing of his long projected folio ever coming out, he had determined to publish his work bit by bit in quartos. The mind of the public was by this time more inclined to literature than it had been when the publication was first attempted. The *Essay on Armories* was speedily subscribed for and saw the light in the end of 1718. There was a characteristic Preface: the author seems to have been satisfied both with the conception and reception of his book on Cadency. 'I may say without vanity,' he states, 'that nothing of this nature so perfect has hitherto been published. . . . It has been approved of by the most knowing Heralds in Britain, and particularly by Sir Henry St. George, Garter King at Arms, which he was pleased to signify to me in his letters: tho' in it I have shown but a small regard to the English writers in Heraldry.'

Fortune at length seemed to smile on the old Herald. The *Essay on Armories* was so well received that his long cherished idea of publishing his system in folio was revived, and in 1722 one volume appeared under the title, '*A Short System of Heraldry, Speculative and Practical, with the True Art of Blazon according to the most approved Heralds in Europe; illustrated with suitable examples of Armorial Figures and Achievements of the most considerable Surnames and Families in Scotland, &c. Together with Historical and Genealogical Memorials relative thereto.* By Alexander Nisbet, Gent., Edinburgh. Printed for T. MacEwen: Anno Dom. M.D.CCXXII.' This work, as we shall see, at once put Nisbet in the first rank of Heraldic writers; but it was not his complete book; it only treated of the Ordinaries and Charges on the shield itself, and much more had been written. Nisbet felt that he was getting an old man, and that it behoved him to publish the remainder of his work with as little delay as possible. Accordingly, some time after the appearance of the first volume, he issued proposals for printing a supplement, which was to deal with marks of cadency, the

marshalling of arms, and the exterior ornaments of the shield. The writer, however, was destined never to see the completion of his life's work, for which he had so long waited. He had struggled courageously against many disappointments, and when at last the full fruition of his hopes seemed near at hand, death came in 1725 and stopped the busy pen for ever. His life is indeed a melancholy record of that hope deferred that maketh the heart sick, but it was probably not without its compensations. His political views prevented him ever getting official position, but his wants were few and simple, and judging from the slight notices which we have of him, he was held in respect and esteem by his contemporaries.

Before proceeding to estimate Nisbet's place as a Heraldic author, let us consider somewhat in detail the fate of his writings after his death, as what happened exercised an important influence on the form which they ultimately took. It is a strange story, and Mr. Ross deserves much credit for the light which, by his patient research, he has been able to throw on it. Twenty years after the appearance of the first volume another was announced, purporting to be the second volume of Nisbet's *System*. It was a very different production from its predecessor, and was especially wanting in that clear arrangement and direct style of dealing with the subject which was so conspicuous in the other. The first part of the volume, extending to 113 pages, was a garbled version of the author's remarks on Cadency and the Marshalling of Arms. The second part, with another pagination, treated of the exterior ornaments of the shield: then followed appendices, also separately paged, consisting chiefly of genealogical accounts of Scottish families, and the book concluded with some historical and critical remarks by a 'learned antiquarian' on the Ragman Roll. Now, Mr. Ross contends that by the printer's own admission in the introduction to the volume, Nisbet can only be held responsible for 259 pages of it altogether; and the editor waxes hot with righteous indignation as he points out that even these have been so altered and tampered with that in many cases little if any of the original Nisbet has been left, while in others his meaning has been seriously perverted. As regards the first

portions of the volume in question, any one can see for himself by comparing them with the *Cadency* and *Armories* how much these works have been altered ; while as to that portion relating to the exterior ornaments of the shield we have now ample opportunities of judging, as Nisbet's original MS. of this part of the book has been recently discovered in the Lyon office. By printing passages in the MS. on parallel columns with the corresponding passages in the folio of 1742, Mr. Ross fully proves his case as to the extensive alterations which were made on Nisbet's original work. Perhaps the most extraordinary of these occurs in a passage which deals with the family of the author himself : to illustrate this the more clearly, we have a facsimile of the printed page of 1742, and another of the passage in the MS., of which the former purports to be a rendering. In the page of print there is a paragraph of some length relating to the family of Nisbet of Dean, which has been calmly interpolated without the slightest authority whatever. What renders it the more curious is that the passage is written with many little touches which might induce people to believe that it was the author's own. After stating that the family of Sir John Nisbet of Dean had been in use for a long time to carry supporters, it goes on—' which two supporters uphold the principal arms of the family of Nisbet of that ilk, viz., —argent, three boars' heads, erased sable armed and langued gules, with the crest of the family, laying aside the chevron, a mark of cadency used formerly by the House of Dean ; in regard that the family of Dean is the only family of the name in Scotland that has right, by consent, to represent the old original family of the name of Nisbet : since the only lineal male representer (the author of this *System*) is like to go soon out of the world, being an old man and without issue male or female.' The forgery (for we must admit it to be so unless we hold that the Lyon office MS. is a mere rough draft, and that Nisbet had a more extended copy which was ultimately used by the printers), is a clever one and has imposed upon many. The old Herald has been held up to obloquy on account of the passage as a man who in his needy old age sold his birthright. The editor is of opinion that this interpolation was inserted at

the instance of Sir John Nisbet of Dean, who must have seen the MS. shortly after the author's death. If this is the case, the instigator, if not the perpetrator of the forgery, did not benefit by it, for the Baronet of Dean died fourteen years before the passage so altered saw the light. It is unnecessary to go further into this part of the subject, but it may be said generally that the editor gives ample proof of his assertion as to the uncalled for alteration of Nisbet's original work.

Not the least interesting part of the Introduction is that which treats of Nisbet's authority and position as a Heraldic writer. Mr. Ross not unnaturally takes a very high estimate of this, and we are not disposed to quarrel with his conclusions. When the condition in which the study of Heraldry was at the time is considered, Nisbet is deserving of all praise for having discarded most of the rubbish which the earlier writers had accumulated round the subject. The mythical bearings of the nine worthies of Christendom, which usually formed the commencement of all Heraldic works, are not even mentioned, and he only alludes in terms of reprobation to the fantastic practice of blazoning the arms of the nobility and princes by the names of the precious stones and planets. Of course he was not altogether free from the credulity of his age; and he accepts stories as to the origin of names, which would make a modern philologist's hair stand on end. He tells, for instance, that the name Balnavis not improbably arose from one Nevoy playing football before the king, who cried out, 'Well-balled, Nevoy!' We must not be too hard on him, however, for even in our own day equally preposterous derivations are believed in. Quite recently we heard it gravely asserted that the name Carfrae took its rise from the circumstance that in times gone by, a certain carver at the king's table (it is always *the* king in such cases, a specific monarch is seldom condescended on) had on one occasion so clumsily performed the duties of his office that he splashed the sacred person of His Majesty with gravy, whereupon that august personage addressed to him the words, 'Carve frae ye, man, carve frae ye!'

As regards Heraldry proper, Nisbet is a writer for all time;

he handles his subject with the ease and freedom of a master, and though there are points of detail in which modern opinion, with all its advantages of easy access to countless authorities and examples, may differ from him, yet it may safely be said that if any one masters Nisbet thoroughly, he will have an acquaintance with Heraldry which will always stand him in stead without much correction. Nisbet has not certainly much pretension to style, but he says what he wants to say in an intelligible and straightforward manner: as he himself says of it, 'It is such that my meaning may be easily understood, which, being the principal end of any language, is all I aim at.' He avoids overlaying his sentences with metaphor and allusive conceits, a practice frequently indulged in by the writers of his day; yet the most cursory reader cannot fail to see that the Treatise is the work of a well-read and educated gentleman. His industry, indeed, must have been stupendous; his work deals almost as much with genealogy as with heraldry, and though in the immense number of facts presented in connection with the history of the Scottish families whose arms he quotes, there are no doubt not a few errors, we must consider, as Mr. Ross very properly points out, the disadvantages under which Nisbet lay in regard to facilities for research. He had to burrow amongst undigested masses of records for facts on which we can at any moment lay our hands by means of excellent printed calendars and indexes. At a time when travelling was difficult and expensive, he spared no pains to gain access to charter chests in the houses of various of the noble and gentle of the land. He was evidently most careful to be as accurate as his lights would allow him; if in some instances he has gone astray, it is not for us to blame him for what he has not done; we should rather be full of wonder and admiration for what he did do. He devoted the patient labour of a lifetime to the elaboration of a work which has proved indispensable both to the heraldic student and to the antiquary. It is not too much to say that what Stair had done for the Law of Scotland, Nisbet did for its Heraldry. Both will be looked on as great institutional writers, and the study of their works will always be necessary

for those who wish to obtain an adequate knowledge of the principles of their respective subjects. The memory of Nisbet has long suffered from misrepresentation, and Marchmont Herald has done well in giving to the public a clear and concise account of the life and works of a remarkable man.

It is time to turn to some of the other contents of the volume under notice. In addition to that portion of the introduction which deals with the family of the Herald, there are added some very full notes on the Nisbets of Dalziel, Craigininnie, Dean and Dirleton. Without going into detail it may be sufficient to say that they display much painstaking care and research. The genealogical tables annexed to each of the Plates are not perhaps quite so satisfactory. One feature, however, is distinctly praiseworthy: after the blazon of arms which is given at the beginning of each table, it is stated whether or not the arms are registered. This is as it should be, and if more attention had been given to the registration of family arms in times past, there would not now be so much unauthorised assumption of armorial bearings as there is. At the end of each table is given a list of the authorities consulted in compiling it. These are in general easily accessible and printed works, some of them indeed of not unimpeachable accuracy. Of course in the enormous number of separate facts which the contents of these tables represent, there is almost bound to be a certain amount of errors. There are, however, a good many slips which a little more care and original research might have avoided, and there is also a certain want of system shown in the manner in which the various descents are displayed. We happened by chance to take up the pedigree of Aikman of Cairnie for examination, and found in it several sins both of omission and commission. More information, for instance, might have been given as to the family of John Aikman the first laird of Cairnie. Many dates which are left out might have been inserted. The laird himself was born 5th February 1613, and died 10th May 1693: his first wife died 14th December 1664; her father's name was Robert not Thomas, and he was not a knight. By her the laird had a family not of three children only as stated in the table, but six.

Again John's son William had not merely two, but five children, of whom William, who ultimately succeeded, was the youngest. It is no doubt a mere printer's error that Margaret, the eldest daughter, is represented as dying in 1765 instead of the corresponding year in the previous century. Thomas Aikman of Brambleton (the equally used form of the word, Broomhilton, is not given) was quite patriarchal in the number of his immediate issue, for which due credit is not here given him. The number of his first family by Isabel Learmont (who herself died in 1683) is not given: as a fact they were six in number, while by his second wife, he had two more than even the very respectable amount of ten mentioned in the table. Surely also it is stretching the meaning of the word (even in a Scottish sense) too far to style the successor of William Aikman of Ross and Brambleton his 'cousin,' seeing that the former had to go back four generations to find a common ancestor. Sometimes a link in a pedigree is not duly hammered on to the preceding one. In the account of Ogilvy of Boyne there is a certain 'Jean Isabel' (No. XIV.) who drops in suddenly, as if from the clouds. She is not blessed with a surname, her parentage is not mentioned, nor is there anything (save that his name appears as No. XIII.) to lead us to the conclusion that she was the daughter by his first wife of Archibald Ogilvy of Inchmartin.

We have drawn attention to these slips in the hope that in the event of the tables ever being reprinted, still more care may be taken to make them as accurate as possible. But even as they stand there is no doubt as to their usefulness, and some of them, such as those of Lithgow of Drygrange, Justice of East Crichton, Campbell of Succoth, and others, are exceptionally valuable. At the end of the volume are given the fourteen small plates, each containing sixteen shields, which were originally intended to be inserted in the *Cadency*, but only two of which were ultimately printed there. The editors have, in the great majority of cases, been able to identify the families to which the arms belong, and in every case have added the blazon of the arms. Dr. Woodward is responsible for the description of the shields on Plate XV., all of which

belong to foreign armory. He has performed his task with his usual accuracy, and points out that Nisbet is indebted for the greater part of his knowledge of Continental Heraldry to the works of Menestrier.

A word of praise is due to the general get up of the book, which is well printed, the reproduction of the plates being clear and distinct. Not the least valuable feature is an admirable index, which makes the contents readily accessible. It is very gratifying to see two Scottish Heralds like Mr. Ross and Mr. Grant producing a work such as this. We trust it is only the beginning of a school of Heraldry in Scotland which will make its influence felt in time to come.

The second book, whose title is at the head of this article, is the outcome of the Heraldic Exhibition held at Edinburgh last year. It was the first of the kind ever held in Britain, and proved a great success. The Committee considered it wise to open it free of charge, and it is stated in the Prefatory Note that it was visited by nearly 22,000 persons. Even allowing for a certain proportion who went there as they would have gone to anything else which was to be seen for nothing, there can be no doubt that these numbers indicate a remarkable interest in a subject which not so long ago was considered by many a mere pedantic relic of antiquity. But, indeed, it was not necessary to be a heraldic student to enjoy to a large extent the display of the articles which were brought together. Many were objects that the public never had had an opportunity of seeing before: some of them were of great historic interest in themselves, and others appealed to all who profess artistic or antiquarian tastes. Many persons probably left the exhibition with their ideas about heraldry very considerably modified, and if it has any effect in making writers more accurate when dealing with heraldic matters, the exhibition will not have been held in vain. For it is wonderful into what mistakes authors will fall when dealing with a comparatively unfamiliar subject. Even dear Sir Walter himself, enthusiastic lover as he was of all things relating to armory, sometimes nods: witness the description of the cognizance of *Marmion*—

“ Well was he armed from head to heel
 In mail and plate of Milan steel ;
 But his strong helm, of mighty cost,
 Was all with burnished gold embossed.
 Amid the plumage of the crest
 A falcon hovered on her nest,
 With wings outspread and forward breast ;
 E'en such a falcon on his shield
 Soar'd *sable* in an *azure* field.”

It is of course obvious that Scott here blazons colour on colour which is contrary to the usual rule of Heraldry, at all events in this country, though, as Dr. Woodward points out, it is far from uncommon abroad. In connection with Scott, it may be noted that not the least interesting of the exhibits was a copy of Ferne's 'Blazon of Gentry' from the Abbotsford library. The book is not a very readable one in itself, but this copy, Scott tells us in a note to *Quentin Durward*, belonged originally to Thomas Drysdale, Islay Herald, who purchased it in 1619. He seems to have read it with patience and profit, till he came to the passage which quotes Scotland and England as an example of feudatory and sovereign powers. 'This assertion,' says Scott, 'set on fire the Scottish blood of Islay Herald, who, forgetting the book had been printed nearly forty years before, and that the author was probably dead, writes on the margin in great wrath and in a half-text hand, "He is a traitor and liar in his throat, and I offer him the combat that says Scotland's Kings were ever feudatorie to England."'

The catalogue as now printed differs from the original in several respects: it is apparently somewhat fuller in detail and in some instances objects have been classified under other headings from those under which they originally appeared. It has also been entirely reprinted, and now appears in the shape of a handsome quarto with upwards of a hundred illustrations, some of them in colour and the others reproduced by a photographic process. Some of the former are admirable, especially the Patent of Arms granted to the Tallow Chandlers Company of London in the year 1456. The very best period of Heraldic Art had perhaps passed by that time, but no one can fail to be struck by the beauty of the Patent as a specimen of the illu-

minator's skill. The lines are flowing and harmonious, and the whole scheme of decoration is artistic and dignified. Compared with this the Scottish Patent granted by Sir Robert Forman of Luthrie, Lyon, to Sir James Balfour of Pittendreich in 1563 is poor. The workmanship is sadly wanting in grace, but is not without spirit and force. A pretty example of Heraldry as applied to interior domestic decoration is given in a coloured reproduction of a painted distemper ceiling in the Council-room Linlithgow: it dates from 1567, but the building in which it was discovered is now unfortunately destroyed. The other coloured illustrations consist of the Scottish coats in the *Armorial de Gelre* which were first given by Mr. Stodart in his *Scottish Arms*, and afterwards more correctly by Captain Dunbar in a paper read before the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, in the proceedings of which body these plates first appeared.

We can only very briefly allude to a few of the more important items which appear in this catalogue. The collection of British and Foreign Armorial was singularly complete, and we have here five and thirty of their pages copied in photography. Though of course we miss the glowing colours which add so much to the interest of the originals, a very fair idea is given of the workmanship of the different books. Twelve armorials have been selected from which specimen pages are given: they are all Scottish and date from Sir David Lindsay downwards. One feature is common to those which belong to the days of Queen Mary and James VI. They are all introduced by a series of full length effigies of the Scottish monarchs and their wives all clad in surcoat or kirtle, and displaying thereon their full armorial bearings. Occasionally, as in the Workman MS. from the Lyon office, these are accompanied by descriptive verses, but more often they stand alone. All agree, however, in representing John Baliol as a dishonoured man, sometimes prone on the ground but always with a broken crown, shattered sword and sceptre and torn surcoat. The best executed and most artistic, if not the most heraldically correct, of these Scottish armorials is one which belonged to George Lord Seton, who died in 1585, when it became the

property of his son Robert, afterwards Earl of Winton. It is now in the possession of Mrs. Hamilton Ogilvy of Beil. Nine of its pages have been reproduced in the catalogue. All the Jameses except James I. are given with their consorts, and form a very interesting and curious set of regal effigies. Whether or not the figures are intended to be portraits is difficult to say, but the faces of all possess marked individuality, and several little personal touches are given which show that the artist was actuated by an intelligent desire to identify the several monarchs. We see, for instance, James IV. depicted with an iron chain round his waist, which it is said he wore constantly next his skin in expiation of his rebellion against his father, and by means of which his body was identified on Flodden field.

One of the most remarkable representations of armorial bearings in the exhibition occurs in a Book of Hours lent by the Marquess of Bute, but which for many generations was one of the most treasured items in the library at Murthly. It is a beautifully executed illuminated MS. of the thirteenth century, the calendar prefixed to it containing amongst its obits that of Sir John Stewart, the 'Black Knight of Lorne' and his wife. Its heraldic interest consists in the fact that bound with it are a series of full page miniatures assigned by experts to the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century, one of which contains a representation of the watching of our Lord's sepulchre. The watchers—four knights—are 'clad in complete steel,' and three of the shields are blazoned with heraldic bearings in metal and colour. If we accept the estimate of the date of the execution of these illustrations as correct, this is one of the earliest instances of the representation of coat armour in this country. We are not aware that any of the bearings have been identified as belonging to any particular families, but the matter is one which deserves more attention than has as yet been bestowed on it.

We can only mention in detail one more of the treasures depicted in this catalogue. The Douglas or 'Cavers' standard has long been a puzzle to antiquaries. It is described in the catalogue as the standard of James second Earl of Douglas

and Mar, which was carried by his son, Archibald Douglas of Cavers, at the Battle of Otterburn in 1388. But if we are to believe Froissart, both the Earl of Douglas and his standard-bearer were killed on the field of battle, and the flag was hung over the Earl's tomb. We know for certain, on the other hand, that Archibald Douglas survived the battle many years. As to the charges emblazoned on the banner, no satisfactory explanation of them has as yet been given. The hearts and mullet might certainly be assigned to Douglas, and the saltire might be taken for the ordinary St. Andrew's Cross. But there are still a lion—a very noble and fierce lion he is—and a Tau or St. Anthony's Cross to be accounted for. How did they get there, and what is their significance? The lion does not occur as a charge on the Douglas shield until a date subsequent to the battle of Otterburn, but it has been suggested that it may have been intended for an original Angus charge, a lion passant appearing on the seal of Malcolm, Earl of Angus, who died in 1232, and that the flag itself may have been an Angus ensign displayed on Hermitage Castle, of which the Douglasses of Cavers were wardens under the Earls of Angus. Another opinion is that the flag is really a Percy banner, perhaps that mentioned by Froissart as having been captured at Newcastle, and that the Douglas charges have been added after it came into possession of that family. The Tau Cross and the motto, *Jamais Areyre* are at present insoluble mysteries; that motto is not believed to have been used by the Douglas family until the latter part of the sixteenth century.

We have indicated in detail one or two of the more outstanding exhibits in an interesting exhibition. The heraldic student will find much to study in this catalogue, even though he may not have seen the exhibition itself. The articles selected for reproduction in the plates give a fair idea of the singular variety of the contents. There are some wonderful family trees, though we regret not to have a photograph of that of the Campbells of Glenurqhy, with portraits of the various members, said to be by Jameson the Scottish portrait painter. Wood carvings and stained glass are both well represented; and several heraldic wall decorations are given.

Not the least curious of the plates are those giving a complete set of Scottish heraldic playing cards, in which each card has the arms of some Scottish family upon it. There is also a specimen from a similar pack of French cards. In the exhibition there were many such sets of various nationalities, the object of which seems to have been the instruction of the players in Heraldry, at one time considered an indispensable part of polite education. Among the illustrations may be specially mentioned the fine set of Percy seals from the *Annals of the House of Percy*, reproduced by the kind permission of the Duke of Northumberland.

Amongst the many memorial volumes of exhibitions which have been issued of late years, this will take a high place. Apart from its intrinsic value, it will be dear to the heart of the collector from the fact that it is a privately printed book, and that all the available copies were long ago subscribed for. It is well known that your true book lover values a book as much because of its scarcity as its interest. When both these qualities are combined, the volume should be a real treasure. From our point of view it is chiefly valuable as illustrating the proposition set forth at the beginning of this article, that there is an intelligent and increasing interest taken in Heraldry and kindred subjects, and as showing that Scottish Heralds are alive to this fact, and are anxious to do their duty in furthering the study of the 'Science.'

J. BALFOUR PAUL.

ART. II.—THE STORY OF MARY SHELLEY.

THE history of the household of Godwin is not a cheerful one. There is a melancholy story connected with all the women who belonged to it, excepting his second wife. Mary Wollstonecraft, Fanny Imlay, Jane Clairmont, Mary Shelley, —these names recall associations of sadness and disaster, if not of wrong-doing and tragic punishment. Of all the four Fanny Imlay alone may be said to have suffered entirely through the

selfishness of others and not because of her own rebellion against fate, her own rejection of the accepted social laws of the time in which she lived. She was the child of one of those experiments in which the innocent must suffer for the guilty. She had inherited from her mother a melancholy temperament, and her lot was cast among those upon whom she had no real claim. She had learnt to believe that her own existence—for which she was not responsible—was an injury and an anxiety to others. The burden of selfish demand pressed from every side on her gentle and unselfish nature. When the weight of life became too heavy for her to bear, it was not by a hasty snatch at happiness that she endeavoured to escape; she did not follow the road taken by her mother and sisters, nor seek personal satisfaction at the risk of shame and wrong to others; she found instead an escape by the way of death. So she thought her sorrows would end with herself, and not be passed on to other lives, perhaps in an endless succession of disaster.

She had uttered no complaints before; she had indulged in no passionate upbraiding of the world; she had made no demands on the indulgence or forgiveness of others; even her act of suicide was hardly an act of selfishness; it was intended to relieve those who had been kind to her of the burden of her existence. Her end had the simplicity of true tragedy. She put her passionate despair into one passionate act, with as few words as possible. She uttered none of those heroics by which some sufferers turn their suffering into merchandise, and obtain from the world what they desire in exchange. We hear of her as ministering to others, helping them in their self-inflicted troubles, speaking with courageous kindness of the absent and misjudged, and acting with indulgence to the faulty. She only speaks of herself at last, when she has resolved that the end has come.

‘I have long determined that the best thing I could do was to put an end to the existence of a being whose birth was unfortunate, and whose life has only been a series of pain to those persons who have hurt their health in endeavouring to promote her welfare. Perhaps to hear of my death may give you pain, but you will soon have the blessing of forgetting that such a creature ever existed as . . .’

These words were written at the Mackwork Arms Inn, Swansea. And she died by her own hands, among strangers, having sought no happiness, and found, so far as we know, no love.

Her self-sought death moved Shelley very much, and he was able to put his feeling into some touching lines :—

‘ Her voice did quiver as we parted,
 Yet knew I not that heart was broken
 From which it came,—and I departed,
 Heeding not the misery then spoken—
 Misery, oh ! misery !
 This world is all too wide for thee.’

But Shelley could not have helped her if he *had* known that her heart was broken. There was no true help, in his creed, for the sinlessly suffering. There was no joy of constancy, of patience, of self-denial, that he could teach to others ; because he knew none himself. His theory was, ‘if your feelings are not satisfied by what you have had already, try to get something else, no matter whose it may be, nor at what a cost—to others—you have to secure it.’ His own remedy for trouble was sympathy ; the sympathy of some person, generally a young and a new person, who was willing to devote herself entirely to him, to receive and to reflect all his emotions with the vividness that novelty only could create.

It was left to another poet to conceive and to write of ‘Duty.’

‘ Yet thou dost wear
 The Godhead’s most benignant grace,
 Nor know we anything so fair
 As is the smile upon thy face ;
 Flowers laugh before thee on their beds
 And fragrance in thy footing treads ;
 Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong ;
 And the most ancient heavens, through thee, are fresh and strong !’

This was not the creed that inspired Mary Godwin when she left her father’s house to unite her fate with Shelley’s.

‘ There are who ask not if thine eye
 Be on them ; who in love and truth

Where no misgiving is, rely
Upon the genial sense of youth :
Glad hearts ! without reproach or blot ;
Who do thy work, and know it not :
Oh ! if through confidence misplaced
They fail, thy saving arms, dread Power ! around them cast.'

If there had been no Harriet, these lines might perhaps have been applied to Mary. But there was a Harriet. And besides that, there was Godwin, who, in spite of his early theories on the marriage question, had no encouragement to give to his young daughter when she desired to experiment for herself in this direction. Her mother's experiments had ended in disaster, a disaster which was yet to culminate in the death of her innocent daughter. The experiments which men and women so boldly enter upon, for the satisfaction of themselves and one selected favourite, end usually in much suffering for others who are innocent. Mary could not have entered, without misgiving, into her new life. She relied entirely perhaps, upon 'the genial sense of youth,' which told her that Shelley was good, adorable, and devoted to herself.

Duty that restrains is tiresome, and is likely to have to contend for its place against claimants that wear its mask, without showing its sternness. Mary needed only to take one bold step—that of putting her life in Shelley's hands and regarding herself as his wife—and henceforth, so it seemed, duty and delight would be one. Self-denial, with her, would become a joy ; self-sacrifice, for him, would be happiness. So she made her own duty for herself, as the Israelites made themselves gods with their own hands. And this duty that she had made she followed through hard and devious roads, redeeming the one false step of her life, so far as it could be redeemed, by patience and constancy.

The road was never easy that she had to tread. It was lighted only by her devotion to Shelley and her passionate belief in him. She made his love her religion. For the sake of it she was ready to deceive and disobey her father, to take Shelley for ever from his wife, to give to his children the bitter heritage of those whose parents are divided openly. Like her

mother, when she trusted Imlay, like other women who have flung aside consideration for parents and sisters and children for the sake of the men they loved, she staked her all on the eternity of Shelley's feeling for herself, on the justification that his love would be to her to the very end of her life. Was she then so justified?

In the earliest days of her union with Shelley, she must have perceived that her society was not enough to satisfy him for long together. It was his nature perpetually to pursue a new interest, and he could not rest long content with the sympathy of any one person. He amused himself, to begin with, by a strange sort of friendship for Jane Clairmont. He makes an entry in his diary concerning—

'Jane's insensibility and incapacity for the slightest degree of friendship. The feelings occasioned by this discovery prevent me from maintaining any measure in security.'

He blames himself for this, and says,—

'As you value many hours of peace, never suffer more than one to approach the hallowed circle.'

But he goes on to write—

'Converse with Jane; her mind unsettled; her character unformed; occasion of hope from some instances of softness and feeling.'

Why did he want instances of softness and feeling from this strange inmate of his strange household? Mary desired only her departure. She writes to him—

'Give me a garden and *absentia* Clare, and I will thank my love for many favours.'

The absence of the woman, in whom he was for the moment interested, was, however, the last favour that Shelley was likely to accord to her. He encouraged his wife's half-sister to remain with them. He studied her character and tested her power of emotion. He sat up late at night with her, holding strange and mystic discourse. On one occasion, after they had parted and he had gone to sit by Mary's bed, Clare rushed upon him to ask if he had touched her pillow, it having

been moved by no human power. This exciting circumstance required a renewed vigil. They talked more horrors, excited each other more than before, and were afraid that their candle would go out. He writes the sequel—

‘Just as the dawn was struggling with moonlight, Jane remarked in me that unutterable expression which had affected her with so much horror before ; she described it as expressing a mixture of deep sadness and conscious power over her. I covered my face with my hands, and spoke to her in the most studied gentleness. It was ineffectual ; her horror and agony increased even to the most dreadful convulsions. She shrieked and writhed on the floor. I ran to Mary ; I communicated to her in a few words the state of Jane. I brought her to Mary. The convulsions ceased, and she slept. At daybreak we examined her apartment and found her pillow on a chair.’

These were the scenes through which Mary had to pass, at a time when her health gave her the right to expect protection and tender consideration. Another entry of the diary records—

‘Night comes ; Jane walks in her sleep, and groans horribly ; listen for two hours ; at length bring her to Mary.’

After this he notes, with unwonted humour, that—

‘The next morning the chimney-board in Jane’s room is found to have walked leisurely into the middle of the room accompanied by the pillow, who being very sleepy, tried to get into bed again, but sat down on his back.’

If Shelley could always have laughed at the nervous horrors produced by his own wild vagaries of spirit, his household might have enjoyed a more cheerful existence ; but he returns very soon to the usual level of unreal and hysterical sentiment.

‘Clare imagines that I treat her unkindly ; Mary consoles her with her all-powerful benevolence. I rise (having already gone to bed) and speak with Clare ; she was very unhappy ; I leave her tranquil.’

No wonder it was that the young creature who had given up for Shelley the world and her own virtue, should long for relief from this overpowering presence. Her home life was, besides, haunted by the discomforts of debt and continual change. Shelley was always in financial difficulties ; no in-

come was sufficient to secure him from these. His household was never established, for long together, on a comfortable basis; his impulses and caprices drove his family into positions where, while they spent much money, they endured all the hardships of poverty. If his wife's health suffered, if a baby now and then was born prematurely or died prematurely after hurried household revolutions, Shelley did not consider himself responsible.

Some of his financial perplexities were almost comical, as when he had to leave Mary and Clare in a cab, while he visited the deserted Harriet to get back money from her with which to secure a shelter for the other two girls. There were miseries afterwards of hiding from creditors, and of meeting Mary with haste and secrecy, instead of living with her tranquilly in that innocence of which he so naively wrote.

Long afterwards Godwin wrote to his daughter—

‘I looked on you as one of the daughters of prosperity, elevated in rank and fortune.’

But Mary never enjoyed the advantages of rank and fortune, even after she had become the wife of Shelley, and when a comfortable income had been bestowed upon him. The shadow of her own fault and his rested on her life. She was thrown continually into associations that were painful to her. She was a good wife and a good mother, but few other women who were good wives and good mothers were likely to desire her acquaintance. Her own example had been bad, and her footsteps seemed dogged by miserable copies of it. Her lapse was followed by Clare's, and this was justified by no marriage. Instead, there was the anxiety caused by the existence of Allegra, of whom she had to take charge, as well as of Clare in her trouble. The presence of Allegra caused grave suspicion and scandal, and necessitated further duplicity in Mary's dealings with her father. She had deceived him in order to gratify her own passion for Shelley, and now she had to do it again in order to shield her half-sister's weakness for Byron.

Then there was trouble with her servants, who followed—like Harriet first, and Clare afterwards—all too literally

Shelley's theories and examples on the question of morality. There was a hasty marriage got up for the woman's sake, and the two culprits went away, to become afterwards the authors of a new and odious scandal about Shelley and Clare. In the reply to this scandal, it is curious to notice Mary's horror of the whole of it. Shelley, on the other hand, was so fiercely indignant at a world which could believe *one-half* of it, that he desired to live in that world no more; but the other half—the supposition that Clare might have been his mistress—shocked him but moderately. If it had been true, he would, he considered, have committed a grave error; but he does not speak of a fault.

The trouble of a disorderly life does indeed spread like an infectious disease. The sin of an individual seems to affect the whole social organism around it. We live and act by the thoughts and aspirations of those about us, as well as by our own. In the struggle against individual tendencies to evil, we want the support of the general conscience, and of a conscience in ourselves not out of tune with its finer aspirations. Mary had chosen a life outside the plane of those lives that were noblest and purest; yet she loved the noble and the pure. Therefore, in all her sorrows and perplexities, she was thrown back on her belief in Shelley, on her conviction of the sacredness of their mutual love. That justified her in her own eyes, and that alone must console her for the world's misjudgment.

The death of Harriet does not seem to have oppressed her with remorse. Her confidence in Shelley, and her ignorance of the real facts of life, carried her through the dreadful time of Harriet's suicide. Indeed, Shelley himself, with the beautiful simplicity of a nature which perceives, in its own present needs, the highest embodiment of truth, believed that he was Harriet's best and most disinterested friend. He invited her to join Mary and himself in Switzerland, and to be a witness of their happiness. The brutal indifference to the feelings of a woman whom he had once professed to love, which this suggestion contains, cannot well be surpassed. The indifference may be attributed to ignorance, but it is that ignorance from which the most abominable cruelty has its

birth; it is the ignorance which arises from an entire occupation with personal feelings, an occupation so entire that it blinds the individual to the feelings and sufferings of others. It is as if the operator on a living creature, interested in his work and enjoying his sense of developing power, should say to the victim under his knife: 'How can it hurt you, when I feel it only pleasant?'

Shelley's responsibility with regard to Harriet can, however, be hardly over-rated. She was a handsome and undisciplined young creature, full of animal life, destitute of knowledge and experience, but not without amiability. Her early married life, her ardour in forwarding Shelley's theories, proved so much. She could not devote herself, like Mary, but she put herself with tolerable completeness in her husband's hands. If she had any religious principles to begin with, they could not well have survived her life with Shelley. He taught her to throw off the old trammels of convention, without binding her to adopt any guiding law in their place. He himself set her the example of defying the received code of social morality. She had nothing to fall back upon when he, who had put his intellect before her as the only true guide, forsook her. He abandoned her, ignorant, young, and untrained, to the dangers of life, without her natural protector. He taught her, first by his carefully expressed theories, and afterwards by his union with Mary, that she might rightly console herself for his desertion as she best could. (There is no proof that she so consoled herself before, but much testimony to the contrary. Suspicion of her unfaithfulness was not the original cause of the alienation between them.) He threw her, therefore, into the hands of some man who was likely to treat her worse than he had done himself. A better man would not be likely to constitute himself her consoler, and neither law nor custom would give her protection in any new tie that she might form. She was left, therefore, a prey to those who would degrade her, and cast her off to a lower degradation still. And so the history was carried out, and the mother of his children, the woman to whom he had given his name, the wife to whom he had dedicated his poetry, of whom he had written: 'When I

come home to Harriet, I am the happiest of the happy,' followed the road into which he had thrust her until it ended in the Serpentine. And Shelley, the man of magnificent intellect, whose poetry thrills with tender humanity, the would-be guide of so many, the philanthropist who was made sick by the thought of the cruelty and stupidity of the world, Shelley did not feel himself responsible! Nor did Mary seem to feel any remorse at the tragedy which enabled her to become Shelley's wife, and which gave to her youngest son a title and a fortune. Her punishment was still far off, and her confidence in Shelley's theories about love complete.

These theories were developed later, in *Epispsychidion*, to her own bitter pain, for she was herself no longer the justifying cause of them.

Who has not, at least in their enthusiastic youth, felt the magnificence of that hymn to ideal love? But it is the glory of its vision of constancy that enthalls. It is the rapture of its devotion, the completeness of its suggestion of union. The inconstancy seems to be only apparent; it is the forsaking of an illusion for a reality, the breaking of an idol of clay for a true divinity.

So it seemed to Mary when she was compared with Harriet:

'With one chained friend, perhaps a zealous foe.'

How *right*, how *necessary* seemed Shelley's emancipation from that first mistaken bond!

'One life, one death, one immortality, and one annihilation!'

How intoxicating were these aspirations when applied to herself!—But when they were applied to Emilia Viviani—what were they then?

She endured them patiently, not losing her faith in Shelley; for poets must not be taken literally, even when they particularize so painfully as this. And she seems to have treated Emilia herself with her 'all-powerful benevolence,' as she had treated Clare, as she treated Jane Williams, every one except Harriet; but then she had injured Harriet, instead of being injured by her.

After the episode of Emilia Viviani—that ideal young

creature with a keen eye to her own pecuniary advantage—comes the last episode, that of Jane Williams; and in the midst of it came Shelley's tragic death.

The months before the catastrophe were miserable even to Mary. She suffered physically and mentally, from outward discomfort, from actual illness, and from a terrible gloom which she did not understand. She had been hurried to Spezzia on Clare's account. Allegra, the little daughter of Clare and of Byron had died unexpectedly, and Shelley's one idea was to conceal the death from the mother as long as possible. He was singularly destitute of common sense in all his arrangements. He multiplied trouble by the excitable way in which he received it, and by the effort which he made and encouraged others to make to escape the inevitable. So Mary had to suffer that Clare's trouble, which could not be altogether avoided—might be delayed. Mary wrote thus to Mrs. Gisborne:

'Shelley wished to conceal the fatal news from her as long as possible, so when she returned from Spezzia he resolved to remove thither without delay, with so little delay that he packed me off with Clare and Percy the very next day. She wished to return to Florence, but he persuaded her to accompany me; the very next day he packed up our goods and chattels, for a furnished house was not to be found in this part of the world, and, like a torrent hurrying everything in its course, he persuaded the Williams' to do the same. They came here; but one house was to be found for us all; it is beautifully situated on the sea-shore, under the woody hills,—but such a place as this is! The poverty of the people is beyond anything, yet they do not appear unhappy, but go on in dirty content, or content'd dirt, while we find it hard work to purvey miles around for a few eatables. We were in wretched discomfort at first, but now are in a kind of disorderly order, living from day to day as we can.'

' . . . As only one house was to be found inhabitable in this gulf, the Williams' have taken up their abode with us, and their servants and mine quarrel like cats and dogs. . . . Percy is well, and Shelley singularly so.'

Mrs. Mann—one of their friends, whose own defiance of conventional morality made her a natural ally of the Shelleys—wrote to Shelley himself at this time:—

'I regret the loss of Mary's good health and spirits, but hope it is only the consequence of her present situation, and, therefore, merely temporary, but I dread Clare's being in the same house for a month or two, and wish the Williams' were half a mile from you.'

This was the opinion of a sympathetic and sensible woman, but the suggested change would not have suited the poet at all. He had very strong sympathies, indeed, but the strongest of all were for himself, and he soon found a new interest—a new ‘consolation’ he would have said—in Jane Williams. He wrote of her at first—

‘It is a pity that anyone so pretty and amiable should be so selfish.’

But afterwards—

‘I like Jane more and more.’

And, in the month of June he writes to John Gisborne:—

‘Williams is captain, and we glide along this beautiful bay, in the evening wind, under the summer moon, until earth appears another world. Jane brings her guitar, and if the past and future could be obliterated, the present would content me so well that I could say, with Faust, to the present moment, “Remain, thou art so beautiful!”’

Mary wrote afterwards to Mrs. Gisborne of the same time and place:—

‘I described to you the place we were living in—our desolate house, the beauty, yet strangeness, of the scenery, and the delight Shelley took in all this. He never was in better health or spirits than during this time. I was not well in body or mind. My nerves were wound up to the utmost irritation, and the sense of misfortune hung over my spirits. No world can tell you how I hated our house and the country about it. Shelley reproached me for this—his health was good, and the place was quiet after his own heart. What could I answer? That the people were wild and hateful, that though the country was beautiful, yet I liked a more *countrified* place, that there was great difficulty in living, that all our *Tuscans* would leave us, and that the very jargon of these *Genevesi* was disgusting. This was all I had to say, but no words could describe my feelings; the beauty of the woods made me weep and shudder; so vehement was my feeling of dislike that I used to rejoice when the winds and waves permitted me to go out in the boat, so that I was not obliged to take my usual walk among the shaded paths and alleys of vine-festooned trees—all that before I doated on, and that now weighed upon me. My only moments of peace were on board that unhappy boat, when, lying down with my head on his knee, I shut my eyes, and felt the wind and our swift motion alone.’

She had, however, reason enough for her melancholy, though a reason that she never perhaps put into words even

to herself. She must have felt instinctively the withdrawal of her husband's tenderest sympathy from herself. He did not so put the matter to his friends; he spoke, instead, of his only want being the presence of those who could feel with and understand him.

'Whether from proximity, and the continuity of domestic intercourse, Mary does not.'

He wishes for Mr. and Mrs. Gisborne, and also for Hogg, but consoles himself with Jane, and an intercourse of which

'Words were not the instrument.'

So had he, when first Harriet failed to appreciate him, consoled himself with Mrs. Boinville, her daughter and sister, and had penned those lines of pensive regret:—

'Thy dewy looks sink in my breast;
Thy gentle words stir poison there;
Thou hast disturbed the only rest
That was the portion of despair!
Subdued to Duty's hard control,
I could have borne my wayward lot;
The chains that bind this ruined soul
Had cankered them, but crushed it not.'

Whatever may have been the origin of Shelley's quarrel with his first wife, and it seems evident that, to begin with, *she* thought herself the injured one, there is nothing in these lines so pathetic or so suggestive of true and simple feeling as Harriet's letter to Hookhaen at this period:—

'My Dear Sir,

You will greatly oblige me by giving the enclosed to Mr. Shelley. I would not trouble you, but it is now four days since I have heard from him, which to me is an age. Will you write by return of post, and tell me what has become of him, as I always fancy something dreadful has happened if I do not hear from him. If you tell me that he is well, I shall not come to London; but if I do not hear from you or him, I shall certainly come, as I cannot endure this dreadful state of suspense. You are his friend, and you can feel for me.

'I remain, yours truly,

H. S.'

Poor Shelley! poor poet! That it should take so many

broken hearts to keep him only *moderately* unhappy! But Jane Williams was not one of those on whose life his morbid influence was to cast a permanent blight. She took his homage lightly, and enjoyed it. Afterwards, as we shall see, she made her little boast of it.

Mary, meanwhile, was again in a state of health which ought to have commanded the tenderest consideration. Her good nature in letting Shelley hurry her into an uncomfortable situation for Clare's sake had resulted in serious illness. She was unlikely to recover either her physical strength or her cheerfulness in her present surroundings. She had neither the skilled medical aid nor the easy household arrangements which she ought to have had at a critical time. Besides, Shelley was always a trying companion for a sensitive and sympathetically nervous woman. He suffered from sleep-walking, from 'nervous sensations and visions.'

He saw the vision of himself strangling Mary, and does not seem to have forborne to mention the fact to her! He met—

'The figure of himself as he walked on the terrace, and said to him, "How long do you mean to be content!" No very terrific words, and certainly not prophetic of what has occurred.'

True, indeed, but indicative perhaps of his vague dissatisfaction with his present bond, and prophetic of his future rebellion against it. The fact that he could make such a confidence to his wife was only another example of the serious simplicity of his self-regard. His own subjective moods were to him the most objective things in the world. He expressed them with a fine sense of irresponsibility, which amounts at times to the humourous, but it is the humour of tragedy, as it was when he endeavoured to mollify Harriet by the praise of Mary, to satisfy her with his desertion, by assuring her of his own happiness with her supplanter.

Shelley was, apparently, happy at Spezzia; he speaks of himself, however, as having been 'consoled.' He wrote a letter to Jane Williams after he had left Spezzia with her husband, never, as it happened, to return. He speaks of the probable return of her husband before himself:

'I have thus the pleasure of contributing to your happiness when deprived of every other, and of leaving you no other subject of regret but the absence of one scarcely worth regretting. I fear you are solitary and melancholy at the Villa Magni, and, in the intervals of the greater and more serious distress in which I am compelled to sympathize here, I figure to myself the countenance which has been the source of such consolation to me, shadowed by a veil of sorrow.

'How soon those hours passed, and how slowly they return, to pass so soon again, and perhaps for ever, in which we have lived together so intimately, so happy! Adieu, my dearest friend. I only write these lines for the pleasure of tracing what will meet your eye. Mary will tell you all the news.'

A very pretty letter indeed, and a suggestive one, with its delicately-veiled melancholy, and air of noble patience! Hardly, however, a letter that one would suppose to be written by a man who was keeping a young and delicate wife in a situation that was painful to herself, and keeping her there entirely for his own pleasure. The resignation surely should have been on *her* side. He wrote at the same time to Mary herself:—

'How are you, my best Mary? Write especially how is your health, and how your spirits are, and *whether you are not more reconciled to staying at Lerici*, at least during the summer. I have not a moment's leisure, but will write by next post.

'Ever, dearest Mary, yours affectionately, 'S.'

'I have found the translation of the Symposium.'

The solicitude that is most apparent here is not for her health and happiness, but for her acquiescence in his present mode of life.

Jane's answer to him was not without humour, nor yet without coquetry:

'My dearest Friend,—Your few melancholy lines have indeed cast your own visionary veil over a countenance that was animated with the hope of seeing you return with far different tidings. . . My own Neddino does not deign to lighten my darkness by a single word.'

After the signature she adds:

'Why do you talk of never enjoying moments like the past? Are you going to join our friend Plato, or do you expect I shall do so soon? *Buona notte.*'

Jane did not take her poet too seriously. Hers was not perhaps a deep or a serious nature. She had not been tempted by Shelley's proposal to overturn the boat and with her to 'solve the great mystery.' She had no idea of linking her fate with his, in life, as Mary had done; or in death, as he had suggested himself. His flattery pleased her, however, and she does not seem to have been touched by any sympathetic compassion for his wife. She was Mrs. Hawksbee, without Mrs. Hawksbee's more generous side. To have felt for Mary's feelings would have destroyed the amusement she found in Shelley's sentimental friendship; so she did not feel for Mary. Even the tragedy of their common loss does not seem to have drawn from her any true affection or sympathy.

Neither Shelley nor Jane's 'own Neddino' returned to Spezzia. The two women who had been left there underwent together an agony of suspense, and met together the harrowing certainty of their widowhood. It was not with Jane, but with her husband, that Shelley solved the great mystery, and found his death in the waters of the beautiful bay.

In her great sorrow and loneliness Mary clung with impassioned friendship to her fellow-sufferer. She could not bear to be parted from her. She wrote to Leigh Hunt:

'I shall not come without my Jane, who is now necessary to my existence.'

And afterwards she wrote to Jane herself:

'Often, having you at Kentish Town, I have wept from the overflow of affection; often thanked God who had given you to me.'

This friendship, and the memory of Shelley's love, were the two solaces of her saddened life. Her boy, who was afterwards to become her chief consolation, was yet too young to fill the needs of a heart that longed always for sympathetic communion with some trusted friend. She lived much in the past, filling up the emptiness of the present with fervid memories of the love that had almost been her religion, that was the chief fact of her life, its only justification:

'I was loved once! still let me cling to the memory.'

So she wrote in 1824; and, nearly a year afterwards:

'Thy picture is come, my only one! . . .

'Thou art near to guard and save me, angelic one! Thy divine glance will be my protection and defence. I was not worthy of thee, and thou hast left me; yet that dear look assures me that thou wert mine, and recalls and narrates to my backward-looking mind a long tale of love and happiness.'

So she idealized the past, forgetting its sorrows and anxieties; her great grief for the loss of her children, her glooms, her doubts, her discomforts; her trouble about her father's affairs, her own pecuniary difficulties, her distress at the world's unkindness, the shadow of shame, the misery of concealment; all these troubles were forgotten; the one abiding thought in her mind was that she and her husband had loved each other with a perfect love, a love compensating for every loss and soothing every pain.

But, in 1827, the year after this was written, her friend achieved a new happiness for herself, and, in marrying Hogg, made herself independent of her old friendships. The first use that she made of this independence was to reveal to the world all—and perhaps more than all,—of Shelley's admiration for herself and faithlessness to Mary. There were pretty suggestions of herself as Shelley's good angel, while Mary was depicted as jealous of her, and was made to appear in a ridiculous light in this treacherous picture of the last miserable months at Lerici.

The effect on Mary of this revelation was a terrible one:

'Not for worlds would I attempt to transfer the deathly blackness of my meditations to these pages. Let no trace remain save the deep, bleeding hidden wound of my lost heart of such a tale of horror and despair. Writing, study, quiet, such remedies I must seek. What deadly cold flows through my veins! My head weighed down; my limbs sink under me. I start at every sound as the messenger of fresh misery, and despair invests my soul with trembling horror.'

And again:

'It was not long ago that, eagerly desiring death, though death should only be oblivion, I thought that to purchase oblivion of what was revealed to me last July, a tortuous death would be a bed of roses.

' . . . I have known no peace since July. I never expect to know it again.'

These expressions would seem exaggerated if their full meaning could not be understood. There is power, however, in one thought, if it be intense enough, to sustain a life through outward discomfort or to blight it in the midst of affluent circumstances. Mary's life was sad. She dwelt always in the shadow of her past, but through that shadow there had shone hitherto one guiding, one redeeming star. She had believed in the sacredness of her love and Shelley's. Was it sacred then, if he had put it in the power of this other woman to hurt and wound her so? She utters no word of reproach to her husband, but if her belief in him had remained entire, she could have smiled at the vain chatter of her unfeeling friend. Henceforth we have no apostrophes to his memory, no ecstasies of tenderness recalled. The darkness about her was now black indeed. For what sorrow is worse than this, that the thought to which we had turned for comfort in our worst troubles, should become our keenest pain? that the instinctive return to a tender memory should be met always by a pang of agony? that the face of our friend should change to that of our deadliest foe? 'Shelley' was the word by which she had conjured for herself a kind of peace where no peace was, and now 'Shelley' was the name to stab like a dagger to her heart.

Seventeen years after his death, when she prepared her edition of his works, she found this task—a task which is usually the solace of widows, which fills them with pride and joy even while it renews their sadness, she found it a pain unutterable.

'I almost think that my present occupation will end in a fit of illness. . . . I am torn to pieces by memory. Would that all were mute in the grave. . . . Hogg has written me an insulting letter because I left out the dedication to Harriet. . . .

'Little does Jefferson, how little does anyone, know me! When Clarke's edition of Queen Nab came to us at the Baths of Pisa, Shelley expressed great pleasure that these verses were omitted. What could it be to me? *There are other verses I should well like to obliterate for ever*, but they will be printed; and any to her could in no way tend to my discomfort, or gratify one ungenerous feeling. They shall be restored, though I do not feel easy as to the good I do Shelley. I may have been mistaken. Jefferson might mistake me and be angry; that were nothing. He has done far more, and

done his best to give another poke to the poisonous dagger which has long rankled in my heart.'

Afterwards she wrote :—

'Illness did ensue. What an illness ! driving me to the verge of insanity.'

It is a sad record indeed. The dream of devotion to one who needed her so much that the world's wrong became a right for his sake, this dream was shattered for ever. Could she refuse to believe in his instability? Could she blame him? Could she blame Jane? What was her supreme evidence of his faithful love for herself? Only his faithless desertion of another woman. If it had been right to leave Harriet for Mary, it was no wrong to betray Mary to Jane. Had not she herself, by the great act of her life, done her utmost to establish a code of morality which left him free to pursue, with his so-called love, one woman after another? His devotion to herself, her sufficiency to him: these were not then the eternal and divine facts which permitted her to ignore all other facts of life. If so, what were they? How could she cry out against the cruelty of love's surcease, when she had had no pity for the young wife who had been driven by it to her shameful end in the *Serpentine*? It was not by any shameful way that she, Mary, would seek comfort or find escape. But the blackness and the horror of it all remained. She could see herself no longer as a pure martyr to a holy love. What had she been but a victim of her own weakness, an unwilling ally to the baser influences of social life, the means by which a man had multiplied sorrow and countenanced sin in a sinful and cruel world?

Her punishment recalls that of another woman long before. Perhaps Ann Boleyn believed in Henry's scruples about Katharine. She had certainly reason to believe in the strength and constancy of his love for herself. What must her feelings have been while she awaited the end? What would she have felt had she known that the royal lover, who had agitated kingdoms and defied crowned heads for her sake, could hasten to send the news of her condemnation to a cruel death as a

trifling love-gift to her rival? Yet she had herself rejoiced in Katharine's death. When a woman helps a man to be merciless to another woman, how shall she herself expect mercy at his hands? When she abandons the world's code of honour to rely upon *his*, how shall she reproach him for failing her? Has she not put the seal of her tenderness on his act of disloyalty to one like herself? Shall she speak a single word when he turns away to be rewarded by a third tenderness for a second act of unfaithfulness?

Mary spoke no such word against her husband's memory. There was indeed a bitter cry of reproach against the woman whose falseness confronted her like the ghost of her own early fault come back to avenge Shelley's first wife. Jane's falseness went no further than the satisfaction of her own vanity; she made no sacrifice for Shelley's friendship, nor esteemed it any more than a pleasing tribute to her own superior charms. But her poisonous dagger rankled all the same. All the world knew now that Mary had not 'understood' Shelley, that he had sought sympathy for her insufficiency in the eyes, if not the heart, of another woman. Henceforward she lived in an added gloom. Her life was isolated, and she was driven into a continual meditation that was full of pain. Whom should she trust now? Her husband had been disloyal, her friend faithless, her father self-seeking. Clare had always been an anxiety and more or less of a burden to her. She could hardly respect herself any more.

Cruel, indeed, is the fate of the nobler sort of those who cut themselves adrift from the general conscience to rely on their own conscience, or on that of one whom they blindly trust. Mary's punishment was long and severe. It was an exile from those safe and sweet sanctities of domestic life that she had violated. She might have said, with so many others who have satisfied their own desires under the name of self-sacrifice and devotion—

' Doch alles, was dazu mich trieb,
Gott, war so gut! ach, war so lieb!'

Her feeling for Shelley had possessed all the lofty glow that we associate with religious worship, all the tenderness which

belongs to our sweetest domestic affections, all the melting warmth of which we are conscious when we are moved to do a kindly deed. He had high aspirations, which lifted her above the common life. He had sad personal feelings which offered to her the position of consoler—that position dear to every woman's heart. On the other hand, to gratify her love for him she had to set her own immature judgment not only against the received opinion of the world, but against that of her father, her natural protector; she had to ignore the right of another woman, and to prepare for her unborn children a fate perhaps no better than Fanny Imlay's. There should have been here safeguards enough against the impulse of youth. What is it that is noblest in the love between man and woman? Surely not the blind abandonment to our instinctive desire for union, not that satisfaction in caresses and praises which is but a form of selfish personal delight. It is rather the transformation of this natural selfish impulse into a responsible force, a force for good and not for evil. Blind desire is thus changed into impassioned constancy; the eagerness for self-satisfaction becomes an intention of devoted kindness, a longing to help and comfort. Patience, long-suffering, self-sacrifice, these are the things that transfigure love from its lowest to its highest form. And no man or woman can love nobly, with power of continuance and self-restraint, who has not already exercised this power in other relationships. After all, we have but one heart with which to feel in so many ways; if it is selfish, corrupt, false, and cruel in one direction, it will presently prove itself so in some other. Few men and women have done as Mary Shelley did, and sinned only one sin; but she was very young when the fault was committed, and the influences of her life were dangerous ones. For the daughter of Mary Wollstonecraft to fall into the hands of Shelley in her tender youth was a danger indeed. She had not knowledge or strength enough to escape. Shelley's fervour was of a nature to carry all before it; his dreams of ideal love, beauty, happiness,—though they were gossamer things that fell to pieces before the cold wind of reality,—were yet intoxicating in their splendour, bewildering

in their promise of unlimited bliss. Such visions may serve to nourish noble hopes while we contemplate them only as vague and intangible delights; but the definite acts of responsible men and women must be founded on knowledge, experience, and a consideration of the rights of others. There is no nobility in pleasing the one person whom it pleases us to please, at the cost of others whose pleasure would reflect no delight in ourselves.

And then the uncertainty of a life where continued kindness must depend on fluctuations of feeling! Where, instead of following the dictum of Marcus Aurelius, 'Love earnestly those with whom you have to live,' we ask ourselves continually, 'Do I love her?' 'Does she love me?' and so find, in the innermost sanctuary of life, the anxiety of the outer world. He who feels the pulses of his happiness too often, makes of it presently a chronic invalid.

It was not by force of rebellion that Mary emerged at last from the utter gloom of her desolated life. It was rather by the despised and commonplace virtues of patience and a steady devotion to the duties that remained to her. At the end of her life she found herself in a sheltered haven where duty and love were one, and she was able to write:

'For myself, I repose in gentle and grateful reverie, and love for others. I am content for myself. . . . Though I no longer deem all things attainable, I enjoy what is; and while I feel that whatever I have lost of youth and hope, I have acquired the enduring affection of a noble heart, and Percy shows such excellent dispositions that I feel that I am much the gainer in life.'

But it can never be forgotten, that she owed even this long-delayed peace, not only to her faithful devotion to Shelley, not only to her patient endurance of sadness and loneliness; but also to the good fortune of seeing her only surviving son take his proper place in life, and knowing that he was able to become her apologist and protector. If her first children had lived, what would have been their fate or her position? If Harriet Shelley had not drowned herself in the *Serpentine*, what would have been the end of Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin? Can we call anything happiness, or prosperity, that is built on such a tragedy as this?

ANNIE ARMITT.

ART. III.—FORFARSHIRE.

FORFARSHIRE is unique among the counties of Scotland. It has a character of its own, and as near an approach to natural boundaries as can reasonably be looked for in an arbitrary division of the land. Like things are grouped together in impressive masses, and, from the Grampians to the German Ocean, the arrangement is simple and orderly.

As in all things mundane, there is a corresponding disadvantage. In scenery, as generally understood, that is, in pretty diversified stretches or sudden glimpses which arrest the wanderer, it must yield to its neighbour, Perthshire. The stream of tourists flows past or to one side, dropping a few here and there at quiet railway stations to occupy the shooting-lodges or to make themselves acquainted with the flora. Even the natives, on pleasure bent, seem to prefer St. Fillans to Clova. To be seen to advantage, a good deal must be seen at once, and only those who have climbed to some commanding height know wherein its strength lies.

The county is almost entirely made up of two parallel lines of elevation and two parallel depressions. All the rest is subordinate, and does not anywhere assert itself so as to disturb this simple plan. Running along the northern border is that portion of the Grampians known as the Benchinnin Hills, whose peaks rise to the very considerable height of 3000 feet and upward. The southern slopes of these hills are known as the Braes of Angus. At their foot, and sharply marked off by a great fault or sudden change from the metamorphic rock to the sandstone, is the great plain of Strathmore. This is part of a greater plain beginning in Dumbartonshire and terminating at Stonehaven, but the name is usually confined to that portion shut in between the Sidlaws and the Grampians. It stretches across the county in a belt from four to six miles wide, and constitutes the Howe of Angus. Forming the southern boundary of this central valley is the Sidlaw range, very bold where it enters

from Perthshire, from 1200 to 1500 feet high, but elsewhere of much more moderate elevation. Occupying the remaining space between this and the sea is the maritime district, which may be regarded as terminating at Redhead, or crossing the Border into Kincardineshire, according to the limit assigned to the Sidlaws. The general direction of all the four is from south-west to north-east. Such are the general features of the county.

The mountains to the north are furrowed by four great glens. These originate at the dead wall of partition between Forfarshire and Aberdeenshire, and, winding away in a southerly or south-easterly direction, open into Strathmore. Glen Isla is the most westerly, Glen Esk the most easterly, while Clova and Prosen come between. Each of these glens has a stream streaking its centre. The Clova stream is the South Esk. At Cortachie it enters the country of the old red sandstone, and a mile and a half lower it is joined by the Prosen. The combined waters enter the sea at Montrose. The North Esk flows down Glen Esk, and forms for some distance the boundary between Angus and Mearns. The last of the four, the Isla, deserves to be traced out a little more particularly. On leaving the hills it passes through the tremendous defile it has ploughed for itself, the den of Airlie. Skirting the county for awhile, it turns south-west into Perthshire, and joins the Tay at Kinclaven, near Cargill. It is the only river, with the exception of its tributary, the Dean, which leaves the county. From its peculiar formation, Forfarshire is, in the main, self-contained, and neither gives nor receives contributions. The next two streams originate in Strathmore. From its source in the loch of Forfar, the Dean holds a westerly course, and never leaves its native valley. The Lunan turns eastward, expands into the interesting lochs of Rescobie and Balgavies, and, passing Redhead Castle, enters Lunan Bay. The waters or burns which originate on the Sidlaws are inconsiderable, and for the most part flow down the northern slope, helping to swell the volume of the Dean. The Elliot and the Dighty begin and end their story in the maritime lain. The latter drains the south-eastern, the former the south-western portion.

It is noticeable that quite a large number of the streams, either begin in, or, near their source, expand into sheets of water. Notwithstanding this the lakes are unimportant and not nearly so numerous as at one time they seem to have been. Man has aided nature in draining their shallow basins, either for the sake of the land or of the marl.

Bordering the county to the south and east is a seaboard of considerable variety and interest. From Broughty Ferry onward it wears its milder and sandy aspect. A broadening belt of links follows for a considerable distance the bend of the coast. At Barry the scene becomes wild with great rolling sand dunes, many in the course of formation, and others just greening over. From Westhaven to Easthaven, low rocks, covered at high water, fill up the space between tide marks. A further stretch of somewhat savage sandy coast follows. The cliffs begin beyond Arbroath, and terminate beyond Redhead. Nowhere perhaps to be described as stupendous, they are still sufficiently high to warn the timid back, and to cause the light-headed to feel a sense of dizziness. The line is broken by a sweep of shallow bay. Cliffs not quite so bold, and made of different stuff fill up the space between Lunan and Montrose, and a further stretch of links completes the coast line. The scene has not always appeared as it does now; and a slight acquaintance with the changes through which it has passed will help to clear up the picture.

By the aid of the scientific imagination a few effective sketches might be made of the appearance the country wore at this or that era of the past; and, if done with sufficient skill, they might be found to chain the attention like the culminating scenes of a novel. There is a semi-romantic interest attaching to the past of the earth, which, combined with the majestic slowness of the movement, and the grandeur of the incidents, must ever make Geology one of the most fascinating of studies.

It will be sufficient to give a more general statement of the causes and conditions which wrought out the familiar features. Happily the story is very simple, easy to tell, and not very difficult to understand.

The greater part of modern Forfarshire was made out of the

Grampians, which must at one time have been very much higher than they are. The raw material for building was so much debris, worn away from the hill slopes by the ordinary, or extraordinary agencies of decay. This process of rock forming takes place under water. Thus we are prepared to find that the Grampian hills looked down, not on the valley of Strathmore as they do now; but on a great inland sea or lake, which stretched away over the maritime plain at least as far as Fife, and probably as far as the Lammermuir, Moorfoot, and Carrick ranges. The larger and heavier pieces of this waste were gathered and piled along the edge of the water, where it lapped up on the the lower slopes of the hills, just as the stones and shells of the coast are rolled in by the waves, and map out the highest point the tide reaches. In the conglomerate or hardened mixture of sand and stones on the northern side of Strathmore, the edge of this ancient sea may yet be traced. The more completely ground down material was floated out to the deep water, where the Sidlaws now are and beyond, and settled quietly and continuously to the bottom. There it accumulated through a long period of time, to an immense thickness, getting hardened by pressure and other physical causes from loose sand into sandstone. In this way out of the waste of the mountains and in the bed of the inland sea the foundations of the county were laid. Had this been all, it is obvious that Forfarshire would have presented two features, and two features only, the mountains to the north, and, for the rest, a pretty uniform plain.

But another force came into play to give a little variety to this somewhat monotonous plan. Volcanoes seem to have broken out through the sandstone, and to have spread the ejected molten material over the bed of the sea. In the intervals of quiet between the outbursts the waste of the hills was redeposited over the layer of volcanic matter. Hence that alternation of sandstone and igneous rock, so characteristic of the central uplands of the county. This process went on ever heaping up new material, and thus shallowing the water and approaching nearer the surface. At length a low bank of land showed itself in the neighbourhood of the Sidlaws and the maritime district. The presence of this bank pent up the water in the compara-

tively narrow intervening valley now known as Strathmore, from which after a while it entirely vanished. This was the first appearance of modern Forfarshire south of the Grampians, and out of this shapeless mass the familiar features were chiselled by the ordinary forces of Nature. When first elevated from the sea the land doubtless presents on the whole a comparatively featureless surface. It may be likened to a block of marble raised out of a quarry, rough and rude in outline, massive in solidity and strength, but giving no indication of the grace into which it will grow under the hand of the sculptor. What art effects on the marble, nature accomplishes here. Her tools are many and varied; air, frost, rain, springs, torrents and rivers. With these implements out of the huge bulk she cuts the valleys and ravines, scoops the lake basins, hews with bold hand the outlines of the mountains, carves out peak and crag, chisels the courses of the torrents, and spreads out the alluvium of the rivers.

In the contour of the Sidlaws the working of these forces is manifest. The depressions are worn out of the softer and more easily wasted stone, whereas the elevations are formed of harder and more enduring stuff. The same lesson may be read in the range as a whole. A glance will show that the heights become bolder towards Perth, whereas eastward and seaward they flow down, until in some places they are scarcely distinguishable from the plain. Indeed it is hard to find anyone who can tell on what portion of the coast they terminate or by what route they reach it. After passing Craigowl, the Sidlaws become the enigma of Forfarshire, the probable version being that they divide near Forfar, one branch running south-east to Redhead, the other north-east past Brechin into Kincardineshire.

The same hint will serve for the maritime district. Wherever any part rises above the rest, it is safe to assume that the material of which it is formed, is harder than that of the surrounding country. The slower waste has caused it to fall behind in the form of a knob or ridge. And as there are only two rocks to choose from in the neighbourhood—sandstone and igneous rock—it is easy to tell which forms the elevation and which the depression. Dundee Law, Balgay Hill, and many of the lesser eminences which help to diversify the scene, are just

such masses of volcanic rock of different degrees of hardness and resisting power. Some of them probably mark the vents out of which the lava flowed, and all of them are silent reminders of a time when nature, happily for us, was livelier than it is now, and happily for our posterity, livelier than it is ever likely to be again.

Such is the history of the county, so far at least, and such the light it casts on the familiar features. By its aid we can understand and interpret every undulation on the surface, every curve which breaks the horizon. Mountain, plain, and sea coast become luminous with a sort of self-revelation. We see them coming into being, as the result of certain natural forces whose operations, when once understood, are extremely simple and easy to follow. As some one puts it, we seem to have two eyes instead of one. We look at once with the senses and the intelligence.

At a much later stage further changes, if not so fundamental, still sufficiently marked, took place. The nature of the agent which wrought these may be surmised from the hints it has left behind. Underneath the rough grass or heather, and the thin sprinkling of soil of some of the uplands, the face of the underlying rock is found to be smooth, and marked by parallel scratches. The scoring is more or less distinct, and in the case of the softer rocks may be almost or quite obliterated, but when present it will scarcely be mistaken for an accident.

Nearly every district, however limited in extent, has a mass of stone lying on the surface by the road-side or in the middle of some field. Even the unintelligent curiosity of our forefathers was excited, and, being unable to find any better explanation, they attributed their presence to supernatural agency. Such blocks are numerous enough all over the maritime plain, and dot the slopes of the Sidlaws almost to the very summit of the loftier heights. Many of them are erratics or wanderers from home. The nearest relatives of some of them are among the Grampians, from which seat they must at one time or other, and by some agency or other, have been transported. The *Cauld Stane o' the Crafts*, a mass of fifteen tons, perched on a height in the sandstone district of *Carmyllie*, is a long distance from its home near the source of

the South Esk. The finest instance of an erratic, observed by Sir Charles Lyell, occurred in Pitscandly, an isolated hill of some 700 feet. About forty feet below the summit was a block of Mica slate, thirteen feet long, seven broad, and seven in height. One of the nearest points at which this gneiss appears, in situ, is the Craig of Balloch, fifteen miles distant, and between these points intervene the great valley of Strathmore and the hills of Finhaven.

A succession of quarries occurs along the maritime plain in almost a straight line from the Back Muir of Liff to Carmyllie. A visit to any of these quarries will reveal the state of matters existing over the whole of the lowland portions of the county, and even in the hollows among the hills. Before reaching the solid sandstone rock, a greater or less thickness has to be removed; it may be fifteen or twenty feet of superficial deposit. This subsoil is largely clay, very sticky, and difficult to work, full of irregularly-shaped stones, some of which show signs of scoring. Obviously, this mass is not the result of simple disintegration, and must have been laid down subsequently to the sandstone on which it rests. The surface of the rocks beneath the clay is shattered into large fragments as if by the passage of some heavy body, which was not improbably the same agent that laid down the soil.

The generally smooth appearance worn by the whole county, the regular scooping of the valleys, the rounding of the hill summits, and flow of the hill flanks, the absence of angles and corners, cannot well escape a curious observer.

The explanation now generally accepted by those most competent to form a judgment, is that all this was done by ice. The rocks were scratched and grooved; the giant boulders were borne, often over the tops of hills; the subsoil was deposited and the rough edges were rounded off by glaciers. Those great rivers of ice, immensely deep and thick, ground away along their beds, and spread the rubbish they created over the face of the country. The stones beneath acted as chisels, at once scoring and being themselves scored, and the masses which tumbled down upon their surfaces, or were imprisoned in their substance, were borne along in their flow, and dropped here and there when the melting time came.

The period of cold through which, according to this view, the country must once have passed is now known as the great ice age. The date usually assigned to it is some 200,000 years ago; and it must have lasted for a very long time. At its worst the lowlands were buried to a depth of at least 3000 feet, sufficient to engulf all the Forfarshire hills south of the Grampians. Various accounts of this phenomenon have been given, the most satisfactory being that which assigns it to astronomical causes. The earth was so placed with relation to the sun, that the summers in the northern hemisphere were much shorter than they are now and the winters much longer; the opposite condition of things existing at the same time in the southern hemisphere. Be the explanation what it may, there is nothing very sensational or hard to believe about it. Portions of the earth's surface are under similar conditions now. We need not go far out of our own latitude to be among the glaciers. In Norway the land is still covered by a fringe of the ice sheet, and observant people who go there have a good deal of light thrown on some of the aspects of their own country. 'I climbed for some yards under the ice,' says Archibald Geikie, 'and found the floor on which it rested smoothly polished and covered with scorings of all sizes.'

Further north, where the Dundee whalers go, the lesson is still plainer. 'One can see close at hand, and in full activity the mighty forces, which elsewhere he can at most study in pigmy remnants, remnants from the time when the north of the Continent was buried under ice.' In his account of the crossing of Greenland Nansen tells a fascinating story of a modern glacial era, which may be applied almost without modification to our own land.

'At last we had overcome our first difficulty, the struggle through the floes. Our boats flying the Norwegian and Danish flags glided under a steep cliff, the dark wall of which was mirrored in the bright water. The snow came nearly down to the sea, so that we could begin hauling the sledges at once. About ten on the morning of August 31st, we saw land for the last time. We were on the crest of one of the great waves, or gentle undulations of the surface, and had our final glimpse of a little point of rock, which protruded from the snow. From

August 30, onward, the surface was smooth and even as a mirror, with no disturbance in its uniformity. For days, I may say weeks, we toiled over an interminable desert of snow. One day began and ended like another. Flatness and whiteness were the two features of the scene. In the day we could see three things only, the sun, the snowfield and ourselves.'

And far beneath this silent waste, this monotonous cylinder, which those daring pioneers were crossing for the first time, lay landscapes probably as varied as our own, once lit up and vivified by a warm sun, and rich in southern vegetation. If the land is ever again uncovered, we can imagine that the superincumbent mass will have left its impress everywhere; smoothing hill tops, ploughing valleys, scoring and transporting stones, and depositing rubbish, just as it has done in Forfarshire. So much for an actual ice age to help us to believe in our own, and to realise what it was like.

If the condition here had been no worse than this, the reign of silence and death would have been confined to the central parts, while life would have existed and even flourished around our shores. The perpetual snow line on Greenland begins at 2,000 feet, below which the land is clear, for the most part, from June to August, and supports a vegetation of several hundred species of flowering plants, which deposit their seeds before the winter. In his struggle along the floe-haunted East coast, the wildest and dreariest side, Nansen not only found bare ground to place his feet upon, but met with cheering and pleasing signs of life.

'A little past noon,' he records, 'we reached a small island which seemed to be the loveliest spot we had ever seen on the face of this earth. All was green here. There were grass, heather, sorrel, and numbers of bright flowers. It was a simple paradise, and wonderfully delightful it was to be here stretched on the green sward in the full blaze of the sun. Then we gathered a few flowers in memory of this Greenland idyl.'

The last pleasant greeting he got as he turned his back on the coast and his face to the inland ice, was from a snow bunting. The same living form that bade him good-bye was the first to meet him on the far side. 'Suddenly we became aware of twittering, and soon enough we saw a snow-bunting come flying

after us.' And on finally stepping off the snow, 'Words cannot depict what it was to have earth and stones beneath our feet, or the thrill that went through us as we touched the elastic heath and felt the fragrant scent of grass and moss.'

With us it seems to have been very much drearier and less hopeful. There was no such margin of life and beauty around our Scottish coast; no blessed rim of black; no exposed ledge of rock even, to make a British idyl. We were in the centre of the icefield which welded us to the Continent, and terminated in a long line of steep cliffs far out in the Atlantic. There was neither rothold nor foothold; and every living thing must have been driven away south.

These stern conditions relaxed and returned more than once, at intervals, astronomers tell us, of 21,000 years. Periods probably of great heat, certainly of great mildness, alternated with periods of great cold. After the pendulum, with mighty sweeps, had oscillated in this way, the climate began finally to ameliorate, and the glacial age to pass away. As the ice slowly shrunk and retreated northward, exposing portions of the land, life followed and took possession. Among the plants, the hardier and smaller were in advance. The more delicate and succulent waited till the chilled and sodden earth was warmed and dried, and the danger of devastating floods was past. The English Channel was a land valley, so that no obstacle checked the onward march. For a while these Alpines or Arctics had all the land to themselves. They were satisfied with little, could endure much, and were able to cling to any support above the reach of the tumbling waters, caused by the melting of the ice. They held possession of the lowlands, just as at present they do in Greenland, the hills being capped with white, and the glens blocked with glaciers. As the climate became still milder, and the icefield shrunk still further, the main body ventured forward. Unable to contend with these luxuriant growers on their own ground the Alpines took to the hill slopes. Closely followed, they clambered yet higher up, seizing upon every nook and coign of vantage; rooting themselves wherever they could find a sprinkling of soil or a crack in the rock. At length they reached an altitude where they could defy competition. There they have remained

from that distant time to the present day, and there they will remain so long as the increasing number of hill botanists leave any of them alone, or till another glacial era, sure sooner or later to come, drives them south again. Wonderfully they thrive in these arid heights notwithstanding the sparse soil and diet. What they lack in leaf and stalk they seem to give to blossom; sending out a wealth of flower altogether out of proportion to their size. No one who has seen it can well forget the glory of purple, yellow and white from the saxifrages alone. Districts where the land was mainly flat, or the heights were only moderate, less say than 2,000 feet, gave no refuge to the first comers against their pursuers. Such places number no Alpines in their flora. But Forfarshire had abundant shelter and safe retreat in that northern barrier. It offered the lofty heights, Monega and Maud Crag, and the stern defiles of Caenlochan, Caeness, and Glen Dole. And therefore it comes to pass that we are so rich in Alpines, richer than any county in Scotland except Perthshire.

In much the same order and manner animal life appeared. The hardier Arctic mammals came on the trail of the retreating ice, and lingered as long as the conditions continued to suit them; when at length they held on towards their final resting-place, in or near the Arctic regions, the less hardy temperate forms took their place. And as our climate has not very materially changed since these arrived, they have found no reason to remove. From various causes, chief of which was probably the arrival of man, some of them have become extinct; others, although still on the face of the earth, are no longer found in this country. But the remainder, or their lineal descendants, constitute the modern fauna.

After a while the sea once more flooded the valley between England and the Continent, and so put a stop to further ingress before everything had time to pass. This explains why so many Continental forms are absent from our islands.

Turning to the existing life of the county we are prepared, from what has been said, to find it of exceptional interest. This is especially true of its flora. In addition to its fair share of ordinary forms, it numbers its Alpines. A few figures will make plain how very large the proportions of these hardy plants is.

Ninety-nine in all are found scattered throughout Great Britain and Ireland; mostly on the loftier heights, in very rare cases on the more trying sea coasts. Eighty-eight of these, or within three of the entire number, are native to Scotland, but are by no means equally distributed. They are mainly on the Grampian hills, and seventy-three are found on that portion of the range which forms the northern boundary of Forfarshire. It thus appears that we are on the very centre of the field, and it may be said that the characteristic flora of the county is Alpine. Any one who wishes to visit in their homes these flowers which took possession of our hills so long ago, has a certain limited choice of routes. He can easily reach Caenlochan, that is if he is not afraid of a little fatigue. A drive of twelve miles from Alyth will take him to Kirkton of Glen Isla; and a further walk of about ten miles will place him in the midst of the wilds. By the way he will not fail to notice a change in the vegetation, not sudden but gradual. The roadside weeds and wildflowers, common to the lowland parts, will be seen more and more to thin out; and other and less familiar forms, better suited to the increasing elevation to appear in their stead. Not all of them Alpine; some of them half-way between or sub-Alpines. The place and function of the daisy is usurped by the no less sweet eyebright, and the common lady's mantle gives place to its Alpine sister. If it is not too near the 12th of August, no objection will be raised to his further progress. Perhaps the second half of June or the first half of July will yield the best results. Nine out of every ten plants he sees probably he has never seen before. The first to call forth a note of admiration will be the yellow saxifrage, which clothes the mountain rill sides. Not far off he is sure to find and be delighted with its still more beautiful sister the white starry saxifrage. Perhaps the keeper, if he is about, may volunteer to go with him. It might even be worth while to turn aside to his house and take him into confidence. It is perfectly possible that that functionary may guide him past the haunt of the snowy gentian without telling him how near he is to one of the rarest flowers in Scotland. His caution is to be highly commended. An easy walk across the intervening uplands leads from Glen Isla to Glen Clova from Caenlochan to Glen Dole.

Much the same forms are met with as on the other side, but the same liberty to look at them is by no means enjoyed. On a hill towards the top of these two glens grows the Alpine catchfly, found nowhere else in Scotland, and only in one isolated spot in the north of England. Not far away is another rare Forfarshire plant, the yellow oxytropis. He may return for the night to the keeper's lodge and in the morning saunter down the course of the Isla to Kirkton. He can drop off the coach at the nearest point to the top of the den of Airlie. This defile is exceptionally rich even among dens. It offers shelter to an immense number of shade loving, and moisture loving, as well as rock loving forms. The Herb Paris grows there, and certain rare orchids, and vetches, besides grasses and flowerless plants without number. There is charm as well as interest in the place. The banks which descend toward the stream, and the cliffs which overhang it, are covered with a wild luxuriance of vegetation, lit up with the abundant blossoms of the white wood-vetch, the red berries of the stone bramble, and the tall spikes of the giant bell flower. The fame of Loch Rescobie near the source of the Lunan for the wealth of its water plants is known beyond the county. It is especially rich in pond weeds.

The Sidlaws may be crossed almost without pausing. There is little to interest in its flowering plants, less even than one would expect. The flora of the inward part of the maritime plain is comparatively poor, certainly not richer than most other flat places diversified by wood.

The case is different with the sea coast. All the way from Invergowrie to Montrose interesting forms are to be met with. A walk along the Arbroath cliffs, with an occasional descent of some of the steep slopes, will make one acquainted with a variety of sea plants. These grow for the most part in such profusion that no amount of rough usage seems able to diminish the quantity. The sea campion, the clustered bell flower, the purple mountain milk vetch abound. The only sufferers of permanent injury are the ferns, and these are in danger of extinction, except perhaps for a few which may have rooted themselves beyond reach, and means will doubtless be taken to secure even these. Forms, once plentiful enough, are either scarce or no

longer to be found, and the scarcer they become the greater the run after them. They are just sufficiently attractive to catch the eye of the passer-by; and they make pretty books and pretty ornaments for triflers. Can nothing be done to cure this mania and stop this waste? If not, it will soon become necessary to omit a few forms from our Forfarshire flora.

The same climatal changes and diversity of conditions which give the variety of plant life, give a corresponding variety of animal life. It must have struck the least observant that our wild mammals are few in number, and they will be best understood when regarded as a fragment of a rich fauna which overran the land on the retreat of the ice. Once upon a time the bison roamed over our grassy plains, with the wolf hanging on the skirts of the herd; the brown bear shambled through the forest glades of Strathmore, while his formidable cousin, the grisly, held the defiles of the Grampians. Within historic times the beaver built his lodge on the Isla, and the wild boar rooted in the adjoining thicket. 'The bear has left no traces of a later date than the Roman occupation, the beaver was trapped for its fur in the twelfth century, the wild boar disappeared from England before the reign of Charles I. Traditions of the wolf still linger in country tales; it was exterminated from Scotland in 1680.'

Of the Arctic mammals which preceded these temperate forms, most of them held on their way to the north. The reindeer lingered for a while, and is said, with considerable probability, to have been hunted by the Jarls of Orkney, in the remote North of Caithness, as late as the year 1159. If any northern forms remain they are most likely to be found in the recesses of the Grampians, and a search for them there shows that the remnant is exceedingly small. Whatever may be the case with the plants, the animals are not characteristically Alpine. The native Grampian mammal is the mountain hare, also known as the blue and variable hare. Any day he may be seen scudding up the heights, and pausing for a moment, with reflexed ears, on the ridge. He has a cousin on the plain and another in the Arctic regions. This hare seems to be the only form left permanently behind on the northern migration.

The other mammal found among the Grampians is the red deer. But he is not an Arctic animal at all. He is not even an Alpine, or mountain animal. He belongs to the temperate fauna of the lowlands, and is cooped up there, because these glens and defiles cannot be put to any other use.

The case is different with his graceful little cousin, the roe-deer, found abundantly further down the glen. He is our only truly wild deer, and owes his liberty to his small size, and to the fact that he is not gregarious.

The third of the family, the fallow-deer, which is to be seen here and there over the plain, can scarcely be regarded as other than an ornamental, tame animal.

In some of the deeper, darker defiles, the wild cat still lingers. He is reported as far south as the Sidlaws. Stories of his presence have to be received with considerable caution, as domestic cats occasionally take to the woods and deceive inexperienced observers. But he has the square jaw and thick-set look of a genuine wildling, and when once fairly seen can scarcely be mistaken.

There are several representatives of the weasles and their allies. The larger species, such as the pole-cat or founart, and the common and pine martens, once numerous enough, are extremely scarce; the latter is probably extinct. They appear in books as of yore, but one authority is apt to copy from another. It is the easiest way of getting information. The stoat and the common weasel are very generally distributed. That curious-looking fellow, the badger, sometimes spoken of as our native bear, from his habit of placing the whole foot on the ground, is found in the Grampian region, and sparingly throughout Strathmore. He doubtless owes his continued existence in considerable numbers amongst us to the deep shelter of the woods he frequents, to the burrows he digs, and to his nocturnal habits.

The mammal of the stream is that very powerful and somewhat misunderstood creature, the otter. He is hunted for various reasons, among others, because he kills the salmon. Probably he only secures the diseased, or those in danger of becoming so, and should be regarded as a benefactor. There is a wonderful balance in nature which we are constantly disturbing.

The fox is the mammal of the coverts, and is preserved from extinction for the sake of sport. As for the rest of the small deer, such as rabbits, moles, hedgehogs, rats, mice, shrews, and voles, they are sufficiently well known.

Basking on the rocks of our coast, or popping his head above water, like a great dog, in the estuary of the Tay is the seal. He is a warm-blooded animal, a fair representative of the mammalia of the deep. He is a carnivore, who has taken to the salt water to feed on fish. In the struggle for existence he has been pushed beyond the sand, just as the otter was pushed over the bank, and both have, in different degrees, been modified for an aquatic life. The seal follows the salmon up the estuaries the length of the rivers, where the otter takes up the chase. Indeed, he is the otter of the sea.

For obvious reasons the domestic mammals have increased in an inverse ratio to the extermination pursuing their wild brethren. Strangely enough, all those useful brutes, with the exception of the dog and cat, belong to the ungulates, or hoofed animals. The horse, the ox, the sheep, the pig, the goat, are of this order. It would take too long to discuss the vexed question as to whether these were derived from wild stocks previously at large in the country, or from tame breeds brought over from elsewhere. One instance will suffice. Among the animals which roamed through our forest glades after the glacial period, was the great ox or urus. Cæsar found it still existent in his time, and speaks of its size in exaggerated terms. That it was a native in these parts is shown by the occasional discovery of its spreading horns. This wild ox is generally credited with being the ancestor of most of our tame cattle, among the rest of our black Angus, doddies which, not so long ago, were neither hornless nor black. It is said to be represented in the present day in diminished bulk and fierceness by the Chillingham herd. Men so diverse as Mr. Darwin, the naturalist, and Sir Walter Scott, the antiquary, take this view. In his *Bride of Lammermoor*, the latter mentions the inmemorial habit of preserving the ancient cattle in the parks of the Scottish nobility. Professor Boyd Dawkins, on the other hand, says that the so-called wild cattle were simply tame cattle

run wild; and that all our present breeds were introduced in an already domesticated condition.

If the mammals are thus fragmentary and not very numerous, the case is different with the birds. Living largely on the wing, they have not been exposed to the same destructive influences. We can scarcely be said to have any distinctly Arctic forms except during the winter, and that for a very good reason. Birds seek out the conditions which suit them, by a self-adjusting process called migration. When it is too cold they go south, when it is too warm they go north. When the hard Arctic weather sets in, the snow-bunting, which Nansen met in Greenland during the short summer of that region, comes this length, and along with it the mealy redpole, besides great flocks of water birds.

The ptarmigan is a near approach to a resident snow-bird. It has the habit common to northern forms of changing the whole or part of the plumage in winter to white. It consorts with the hardiest Alpines, 3000 to 4000 feet above the level of the sea. In strange contrast to this form is the raven, which, notwithstanding its unchanging coat of black, is a true Arctic. It is by no means exclusively confined to mountain tops, being reported from various parts of the county. Of the eagle kind usually associated with mountains, the golden eagle and the peregrine falcon are known to nest among the defiles of the Grampians. Further down, among the grouse, the mountain blackbird or ring ousel lives and rears its brood. In the neighbourhood of the roebuck our largest game-bird, the capercaillie, and our handsomest, the blackcock, make their appearance. Since its reintroduction the former is greatly on the increase in Forfarshire, so that there is scarcely a district from which it is not reported. The blackcock, on the other hand, from causes not very clearly made out, is probably on the decrease. The capercaillie frequents the fir woods to feed upon the shoots, where he has the society of two bright and lively birds of the crow kind, the jay and the magpie. All down the glens, and into Strathmore, the bullfinch nests in the tall bushes and among the fir trees.

Our streams are the haunt of two equally interesting, and in their different ways, equally beautiful birds, the kingfisher and the water ousel. There is no other reason why the kingfisher,

the brightest and most tropical of our British birds, should not be mirrored in every quiet piece of water, than that it is too tempting an object for the ordinary British savage. Although occasionally seen even in the neighbourhood of Dundee, it is now rare throughout the county. Happily the case is different with our black and white friend the water ousel, which is still plentiful enough.

Loch Rescobie, rich in plant life, is equally rich in animal life. Its tall reeds form the nesting place of some of our sweetest warblers, and the summer and winter shelter of numerous aquatic birds. The mallard, the widgeon, the teal, the golden eye, the pochard, the shoveller, the eider, the gosander, the shieldrake, the coot, are a few of its inhabitants. The Sidlaws have the forms of life usually found on moorlands and moderate heights. The lesser hawks and falcons are well represented. The buzzard occasionally wheels over one of its summits, and the kite haunts its lower slopes. Birds of the linnet kind build among the coarse grass or in the whins. Various tits, finches and buntings, are among the more familiar forms of the plain.

The coast is to the bird life what the Grampians are to the plant life, the direction in which one turns who wishes to see the country at its best. A walk across a stretch of links on some breezy day, say about nesting time, is quite a revelation. Usually the first greeting is the 'chat, chat,' of the wheatear. Lark and meadow pipit rise from the bent and silently flit away. The jerky creaky flight of the lapwing sounds immediately overhead. The shrill pipe of the golden plover, and the wild whistle of the curlew come from all quarters. Dunlin and snipe appear for a moment and then vanish. Crossing some patch of heather the foot is almost on the back of the sitting eider duck, so completely does her plumage blend with the surroundings. As the sea is approached the terns appear in increasing numbers, until they form a vast and noisy flock. High in the air they follow screaming down at the intruder. The reason of their solicitude is evident, for in hollows of the sand, with or without a few blades of withered grass, the eggs are everywhere. The lesser tern, the Arctic tern, the common tern, all have an interest in the nests. Indeed, so great is our wealth, that what we seem to want is not

more birds but more observers. There is a great deal of truth in what Gilbert White of Selborne says, 'It is, I find, in zoology, as it is in botany, all nature is so full that that district produces the greatest variety which is the most examined.'

After the close of the great ice age man made his appearance in Scotland, it may be not for the first time, but for the first time of which we have any record. The positive signs of his presence, if few, are sufficient and within easy reach of all who take an interest in the matter.

Country people have long been acquainted with certain stones or flints chipped into a resemblance to arrow heads. They usually lie near the surface, where they are turned over by the plough, and when thus exposed can scarcely escape attention. These are the very earliest relics of man, the first hints of his presence here. They also tell something of his condition in those far off days. Unacquainted with the use of metals, he fashioned the harder stones into instruments for war, the chase, and domestic use. Wonderfully perfect these Forfarshire remains are; extremely varied in form, and often beautifully finished. They are a great advance on those found amid certain gravels, and in limestone caverns in the east and south-east of England, which are rudely finished and roughly chipped. So marked is the difference that we are in the habit of distinguishing between a new stone age and an old stone age.

In one thing only the man of this old stone age excelled him of the new—a strange gift to be associated with so much rudeness. Fortunately for us, he employed the intervals of leisure from the chase in engraving, chiefly upon bones, teeth, and antlers, the animals among which he lived, and the hunting scenes which most vividly impressed themselves upon his mind. 'There are no sculpture, no etchings, no outline drawings pertaining either to the new stone age or to the bronze age that followed that can equal the marvellous work of these reindeer hunters.'

It would seem as if a race of men of a very low grade, except for this curious aptitude, dwelt to the south of these islands before the approach of the last great period of cold. If they ever ventured so far north as this, all traces of them have been erased.

At least there is no sufficient proof that certain so called palæolithic weapons are genuine. As the ice sheet crept over land and sea they retreated before it. 'Step by step man was driven south, England and Belgium were deserted, perhaps even Germany to the foot of the Alps was left unoccupied until at last the race or races of the old stone age reached the South of France.' They have left no further record of themselves to show that they came back on the return of more genial conditions. They disappear completely from the stage and offer as much food for conjecture as the lost ten tribes.

The Eskimo, a living people inhabiting a litoral strip along the shores of the Arctic Sea, are supposed by some to be their lineal descendants. Many of their customs are identical; they use implements of the old stone age type; and they have the same habit of scratching on much the same hard objects animals and hunting scenes. If there is any significance in these resemblances, then the cave men must have retreated ever further north before their betters, until they got behind the shelter of the Arctic Circle.

All that we certainly know is that, after a long interval, a race vastly superior, appeared, spread over the whole island, and settled down under the shadow of the Grampians. This was the man of the new stone age, the chipper of the flint implements lying around us. He is described as short of stature, with swarthy skin and dark hair. Though still a hunter and fisher he was a farmer as well. He had ceased to rely entirely on the bounty of nature, and exercised that wise provision which is the earliest sign of civilization. He had flocks and herds, and planted and reaped. He seems to have been swallowed up rather than driven out, by successive waves of invaders. Traces of what he once was are supposed to be recognizable in the small dark Welshman, and the short swarthy Irishman. The same dark type is common enough in the Highlands and Western Islands. Whatever may be the value of these genealogical surmises, it is interesting to have amongst us races which, even approximately, represent the two divisions of that distant era.

Succeeding the stone age came one in which bronze was introduced. There is reason to believe that the change did not take

place all at once. The highly finished and perfected implements and weapons of the earlier age continued in use. It seems to have been the habit of these men of the bronze age to mark or surround their interments with stones. The various circles throughout the country, and the upright blocks thinly scattered over the county should probably be interpreted in this way.

Many of our heights, especially those which command a distant view, show the remains of hill forts. Mounds of earth or walls of stone, circular or oval in form, are drawn round, so as to enclose the summit, whither probably the natives retired when hard beset. An interesting example of the stone fort crowns the White Caterthun in the parish of Menmuir. And a variety in which the stones have been vitrified or treated with fire, is found on the hill of Finhaven, towards the southern side of Strathmore. These forts are associated with weapons and implements of iron.

To this third, or iron age, seem to belong also the weems, or so-called 'Picts' houses.' These are underground tunnels or galleries, more or less curved, generally to the right. They were entered by a narrow descending passage, down which the inmates must have crept or slid. Usually there is only one entrance, but occasionally a second is found. The sides are supported by rough stones, rudely piled, and made to overlap as they approach the surface. Across the opening left, when the narrowing process was carried to the limit of safety, flat stones or pieces of wood were placed. These remains, in various states of preservation, are tolerably numerous throughout the county, and probably many more would be found if proprietors and farmers would investigate any suspicious appearances.

The earliest in this neighbourhood was known last century, and for a long time lost sight of. The most perfect was exposed in 1871, in a field at Tealing. The general shape is that of an arm bent as upon the body, the curve being to the left. The usual narrow entrance admits to the burrow. The floor descends steeply for a little, and is partially paved with slabs. Two erect stones, some 16 or 18 feet from the inner end, seem to have served as checks to a door, shutting in a separate apartment. The entire length is some 80 feet; the average breadth is about 7 feet; and the height, when covered in, was probably from 4 to

5 feet. The exceptional size of the place marks it off as the abode of a number of people. The enormous strength and durability of these structures have often been remarked; and certainly it seemed strange to visit this one through the autumn field and find it as well suited for its purpose as when first built; and, apparently destined to last as long again. The ashes of the last fire lit there; the bones of the horse which formed the last meal partaken of, remained as they were left by the last one who crept out. In the neighbourhood of these weems there are usually indications of a surface dwelling, showing that they were probably used as retreats in hard weather or in times of danger. This special type seems to range along the east coast of Scotland, from south to north.

It will be necessary to pass over a gap in the life history of the county, from the pilers of dry forts to the builders in stone and lime. The curious wanderer turns eagerly aside to see ancient buildings whose date must be guessed from the style of architecture, and whose story shades back into tradition. Of such places Forfarshire has its full share, the most widely known of which is perhaps Glamis. The traditions of the country side round about the spot in which this article is being written are identified with the names of Ramsay, Ogilvy, and Graham, and these names with the districts of Auchterhouse and the Mains.

Among the trees immediately behind Auchterhouse Station is an ancient mansion house whose presence is little suspected by the casual passer-by. Even the less intelligent and curious of the natives are scarcely aware of its existence, and need some explanation before they can give the needful guidance. The approach, if short, is shaded, and has somewhat of the impressive effect of a longer avenue. The burn murmurs to the left through a cool and grateful though shallow den. A conical dovecot attracts attention amid the shrubbery. Scarce has the visitor passed through the gate than he emerges on the opening in front of the house, a pleasant piece of green sward surrounded by trees, some of them large and old. The house itself, which seems to have been built at different times, is a quaint white baronial building forming two sides of a square which the out-

houses and a wall with a gateway complete. The projecting portions, the small and barred windows and nail studded door give it a look of considerable antiquity. It is described by Ochterlony, about 1682, as a fine house with good yards and an excellent park and meadows; and by Jervise in 1861 as all but a ruin. If neglected, it would soon come to wear a ruinous look. But on the day in question it looked anything but ruinous with its trim walks, its shaven lawn, its great trees in full leaf, its flowering laurels, its avenues of roses, its gardener busy in a distant corner of the grounds, its clean and open doorway, and the sound of footsteps in answer to the summons.

Near the house is a square ivy-covered ruin of considerably greater antiquity. Very little is left, only four walls about twelve feet high, and that not all old. The area within is some fifteen by twenty feet. It goes by the name of Wallace's tower, and with that we must be satisfied. An owl was in possession of a deeply shaded recess, but though he looked very wise, he did not reveal any secrets. If Auchterhouse means the church on the hill, looking up from the mansion towards the village, we can understand why it should have been called so. Once a fine building in the later Gothic, or perpendicular style, supposed to have been erected about 1426, and dedicated to 'Our Lady' stood there. Fragments, hints of what it was, are still scattered about. But it has long since been replaced by an insignificant oblong erection with a dumpy steeple at one end. The interior is perhaps a little less barn-like than Scotch churches usually are. The kirk-session books, which the obliging schoolmaster will produce to any one sufficiently curious to ask for them, are of great interest, and may be taken as a sample of the curious light session books cast on the life of the past. They are of course strictly contemporaneous records, and give a detailed, if fragmentary, account of the customs and ideas of the forefathers of the hamlet. The incidents are related with a startling minuteness, directness and absence of ornament, and in the fewest words compatible with clearness. The man who wrote had no end in view except to tell the truth and get to his dinner. One entry relates that there was only one service to-day, for the enemy was near. Obviously that was written down while the little

community was still in a flutter, and uncertain what was to happen.

To come to more familiar matter culled at random:—‘Oct. 19, 1656. The text, Rom. 13, v. 11. Collection 9sh. 10d. That day Margt. Spense cal’d upon at the kirk door, compeared not; ordained that she be called next Lord’s day.’ Nobler names than Margaret’s appear in the same record as delinquents. Plainly the Kirk was a power in those days, feared no one, and exercised many functions now delegated to others, or suffered to fall into disuse. Some of the entries raise a smile because of the blunt way in which ancient and obsolete customs are introduced. ‘Ye two hundred and fifty pounds of interest, got from my Lord Airly upon ye 31 Dec. 1737, was lent to ye minister,’ notwithstanding it was said, page 410, to be ‘emboxed.’ Turning back to page 410, the entry, of which this is a correction, is found duly made. The church kept its treasure in an iron-bound box, with a slit in it sufficient to admit a coin. When wealthy, as seems to have been the case here, it acted as banker to the neighbourhood, and the interest paid by Lord Airly, probably for money advanced, instead of being put back in the box was immediately lent to the minister.

Further down the Strath to the south of what was once an interesting and picturesque, but is now a sadly down-trodden den, is the Castle of Fintry or Mains. A favourite resort of the inhabitants of the east end of Dundee, the surroundings have paid the usual penalty of popularity. The style belongs to the sixteenth century, and, as if to put all doubt to rest, the building itself bears the dates 1562, and 1582. The builder seems to have been one Sir David Graham, a nephew of Cardinal Beaton, who shared in a plot for the restitution of the Catholic Church, and was executed at the Cross of Edinburgh in 1593. The initials D. G. and D. M. O., David Graham and his wife, Dame Margaret Ogilvy, could, till lately, be traced on one of the stones above the west door. On the other side of the Dighty, and almost within a stonethrow, lived a branch of the same family somewhat more familiar to us. Not a trace of their dwelling remains, but they have found a place in the history, in the literature—*Old Mortality*—and in the songs of Scotland. During the

But we had hardly time to open it, when the sad news from Alicante came, and we learned that it had been decreed in the councils of destiny that the great work was never to be finished, that much else, too, which had been proposed with a light heart was never to be performed. The third instalment of this enormous history was to be the last to pass through the press under the author's eye. Two more volumes at least will appear from the manuscript he has left, but we shall never have the work such as he designed it. We may safely prophesy that no other man will ever undertake on such a gigantic scale the history of the island which exercised such an irresistible fascination over him. The 'History of Sicily,'—what has already appeared of it, along with what is still to appear,—remains a fragment, like the 'History of Federal Government;' but the fragment has a value, quite independently of what was to have come after, as great as if it were a complete work.

It is hard for one, who owes as much as the present writer to Mr. Freeman's historical teaching, to speak of him, now that he is no longer here, without seeming to descend into the language of panegyric. The greatest thing perhaps that one man can do for another is to awaken a latent sense. Like others, I know from experience that Mr. Freeman's works can awaken a sense for history. It would be hard perhaps to say which of the two last Regius Professors of Modern History, Bishop Stubbs and Mr. Freeman, did more to stimulate historical students and guide historical research into right lines. Their work, one is happy to think, cannot be undone by any successor, however widely different be that successor's methods. Mr. Freeman certainly has exercised an influence on historiography in England, which it has fallen to the lot of few others to exercise. He may be said to have created a new branch of history, what he calls 'historical geography.' He broke down the venerable wall of partition between 'ancient' and 'modern' history. These two achievements, to speak of no others, must have an abiding influence. The accuracy of his work, considering its amount and considering its wide range, is simply amazing. Even his history of the Saracens, which is perhaps his weakest book, is

wonderful, if we take into account the circumstances under which it was composed. Such a slip as 'Teos in mid Aegean,' which occurs in his 'Federal Government,' is a rarity indeed. After a minute study of his 'Historical Geography of Europe,' a book whose six hundred pages are crammed thick with facts, one felt quite triumphant on discovering that he had gone wrong about White and Black Bulgaria. One sometimes notices a tendency to suppose that accuracy in detail and broad views of history are incompatible. It is suggested that men who rise to wide views and make large generalisations cannot stoop to the drudgery of certifying themselves about 'petty' details; and on the other hand, that the 'slave' to accuracy is incapable of rising to the higher rank. One is almost ashamed to refer to this foolish notion; but one sometimes meets it existing in unexpected places. Our greatest modern historians, both in England and in Germany, are obvious refutations of it; no one more conspicuously than Mr. Freeman. No writer was more punctiliously—some said, 'pedantically,'—precise in details, and no writer had a finer power of generalisation, or held the whole drama of œcumenical history more firmly in his hand. And perhaps it is not too much to say that it was just because he was so punctiliously accurate in regard to the smallest facts, that he was able to generalise with such effect. He was quick at seeing likenesses, but he was equally quick at seeing differences. He was fond of working out historical parallels; but he always insisted on the contrasts. This double faculty is nowhere more eminently displayed than in his lucid disquisition on the character of 'Federal Government,' in the first chapter of that brilliant fragment. There he shows his great powers as what is called a 'philosophic' historian,—though it is a name which he would not have chosen to apply to himself.

One of the most serious charges brought against Mr. Freeman's way of writing history is his 'diffuseness.' It is at least partly the cause why some have even dared to deny him a place among 'great' historians. Now it is to be observed that the word 'diffuseness' itself is a *petitio principii*; it implies that the quality which it denotes is a fault. But, as Mr. Freeman

used to say himself, there is a time and place to be diffuse, and there is a time and place not to be diffuse. In a short book no one could condense facts more skilfully than he into a small space. But in his large books he turns over events and looks at them from every aspect, and determines their significance by comparing them with other events; in short he is 'diffuse.' This method makes his books longer, but gives them an unique character which makes Mr. Freeman stand quite alone among historians. It lets us into the workings of his mind. But it makes his books longer, and that is a deadly sin in the eyes of the majority of readers who are always in a hurry. Life is so short, they say; *μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν*. But there are a few who will always enjoy Mr. Freeman's way of presenting history in his big, as well as in his small, books.

πολλοὶ μὲν ναρθηκοφόροι, βάκχοι δέ τε παῦροι.

I should be sorry if the three long volumes of his 'Sicily,' were shorter by one page. One may admit that he went at too much length into the subject of King Kôkalos and some other matters of which we really know nothing; but now that those discussions are written, I could not wish them to be curtailed of a single line.

The opening paragraph of the third volume is a very good instance of Mr. Freeman's diffuseness:

'We have now come to that stage of Sicilian history which is more commonly known than any other, because it is the stage in which the history of Sicily and the history of Old Greece are most closely brought together. In truth they are more than brought together; for a time, a short time but a memorable one, the history of Old Greece is wrought out on the soil and on the waters of Sicily. We have to come to the tale, a tale which must begin somewhat earlier than we have been wont to fancy, of the intervention of Athens in the affairs of Sicily. It is this tale which leads up to the great Athenian invasion, to the great Athenian overthrow on the hill and in the haven of Syracuse. At that intervention, that invasion, that overthrow, we must learn to look with Sikeliot and not with Athenian eyes. It is hard to do so. We are, as it were, brought up Athenians. We are at home at Athens as we are at home in no other spot in the contemporary world. We feel as if the tongue of Athens was our own tongue, as if the men of Athens were our own folk. In reading the story we feel the same kind of feeling towards Athens that we feel towards our own coun-

try. We are driven to allow that Athens or that England is wrong in this or that quarrel; but we cannot bring ourselves to wish that the Athenian or the Englishman should be defeated even in a wrongful quarrel. Nor is the feeling wholly unreasonable. Putting aside the share that Athens has had in shaping the intellectual life of the world, putting aside her artists and her poets, the great democracy claims our homage on yet higher grounds, as the city where men learned to put the fair debate and the free vote instead of the brute force of tyrants, mobs, or oligarchs. . . . It is hard to follow the story with the hopes and fears, not of an Athenian but of a Sikeliot, in the great time of all, with the hopes and fears of a Syracusan. Yet this is what the historian of Sicily must do. With his Thucydides ever in his hand, he must strive to be his own Philistos. He must teach his heart to dwell in the besieged city and not in the besieging camp. He must learn to share the feelings of the men who rushed to the shore when Gongylos brought the news that help was coming; he must learn to go forth in spirit with those true allies who checked the onset of the invaders in the night-attack by Euryalos; he must learn to join in the shout of victory and thankfulness which went up to Héraklès the Deliverer on that evening of wild delight which followed the crowning mercy in the Great Harbour. And surely, be it on Senlac or on Epipolæ, it is a higher and more ennobling feeling when we fight in spirit, whether in defeat or in victory, with the men who are fighting for their own soil against unprovoked invasion.'

The point of this long paragraph might have been expressed in five lines. But so expressed, it could not have come home to us so vividly, nor impressed us so distinctly. And the gain in getting a distinct and abiding impression is in itself worth the cost of some additional space and time. If you condense the paragraph, all the flavour is gone. The exhaustive treatment of ideas and facts, the presentation of them under a variety of lights, is one of the most valuable features of Mr. Freeman's manner of writing history; and it is this which has won for his style the character of diffuseness. He is diffuse; but he is diffuse in the right way.

The third volume of the history of Sicily consists of two long chapters; and a long Appendix, containing thirty-one notes on special difficulties. The first chapter deals with 'the wars of Syracuse and Athens,' (B.C. 433-407); the second with 'the Second Carthaginian invasion' (410-404) including the legislation of Dioklès, the Carthaginian siege of Selinous, the destruction of Himera, the last days of Hermocrates, the siege

of Akragas, the rise of the tyrant Dionysios, and the war of Gela. That wonderfully exciting tale of the Athenian expedition is retold here, but with more fulness, more delightful 'diffuseness,' than it has ever been told before. It is told by one who knows every inch of the ground on which that great drama was enacted, as well as every word of his Thucydides. The danger, as he says himself, is of overpressing Thucydides and trying to get too much topographical meaning out of his statements. It would be impossible here to go into Mr. Freeman's views on the various controverted points as to the walls and counterwalls of the siege of Syracuse. Let us rather turn to see what he has to say of some of the great men who played parts in that episode, and, above all, of Hermocrates, the hero of his story.

It will be remembered that Hermocrates, the Syracusan, first appears to us in the history of Thucydides as taking a prominent part in bringing together the remarkable congress at Gela (424 B.C.), where envoys from all the Sikeliot cities met to discuss how their differences might be settled, and as one of the chief speakers at that congress. Mr. Freeman defines with his wonted lucidity the peculiar character of the patriotism and policy of this statesman. His patriotism was not merely Syracusan; but on the other hand it was not Pan-hellenic. It was Sikeliot, and his policy was 'colonial.' 'His range is Sicily, or at least the Greek cities of Sicily. His care and goodwill take in all of them, but goes no further. His position towards the rest of the Greek nation is startling. All men out of Sicily are strangers. He makes no exception for the Dorian kinsfolk of Syracuse, no exception even for her Corinthian parent.' Sicily is his world, and he holds that all differences between her cities are to be settled, whether by controversy of words or controversy of war, among themselves, without the intervention of any stranger, be the stranger a Greek or a barbarian.

'Hermokratēs, in short lays down with regard to the western offshoots of Hellas the same principle which has been since laid down with regard to the western offshoots of England and other European lands. It is in truth a "Monroe doctrine"

which he preaches on behalf of the Greeks of Sicily. The points of likeness and of unlikeness in the two cases are obvious. The civilized states of America have all grown out of European settlements, just as the Sikeliot commonwealths had all of them grown out of Greek settlements. But the commonwealths of America have not, like the Sikeliot cities, all grown out of settlements of the same European nation. To find a common word to take in every metropolis and every colony, we are driven to use the word *European*. And there is this difficulty in using that word, that it is not national but geographical; that it is therefore less easy to use in a sense other than strictly geographical than national names like "Greek" or "English." Yet even with these last we have seen the occasional difficulty of carrying them beyond their first geographical meaning. . . . Gela and Katanê were less to one another than Virginia and Massachusetts; they were more to one another than Mexico and the United States. Their exact relation is not at this moment to be seen in the northern continent of America; but it would be seen there now if the Southern Confederacy had kept its distinct being; it will be seen there if ever Canada should throw off its British allegiance. . . . But in the southern America the exact relation may be seen in its fulness among the independent, sometimes hostile, commonwealths of Spanish speech and origin.'

Mr. Freeman regards the speech, which Thucydides puts into the mouth of Hermocrates, as a trustworthy statement of that statesman's views, which Thucydides had every means of knowing. And Mr. Freeman further believes that it was a later insertion of Thucydides, written after he had met Hermocrates during his banishment. It is to the words of Thucydides that we are immediately listening; but it is to the words of Thucydides describing the policy of Hermocrates from the teaching of Hermocrates himself. We need not doubt that in his actual speech just as in his Thucydidean speech, Hermocrates invited Sicily to keep out Athens at all costs, and described in strong terms the real designs of Athens, which he already suspected. We need not doubt that his policy, as enunciated actually at Gela, bore that insular character which

Mr. Freeman brings out so well. 'To him an island was an island; the silver streak or the wide sea that parted Sicily from other lands was an indication of providence not to be neglected or overstepped. . . . He does not preach federation; he does not even preach alliance. He conceives the possibility of disputes and wars among the Sikeliot cities; he only pleads for peace wherever peace can be had, and for the settlement of all differences without the intervention of strangers.' Another aspect of the speech which is well worth noting is the absence of all hint of the presence of barbarians in Sicily, either Sikel or Carthaginian. 'Hermokratês was surely statesman enough to know that the great Phœnician Commonwealth was only a sleeping lion. He must have known that Carthage, which had been so terrible fifty years back, might be terrible again.'

But 'the dream of a Greek Sicily dwelling apart from the rest of the world, and settling its affairs of war and peace within its own coasts, was destined to remain a dream. By a kind of irony of fortune, Hermokratês became the very embodiment of increased intercourse between Greek Sicily, and the rest of the world. He it was who was most zealous in bringing in deliverers from Old Greece to beat back invaders from Old Greece. He it was who counselled an appeal to Carthage herself to come on the like errand. But he too it was who, when Carthage did come on quite another errand, was the first to have her in her own corner and to win back at least one spot of Sikeliot ground from her grasp. And he it was who was to guide the fleets of Sicily into the waters of the motherland, to do for Peloponnêsos what Peloponnêsos had done for Sicily, and to make the Syracusan more famous in Europe and in Asia.' The criticism in the appendix on the speech of Hermocrates, with special reference to a pamphlet of H. Droysen (*Athen und der Westen*) are most valuable; and the principle *credo quia impossibile* is strikingly applied.

Nine years later we come to the assembly at Syracuse and the remarkable speeches of Hermocrates and Athenagoras. Mr. Freeman's description of the position of Athenagoras is specially interesting. 'The two men' he writes (p. 115)

'are well contrasted; the oligarch in home politics with the champion of democracy—the official man, knowing the ins and outs of all official affairs, with the popular speaker, who holds no official place, who has no means of information save such as are open to every citizen, whose only source of power and influence is that his fellow-citizens choose to set store by what he says.' This man is described as a 'leader of the people' (*δῆμον προστάτης*), and Mr. Freeman well points out that this was not an official title, and does not denote any definite office. The comparison of the Roman tribune of the plebs would be quite misleading. Grote pointed out that Athenagoras corresponds in some way to a member of Opposition in a modern parliament, and Mr. Freeman justly says that the nearest modern parallel to the *δῆμον προστάτης* is the Leader of Opposition. But he does not neglect to point out the difference; 'the Leader of Opposition, though not at the time in office, is sure to belong to the official class.' And in this connexion he traces very clearly how an official class grows up in democracies. The passage is most important (p. 122).

'The position and language of Athênagoras have a wider range than merely as illustrating the politics of Syracuse in his own day. They throw light on some of the most general and most remarkable facts of man's political nature. It is much easier to draw up a democratic constitution than to work it, when drawn up, in a democratic spirit. The dislike to exertion, the shrinking from putting oneself forward without some special call, is very strong in the mass of mankind. It has become a proverb that everybody's business is nobody's business. And this is true from one side; but it is equally true that what is everybody's business is sure to become somebody's business. In some men the love of business is inborn. They must be employed, be the employment never so petty or uninviting. Without consciously asserting that "we are they that ought to speak," they instinctively assume that it is for them to speak and to be listened to on all points. And men are apt, from the mere willingness that trouble should be taken off their hands, to take such men at their own estimate of themselves. In bodies therefore whose constitution is strictly democratic, bodies where there is nothing really answering to office or opposition, bodies where the position of every member is formally as good as that of every other, a *quasi* oligarchic, a *quasi* official, class is always likely to arise. It forms itself in assemblies where any influence of wealth or rank is out of the question; it comes by a kind of natural or unnatural selection; influence by no means always falls to men of the most striking ability, but

rather to those who are most willing to toil at the least attractive forms of drudgery. Without real office, they form an official class ; it is for them to speak and to act ; it is for others, if they dare, to doubt, to question, to answer, to take their chance of encouragement or discouragement on the part of the assembly in general.'

He goes on to show that the official class which would thus gradually form itself was largely formed of men of the oligarchic class, and 'an oligarchic spirit beyond that of mere officialism was likely to spread among those members of it who were not of illustrious birth.' Of such a class Hermocrates was a member. Against such a class Athenagoras had to struggle, — 'against men who could be at least suspected of administering the affairs of the State to the profit of themselves or their party, men who kept the people at large out of that knowledge of affairs which they might rightly claim, men who, it would seem, had cried Wolf, wolf, so often that they were not believed when the wolf was at the door indeed.' Athenagoras entirely denied the report of the invasion of the Athenians, which Hermocrates said was imminent, and is represented as a story got up by the oligarchs. The Athenians, he said, are far too wise to come, and if they came, they would be easily beaten. He draws a fair picture of the strength of Syracuse; but we may suspect that this picture was drawn for him by Thucydides. He then goes on to defend the democracy against the charges which the oligarchs were fond of preferring against it, and here again Mr. Freeman admits that what is said of democracy is the saying not of the real but of the Thucydidean Athenagoras. At all events we have in this speech a definition of democracy, which Mr. Freeman considers to be 'the best definition ever given of that misapplied and slandered name.'

'He use the name democracy in its true political sense, the sense of Periklès, Isokratès, and Polybios, a sense which has been somewhat overshadowed by the philosophical prejudices. With Athênagoras, democracy is no corruption, no falling away from any higher model ; he does not discuss the abstract claims of ideal kingship or of ideal aristocracy. He takes the actual and lawful constitution of Syracuse as he finds it, and contrasts it with the tyrannies and oligarchies which had been in past times, and which, if the people did not watch over their rights, might be again. The definition lies in a nutshell ; democracy is not the rule of a part only. In the

democracy of Athênagoras the rich and noble are in no way shut out from taking their share along with other citizens in the administration and honours of the commonwealth. They are not put into subjection to any other class ; they have their own special function in the State assigned to them. For in a democracy each man, each class of men, has its fitting place. It is for the rich, he says, to be guardians of the public purse ; it is for the wise to give counsel ; it is for the people at large to listen to their counsel, and to decide between opposing advisers.'

There is also an appendix on this theory of democracy, where it is pointed out that it coincides with that of Isocrates, and differs from that of Aristotle. 'For whatever reason, Aristotle uses words in a sense different from everybody else.' The reason, I think, is that Aristotle's view of a democracy, as a debased form of constitution—debased from that special constitution which he calls a *πολιτεία*—is probably derived from Plato, who in the *Republic* represents all existing political forms of government as degenerations, in a descending line, from the ideal State, and democracy as the worst but one—that one being the tyrannies.

The next occasion on which Hermocrates makes a speech in Thucydides is at Kamarina in the winter of 415-414 B.C. In that speech he exhorts to common Sikeliot action, and preaches the old doctrine against the intermeddling of 'strangers.' He is answered by the Athenian envoy, Euphêmos, in a speech which is 'the most remarkable in the whole collection of Thucydides. Its line of argument so exactly falls in with that put into the mouths of other Athenian orators, that we may be sure that, whether it be characteristic of the man or not, it is at least characteristic of the people. Never was the doctrine of interest, and of nothing but interest—the doctrine of dominion, of what it has lately become the fashion to call "empire"—the doctrine of "expansion" in the form of "empire"—more clearly, more unblushingly, set forth. It simply comes to this: Athens seeks dominion, such dominion as she is capable of. Her conduct is ever that which is best suited to win and to keep such dominion.' She will be inconsistent when it accords with her advantage to be inconsistent. She will leave some of her allies independent, she will make others dependent, according as suits her interest. He then

goes on to make an attempt to show that interference in Sicily was demanded by the interest of Athens; and at the same time that, in case she proved victorious, it would be for her interest to leave her Sikeliot allies independent. It would be to her advantage to strengthen her friends in the west; she would not be tempted to weaken them. In particular, Kamarina had nothing to fear from the ambition of Athens, and everything to fear from the ambition of Syracuse. Mr. Freeman points out the fallacies in the speech of the Athenian orator. In the first place, What security had Kamarina and the other cities of Sicily in case Athens were successful? Might it not come to pass that Athenian views as to their interests in the west, and their policy towards their Sikeliot friends, would change in that event. In the second place, when Euphemos said that Athens was compelled to intervene in Sicily, in order to hinder the Syracusans from sending help to the Peloponnesians, this argument was clearly a mere pretext. 'It admitted of a good diplomatic answer, namely, that Athens had at that moment no Peloponnesian enemies, that she was at peace with Sparta, and even in alliance with her. An Athenian might have rejoined that the alliance was nominal, and the peace likely to be broken at any moment. And an answer might have been made, again, that if the peace was precarious, it had become so largely through the tendency to universal meddling on the part of Athens—meddling in Peloponnesos first, and now renewed meddling in Sicily.' And besides this, the Syracusans had actually never sent any help to the Peloponnesians since the outbreak of the war, and at the moment which Athens chose for attacking Syracuse such help was impossible.

In this volume, the author has had constantly to deal with a special kind of difficulties, which in the previous volumes occurred only now and then. For Thucydides has become the main authority; and Thucydides is famous for the difficulties which beset his text. As these difficulties may sometimes occur at crucial points in the narrative, the historian is necessarily drawn into the region of textual criticism. He must adopt some principle in

dealing with these vexed questions. He cannot altogether ignore the science, is it? or art, of 'conjectural emendation.' Mr. Freeman has boldly faced the problem in his Preface, and set forth his views on the subject. As it is a question, which every student of history must come face to face with, sooner or later, in greater or less degree, I propose to devote some space to its discussion. Mr. Freeman lays down his principles as follows (Preface, p. vi., 592):

'To one who has hitherto had little to do with the criticism of words, except so far as it is needful for criticism of facts, the results are sometimes astonishing. Verbal scholars, like Eastern scholars, seem to have laws of evidence different from those which are followed in judging of the facts of history. According to these last rules, in those matters where we have to go by written records, the text of those records is our evidence, evidence with which we have no right to tamper. Through the whole of the present inquiry I have been struck at every step by the way in which certain scholars, whenever they cannot understand a passage in Thucydides, at once rush off to put something of their own in its stead. Thucydides' own style is confessedly hard. That is to say, it is hard to construe; for the meaning is often perfectly plain when the construing is hardest, and some passages which are hard to construe in the library are easy enough on the top of Epipolai. And Thucydides' style being hard, his text was yet more likely to be corrupted by transcribers than the text of other writers. We often feel morally certain that the text is corrupt; once or twice, by help of quotations in ancient writers, we can prove it to be corrupt. But save in this last kind of case, the text, as we have it, is our evidence. We must deal with our witness as we find him. We must take his statement for what it is worth; we must not put some other statement instead of it. We must construe his words, if we can; if we cannot construe them, we must honestly say that we cannot. We must in no case put our own words into the mouth of our witness and make him say something that he does not say. We must not be ashamed to practise the greatest lesson of all lessons, to dare to confess that there are things which we do not know. For instance, I do not profess to know what Thucydides wrote or what he meant, where, in the Letter of Nikias (vii. 13. 2), our present text gives us *ἐπ' αὐτομολίας προφάσει*. . . .

'At the same time, while the historian must set his face against conjectural emendation, he will not forget that there are emendations which are not conjectural. It is not conjectural emendation when the editor of an imperfect inscription fills up its blanks with the formal words which his experience teaches him must have stood there. And in the texts of written books there are cases where meaning and palaeography so happily play into one another's hands that an emendation carries full conviction with it.'

The cautious spirit of the first paragraph will command the sympathy of all sound historians. But when one comes to apply in particular cases the principle here laid down, one feels rather at a loss. It occurs to one that there must be something more to be said. The precept that we should never go beyond our text, and that, when our text is unmeaning, we should refuse to attempt to restore it, is delightfully simple. But is not this pushing scepticism a little too far? Are there not cases in which we are fully entitled to make an inference from the corrupt text of an author to what the author originally wrote? Sometimes an emendation is nothing more than the correction of a misprint. But there are also cases in which the corruption is something more than the slip of a pen, and which nevertheless admits of certain restoration. There are cases in which, when a witness A is reporting what was said by B, we can (1) know for certain that certain expressions or statements which A puts into B's mouth were never used by B, and in some of these cases we can (2) infer with certainty what B actually said. Supposing we found in this volume of Mr. Freeman (p. 73) the following sentence: 'War between acropolis and colony suggests the story of Syracuse and Kamarina.' We could conclude positively that the author was misrepresented by his witness, the printer, and we could be equally positive that what the author wrote was 'metropolis and colony.' And Mr. Freeman himself admits this. For in the second paragraph, which I have transcribed from his preface, he confesses that emendation is not always conjectural. But once this is admitted, we can no longer find our solution solely in the simple precept suggested by the first paragraph. It appears that the historian who is dealing with a corrupt text has to decide what emendations are conjectural and what are not. And thus we find ourselves almost where we started. We are to be very cautious in accepting anything different from the text which has come down,—a proposition which every sound textual critic will profess. But if we once admit that there are cases in which it is more reasonable to depart from the text than to adhere to it, the subjective element—the 'personal equation'—comes in. Where one man thinks that 'meaning and palaeography so happily play into one another's hands that an emendation carries full conviction with it,' another

will reject the emendation as a rash conjecture. Who is to be the judge, and what is to be the standard? An example which Mr. Freeman goes on to mention will excellently illustrate the point. 'After all,' he writes, 'it is very wonderful how little the whole process of text-tinkering affects the facts of history. In this volume there is one case only in which a question of the reading at all touches the narrative. And this is not in Thucydides but in Plutarch. It is the question about the reading *κελευσθέντας* or *καταλευσθέντας* in the 28th chapter of the Life of Nikias, of which I have more to say in Appendix xxiii.' The passage in Plutarch is: *Δημοσθένην δὲ καὶ Νικίαν ἀποθανεῖν Τιμαῖος οὐ φησὶν ὑπὸ τῶν Συρακοσίων κελευσθέντας, ὡς Φιλιστος ἔγραψεν καὶ Θουκυδίδης κ.τ.λ.* 'Timaios denies that Demosthenes and Nikias were put to death by the Syracusan, as Philistos and Thucydides state.' But what is the meaning of *κελευσθέντας*. Mr. Freeman confesses that he does not understand it, and that it 'is hardly grammar.' *καταλευσθέντας*, 'having been stoned,' has been proposed, but Mr. Freeman will not decide, though he seems inclined to entertain it. Grote prefers *κελευσθέντας*, which seems impossible both in sense and in grammar. If we remember that *κατα* was often written in the abbreviated form *κ* (as for example in the papyrus of the new Constitution of the Athenians), so that *καταλευσθέντας* being written *κίλευσθέντας*, might most easily—nay, would almost inevitably—be read *κελευσθέντας*—might we not regard this as an instance in which 'meaning and palaeography happily play into one another's hands.'* The fact that Mr. Freeman wavers about it is significant.

But there are other cases in this volume where Mr. Freeman ventures—generally with a protest, it is true—into the dangerous region of conjectural emendation. He is not—he cannot be—quite true to his counsel of perfection, to admit nothing that is not given by the direct evidence of the witness. That these cases do not much affect the facts, is of no conse-

* The fact that Thucydides does not mention the stoning—he merely says 'put them to death,' *ἀπέσφαξαν*—is no objection. The stoning is only incidental; and if Philistos mentioned it, that was enough to justify the form of Plutarch's sentence.

quence; the principle is at stake. Thus on page 164, in commenting on a passage of Thucydides (vi. 64, 3, *ἐκείνους δὲ ῥαδίως τὸ στρατεύμα προβαλόντας τῷ σταυρώματι ἀλρήσειν*) which admits of a perfectly intelligible interpretation as it stands, Mr. Freeman says: "στράτευμα and σταύρωμα are words so easily confounded that even a hater of guesswork may be tempted to do a little transposing."* Here he actually goes so far as to suggest an emendation of his own. Again, page 223, he writes, 'I suppose we must accept *φυλή* for *φυλακή*' (Duker's correction in Thucydides, vi. 101, 5,) and proceeds in his narration just as if *φυλή* were actually in the text. On page 195 he admits that 'one is almost tempted rather to read *οὐ πολλοί*' (Thucydides, vi. 88, 4), though the text with *οἱ πολλοί* is translatable. But on page 190 he goes further still, and (Thuc., vi. 74, 2) reads simply *ἀπελθόντες ἐς Νάξον* without remark, where the manuscript has the extraordinary reading, *ἀπελθόντες ἐς Νάξον καὶ Θράκας*. In another place he unwittingly accepts a 'conjectural emendation,' which makes a rather difficult sentence far more difficult than it is with the true text. †

When Mr. Freeman refers to the passage in Plutarch, quoted above, as the only case in this volume, where 'text tinkering' affects the narrative, he has forgotten the question about the fate of the Hykkarian captives (p. 157). When Nikias took 'the Sikan fishing town of Hykkara,' after the recall of Alkibiades, all the inhabitants were made slaves. In our text of Thucydides we find the following statement (vi. 62, 4): *τὰνδράποδα ἀπέδωσαν καὶ ἐγένοντο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἑκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν τάλαντα*. Mr. Freeman, working on this statement, writes:

'The human plunder of Hykkara was doubtless sold to the best advantage; part of it, we shall afterwards find, passed into the hands of officers and soldiers in the Athenian army. The whole sale brought in a hundred and twenty talents.'

But the text of Thucydides does not say this. It says *ἀπέδωσαν*;

* If any change were desirable, I should prefer to omit *τὸ στρατεύμα* (which occurred two lines before) as an interpolation.

† P. 195, in citing Thucydides, vi. 88, 4, he reads *καὶ πρότερον δὲ αἱ ἀλκίσεις εὐθὺς κ.τ.λ.* *αἱ* is not in the MSS., and without *αἱ* the sentence is quite intelligible.

and 'sold' would be ἀπέδορτο. Conscious of this, Mr. Freeman writes in his note, 'whatever is to be made out of ἀπέδοσαν or ἀπέδορτο, it is plain' that the captives were sold. He is quite sure of the fact—for the 'Hykkarian slaves' are mentioned at a later stage of the story,—and if so, he is logically bound to alter ἀπέδοσαν to ἀπέδορτο, as many editors do. Grote, keeping the text, interpreted, 'they gave back the slaves,' namely for a ransom; but the mention of the Hykkarian slaves again confutes this, and, asks Mr. Freeman, 'who was there to ransom them?' We must therefore either accept the conjecture ἀπέδορτο—on Mr. Freeman's own showing—although here we have only the 'meaning,' and not both 'meaning and palaeography' playing into one another's hands; or we must find some interpretation of ἀπέδοσαν consistent with the Hykkarians becoming slaves. As we find these Hykkarians afterwards as slaves of Athenian officers and soldiers, might the word possibly be used here in its regular sense of 'duly assigned,' 'gave as a due?' The slaves were distributed according to some method among the officers and soldiers, all glad, no doubt, to have the opportunity of buying them cheap. It would be natural to suppose that the preemption was given to the officers, the next choice to the soldiers; and the captives who still remained were then sold together. It is just conceivable that a proceeding of this kind, familiar to the contemporaries of Thucydides, might have been expressed by ἀπέδοσαν.

I must refer to one more difficulty on which Mr. Freeman has a good deal to say in Appendix xiii. Thucydides (vii., 2, 4) is describing the state of the Athenian works at the time of the coming of Gylippos. After speaking of the wall on the southern side of the round fort, which he throughout calls a κύκλος, and stating that it had been finished as far as the great harbour, except a small bit on the seaside (πλὴν παρὰ βραχύ τι τὸ πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν τοῦτο δ' ἐτι ψικοδόμουσι) he goes on: τῷ δὲ ἄλλῳ τοῦ κύκλου πρὸς τὸν Τρώγλιον ἐπὶ τὴν ἑτέραν θάλασσαν λίθοι τε παραβεβλημένοι τῷ πλεονί ἤδη ἦσαν κ.τ.λ. What Thucydides means to say is perfectly plain. Stones had been already deposited in sufficiency to nearly complete the wall which, extending northward from the round fort, was to reach the sea at the bay of Trogiolos. The Athenian wall north of the

kyklos, as well as the wall south of the *kyklos*, was progressing, though it had not progressed quite so quickly. But though this is evidently what Thucydides means to say, he does not succeed in saying it, if the text is right. Indeed if the text is right, it is very hard to know what he says. If τοῦ κύκλου could signify the whole Athenian wall, τῆ ἄλλῃ τοῦ κύκλου could mean 'the other part of the wall,' namely the northern half, taking the round part as the centre. But the wall was not a circuit or even the segment of a circle, and therefore it could not have been called κύκλος. If Thucydides used τοῦ κύκλου in this connexion, he could only mean the round fort, to which he has already applied the word repeatedly. But if τοῦ κύκλου means the fort, what is the meaning of τῆ ἄλλῃ τοῦ κύκλου, 'the other part of the round fort?' Commentators have attempted to twist the words to mean 'the part of the wall on the other (namely the northern) side of the round fort;' Grote takes it to mean this; and Mr. Freeman asks 'why should it not?' But this is to play fast and loose with the Greek language. Such a usage is quite unparalleled. This is a clear case in which the text cannot stand, and one is obliged to consider what error may have crept in. Mr. Freeman has a hit at those who strike out the 'the very important words, τοῦ κύκλου πρὸς τὸν Τρώγιον.' It seems to me that it is indeed quite gratuitous to strike out the last three words, but I am very much disposed to think that τοῦ κύκλου may be due to interpolation. Strike out these two words, which might easily have been inserted by some one who did not understand what the κύκλος of the Athenians was; and the sentence becomes intelligible. As the words stand, I submit that τοῦ κύκλου is not 'important,' because it is not intelligible. If it is to be kept and become intelligible, some change of another kind must be made. Insert ἀπὸ before it and read τῆ δὲ ἄλλῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ κύκλου πρὸς τὸν Τρώγιον,—then we have a sentence which is really lucid. But something must be done; some 'konjektur' must be resorted to in order to make sense. And it seems to me that Mr. Freeman is a little inconsistent in being so coy towards emendations in a case where the presence of error is so obvious, while in some other cases where it is possible to construe he entertains conjectures. Interpolations in classical

texts are so frequent that in a case like this it would not be very bold to suspect one.

Mr. Freeman's general spirit of caution cannot be praised too much, and if he goes too far, it is on the right side. But it seems to me that he has been betrayed into certain inconsistencies by his theoretical dislike of 'konjektur.' His doctrine in the preface is not strictly consistent with his treatment of all the particular cases in the volume; and his treatment of some particular cases is not consistent with his treatment of others. Conjectural emendation often goes to such outrageous lengths, that sober-minded people who have a weakness for evidence are tempted to denounce it altogether. Yet they have to admit, when special instances are put before them, that conjectural emendation is permissible and desirable within certain limits. The real problem is to define these limits; and I only wish that Mr. Freeman, with his unrivalled power of distinguishing, had not been hindered by his horror of emendation from determining its legitimate range according to general principles of evidence.

If Mr. Freeman does not spare the guessers, who undertake to restore texts, neither does he spare those other guessers who undertake to search out *Quellen* or start new *Fragen*. Much of the First Appendix, which deals with his authorities, is taken up with ridicule of the *Quellen-litteratur*, and, if one may coin the word, the *Fragen-litteratur* which have arisen in Germany. 'It calls up strange feelings,' he writes (p. 589) 'when one turns from reading his [Thucydides'] pages by the shore of the Great Harbour, from testing the perfection of his picture on the height of Epipolai or by the banks of Assinaros, and finds that the restless ingenuity of German scholars has developed a *Thukydidische Frage*. Everything else has been cavilled at and guessed at; so those who cannot live without cavilling and guessing have come at last to cavil and guess at those things which cannot be spoken against. Things have indeed changed, since it was thought a heinous sin in Grote himself to hint, not that Thucydides had misrepresented a single fact, but that personal feelings had once led him to pronounce a judgment which the facts of his own narrative did not bear out. On such grounds, in those days a

clever writer of imitative verses ventured to match himself with the great master, and to rejoice that such an one as he was no member of either English University. The position taken by Grote, which then was deemed impiety against Thucydides, would now pass for a superstitious worship of him. For the tone of the new school is often that of religious reformers attacking some form of idolatry. 'Sometimes we are forbidden to believe what Thucydides tells us; sometimes it seems that we are almost forbidden to believe that there was any Thucydides at all. Even in our own land we have been ordered, with all the irresistible authority of a "headmaster," to cast away half the text that was good enough for Thirlwall, Arnold and Grote. And a German scholar, with a double allowance of *Scharfsinn*, knows exactly how much was thrust into the text by a "bloodthirsty forger" ("ein blutdürstiger Verleumder") a being more terrible, one is driven to suppose, than the author of the false Phalaris or the false Ingulf.' Mr. Freeman's attitude to the products of German ingenuity, which he enumerates, is characterized by English common sense; and in his own views on the way in which Thucydides wrote his story, he shows—to use the words which he himself applies to Grote—the true *Scharfsinn* of a man who knows practically what he is about.'

In the course of this Appendix he criticizes those strange words of Mr. Jowett, on which, in the January number of this *Review*, I also ventured to protest. He defends Diodōros and Plutarch, as sources of history, against the unqualified sentence of condemnation which Mr. Jowett does not hesitate to pass against them. A great principle is involved, and Mr. Freeman's words are clear and unanswerable.

'It is truly wonderful how a Professor of Greek, who must be familiar with every word of so important a part of Greek literature as the writings of Diodōros and Plutarch, can have mistaken their useful compilations for "the fictions of later writers." Mr. Jowett surely does not suppose that Diodōros and Plutarch deliberately invented everything which they record but which is not recorded by Thucydides. Plutarch and Diodōros used such materials as they had, Thucydides himself among them. "Fiction" is a hard word even for Timaios; it is utterly out of place as applied to the part of the history of Philistos with which we are now concerned. From his narrative, the narrative of a contemporary and actor, Diodōros and

Plutarch have preserved to us endless little local and personal details which it was natural that a Syracusan eyewitness should record, but which had little interest for an Athenian visitor, even a few months later. Precious scraps like these, fresh from the scene and the actor, have much less of the character of "transparent gauze" than the grossly partisan writings of Xenophon, whom Mr. Jowett counts among the vendors of "good cloth." It would be the most curious question of all to see what kind of history of Pelopidas and Epameinondas could be woven out of that cloth only. The writers of "modern histories of ancient Greece"—Thirlwall and Grote for instance—have simply done their duty by "patching together," in Mr. Jowett's scornful phrase, every means of knowledge which they found open to them. In attempting to carry out the same process somewhat further than they did, I feel sure that I should have had their good word. In short, if Mr. Jowett's rule were to be accepted, there would be an end to all historical criticism. There would be an end to all writing of history, almost to all reading of it. We are solemnly called on to shut our ears to a large part of our evidence. Because one writer undoubtedly stands high above all others, we are bidden to pass by the statements—fragmentary, indeed, but still the statements—of another writer, doubtless his inferior in many points, but whose means of knowledge were, from one side of the story, greater than his own.'

Mr. Jowett's view is the view of a man of letters, who judges history altogether from a literary standpoint, and who does not care to hear what happened for its own sake, but only when it is told with literary effect. Nor is it the case, as he seems to imply, that literary merit and truth are always united. Tacitus is a notable instance of a historian in whose pages we find what we can hardly hesitate to call 'fictions' related with consummate art. How could we tell the history of the early Empire trusting to Tacitus alone, and rejecting the aid of Suetonius and Dion Cassius? It is perfectly true that Plutarch and Diodôros are, from a literary aspect, nowhere when compared with Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. But their literary inferiority does not abolish their historical value. If Diodôros was uncritical, and no master of style, he could nevertheless use his eyes, and copy into his own pages what he read in Philistos and other sources which were available to him, and are no longer available to us. Speaking quite seriously, one might wish that Mr. Jowett, or some one else, would construct a history of Greece, using no sources except Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. It would be

an experiment worth making. We should then fully realize what the extent of our debt is to Plutarch, Diodōros, and Pausanias.

The power of appreciating evidence from whatever quarter it comes is assuredly a quality which it is absolutely necessary for a historian to possess—we might almost say that it is his essential quality. He may possess many other valuable qualities, but if this be wanting, he will not be a true historian. And, on the other hand, he may lack many qualities which one would willingly see in a historian, and yet if he possess this he will be entitled to bear that name. The power of appreciating evidence of all kinds belonged to Mr. Freeman in a very high degree; but if he had not this, though he possessed all the other faculties which helped him to become a great historian, he would have lacked the one thing needful. Nowhere is this power, which Mr. Jowett by implication disdains, displayed in greater strength than in this third volume of the *History of Sicily*.

J. B. BURY.

ART. V.—SCOTTISH ORIGIN OF THE MERLIN MYTH.

THERE is already so much poetry and romance associated with the very name of the old Scottish Borderland that it seems superfluous in these days to seek to revive a claim which the Borderland, with its thousand and one mediæval memories, has allowed to drop, namely, that of being the real cradle of Arthurian romance. In almost pre-historic times the great Merlin haunted the Borderland, and sang Tweed's earliest song centuries before the birth of that ballad literature which was to be the poetic and plaintive outcome of long years of Border raid and rapine; but now we look in vain for references in our literature to such a time. Wales and Brittany have caught up the tradition, and, stamping their nationality upon it, the Merlin of Tweed has gone forth as the Merlin of Caermarthen and of the wild woods of Broceliande.

So great has been the fascination of the Arthurian legends that one now feels they should no more enquire into the actual latitude and longitude of King Arthur's capital than cavil at the geographical accuracy of Shakespeare's Bohemia. We should read romance with all the faith of a child listening to a fairy tale, and with story-tellers like Sir Thomas Malory, Edmund Spenser, and Lord Tennyson, the task is no very difficult one. Such is the power of a great poet, that even as the majority of the reading world will be content to study the England of the Tudors and the Plantagenets in the pages of Shakespeare, so Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* is, and will continue to be, the popular history of Arthurian England.

Of late years, however, men have been looking more closely into these old-world romances and their origins. It is not so very long since Mr. Matthew Arnold pled eloquently for a more thorough study of our ancient Celtic literature and its influence on the succeeding thought of the nation, and now Celtic Chairs have been established in Oxford and Edinburgh. In the learned papers so recently contributed to these pages by the Oxford Professor, Mr. Rhys, the readers of the *Scottish Review* have had an opportunity of judging for themselves of the marvellous manner in which such special study has opened for us long-closed pages of our early history. What Professor Rhys has done for England principally, our late Historiographer-Royal, Mr. Skene, has done more particularly for Scotland; and, in discussing the Scottish origin of the Merlin myth, we shall have occasion to examine the poems dealing with the personality of Merlin, which have been translated from the original Cymric in Mr. Skene's great work, *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, and to note how far these poems illustrate the few scanty facts gathered from other sources regarding Merlin. Similarly it will be our duty to enquire how far the researches of the eminent Breton Celtic authority, the Vicomte Villemarqué, favours or discountenances the theory of Merlin's Scottish origin.*

* See Villemarqué's *Myrdhinn ou L'enchanteur Merlin, son histoire, ses œuvres, son influence.*

There is now no doubt that the mass of Arthurian tradition can be traced to Celtic sources, and particularly to the Cymric branch of the Celtic family, and accordingly wherever we find traces of the Cymri there are very similar traditions, diversified only by local circumstances. Thus, each of the four great divisions of ancient Cymric territory, Strathclyde, Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany, have their separate traditions of Arthur and Merlin, and their Merlin shrines. The Scottish pilgrim will find the Cymric bard's grave by the peaceful Tweed in the sweet vale of Drummelzier. The Welshman goes to dragon-haunted Dinas-Emrys, amid the fastnesses of Snowdon, or to the Mynydd Merlin or Merlin's Hill, near Caermarthen. The haunt of the Cornish pilgrim would be fairy Tintagal or that mysterious tomb referred to in Sir Thomas Malory, where, to quote a quaint Scottish reference to the legend, that 'wykede womane closede him in a cragge of Cornwales coste.' And Brittany? Amid the giant stones of Carnac, or on that little islet of Sien, between Raz and Croissant, off the west coast of Bretagne, the faithful still look for the grave of Merlin. Truly it is a tangled web which the romancists have woven around the story of Merlin!

Here then we have, speaking generally, three Merlins—the Scottish, the Welsh and Cornish, and the Breton. The first of these became known through time as the Scottish Merlin or Merlinus Caledonius; the second as the Welsh Merlin, Myrdin Emrys or Merlinus Ambrosius; the third as the Breton Merlin, Marthin, or Marzin. The first I shall call the Merlin of *history*, the second the Merlin of *tradition*, and the third the Merlin of *romance*.

Let us see what can be gleaned by glancing rapidly at the *history* of the Merlin period.

In the long wars for race supremacy which followed the withdrawal of the Romans from Britain, the northern Cymri were ~~were~~ most exposed to the danger of invasion, ~~As~~ in Roman Britain the points to be guarded most strongly were the *Saxon shore* (i.e. the south-east coast of England) and the northern walls. Slowly but surely the Saxons drove the southern Cymri westwards to the mountains of Wales and the coasts of Cornwall. Large numbers of the refugees crossed over to Brittany or Lesser

Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries, giving as Professor Val-roger points out, 'a leur nouvelle demeure des noms qui leur rappelaient la patrie perdue.*' The Cymri between the Roman walls, Antonine's and Hadrian's, were, on the other hand, surrounded on *all* points, by Scots in the north, Picts in the north-east, Saxons in the east, and Galloway Picts in the south-west. They were thus cut off from their Welsh brethren, although the inclusion of Cumberland and Westmorland in the district of the northern Cymri kept open for a long time the communication with Wales.

But, as often happens with a nation most beset with foes from without, they were at strife amongst themselves. Druidism, which had well-nigh disappeared among the Southern Britons, still flourished among the Men of the North, as the Scottish Cymri were sometimes called. Many of the noble families proudly held to their ancient belief, and, as Christianity crept in amongst them, the breach between Christian and Pagan Cymri grew wider and wider. The chiefs of two ancient royal houses took opposite sides in this struggle—Rydderch Hael leading the Christian, and Gwenddolew the Pagan factions. Both appear to have been men of more than ordinary ability, and both are mentioned in the ancient 'Triads of Arthur and his Warriors,' Rydderch as one of 'the three generous ones,' and Gwenddolew as one of 'the three bulls of battle' of the Island of Prydain (Britain). Gwenddolew was also called 'the father of songs,' evidently in recognition of his patronage of the bards. With both sides, also, are associated the names of the two representative men of the rival creeds—St. Kentigern with Rydderch Hael, and Merlin with Gwenddolew.

At last the crisis came, when the Christian and Pagan forces met on the battlefield of Ardderyd in the year 573 A.D. In this fratricidal struggle the Christian army was victorious, and Prince Gwenddolew himself was slain. Rydderch Hael then consolidated the petty Cymric states into his kingdom of Strath Clyde or Cluyd, with Alclyde or Alcluyd (Dunbarton) as his capital, and with Kentigern as primate in the See of Glasgow. Merlin's,

* See *Les Celtes, la Gaule Celtique*. Paris, 1879.

own poems show that he was present at this fatal battle, fighting on the side of his friend Gwenddolew, and that after the battle he fled broken-hearted, if not altogether insane, to the Wood of Celyddon where, if we are to believe his poems, he wandered about for fifty years. Apart from the Merlinian poems, there is an entry in one of the old chronicles—the *Annales Cambriae*—which connects Merlin with Ardderyd:—

Anno 537, Bellum Armterid inter filios Elifer et Guendoleu filium Keidiau : in quo bello Guendoleu cecidit : Merlinus insanus effectus est.*

Here not only is the death of Gwenddolew chronicled, thus identifying 'Armterid' with Ardderyd, but the sons of the Elifer above referred to are also mentioned in Merlin's poems as 'seven heroes,' and as having been present at Ardderyd. As to the site of this battle, there is a curious chapter in the old Latin edition of the *Scotichronicon*,† which gives an account of a meeting between Kentigern and Merlin. Here Merlin is said to explain his connection with the battle of Ardderyd, *quod erat in campo inter Lidel et Carvanolow situato.* Carvanolow, now corrupted into Carwhinelow, is simply the Latinized form of *Caer-Gwenddolew*, the city of Gwenddolew, and not far from the Liddel and Carwhinelow streams is the Ardderyd of the poems, now called Arthuret. The battle was fought therefore near Carlisle close on the Borders.

The Cymri never forgot Ardderyd. It was a tale of dule and sorrow, thoroughly in keeping with that fatality which has ever since haunted their history. Only in the realm of fiction could the fallen Cymri rise superior to all their misfortunes, and with the mythic Arthur conquer the world. The picture of Merlin, as described in the Cymric poems translated in Mr. Skene's work,‡ is a grand and gloomy one. There

* *Cit.* Skene, Villemarqué, Bishop Forbes's Life of St. Kentigern.

† 'Fordun's *Scotichronicon*, with Bower's continuation' — Goodall's Edition, *Edinburgi*; Roberti Flamini, 1759; Lib. III., Cap. xxxi., entitled, *De Mirabili poenitentia Merlini Vatis.*

‡ See particularly the poem called the *Avallenau*, or the Apple Trees, attributed to Merlin and translated in *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, Vol. I., page 370.

is first the battle-front of Ardderyd, with Merlin fighting side by side with Gwenddolew, 'the bull of battle.' The bard himself wears his golden torques,* indicative of his high rank. Then when all is over and the field of battle is left to 'the ravens screaming over the blood' of the slain, there is the retreat across the wilds of Liddesdale into the recesses of the Wood of Celyddon, and to that part of the ancient forest which still bears a name hallowed by sorrow—the Ettrick Forest.† His companions, the remnant of the Pagan army, 'after suffering disease and longing grief about the woods of Celyddon,' preceded him one by one into their mysterious Druidland, there to appear before 'the Sovereign of splendid retinues,' or, as Merlin elsewhere puts it,

'Seven score generous ones have gone to the shades,
In the wood of Celyddon they came to their end.' ‡

How touching is the plaint of the last of the Druids,

'Thin is my covering, for me there is no repose ;
Since the battle of Ardderyd it will not concern me
Though the sky were to fall, and sea to overflow.'

And then in the Avallenau, that poem addressed to his apple tree, he tells how with his shield on his shoulder and his sword on his thigh he sleeps all alone in the woods of Celyddon ; how he is hated by Rydderch and his lords, who are 'offended at his creed ;' how, in the days of his glory, he had wealth in abundance, and entertained minstrels ; how, he is afraid that even his twin-sister, Gwendydd, or the Dawn, loves him no longer. There is also a vague reference to a still more mysterious loved one, 'a fair sportive maid, a paragon of

* Necklace or bracelets of gold worn as a distinguishing mark of eminence among the ancient Cymri, referred to in Strabo, Camden.

† The following quotation from Hollinshead shews that the Wood of Celyddon was particularly associated with Merlin's country of Upper Tweed :—'The water of Clide divideth Lennox on the north side, from the baronie of Renfrew, and it ariseth out of the same hill in Calidon-wood, from whence the Annand falleth.' Vol. I., Cap iv.

‡ Villemarqué supposes that this is rather an allusion to the warriors who fell in Arthur's battle in Celyddon.

slender form,' who is afterwards to blossom into the Vivien of romance. His sister Gwendydd had evidently been for a time his only solace. She was his Gwendydd, 'Gwendydd, the delicately fair,' Gwendydd, 'the idol of princes,' 'the refuge of songs;' and he was to her,—

' My far-famed twin-brother,
The intrepid in battle,
The fosterer of song among the streams.'

(How appropriate a title for the first of the Border singers!)

In a poem which is written in the form of a dialogue between Merlin and Gwendydd, Merlin issues that series of prophecies which Geoffrey of Monmouth afterwards made use of in writing the prophecies of his Merlin Ambrose. In this poem, too, there are touches here and there of human interest, revelations of the inner soul of Merlin himself. This subjectiveness is characteristic of the Merlinian as compared with the other Cymric poems in Mr. Skene's book. When Gwendydd asks who shall come after Rydderch Hael, we can read, as it were, in Merlin's reply the thoughts running through the bard's mind, thoughts of unhappy Ardderyd; and again, when he gently upbraids his sister, his words are evidently intended as much for himself as for her:—

' Gwendydd, be not dissatisfied,
Has not the burden been consigned to the earth?
Every one must give up what he loves.'

Villemarqué, I observe, seeks to explain away Gwendydd's personality, 'qu'en réalité sa mystérieuse interlocutrice n'est autre que la muse bardique;' but there seems to be no necessity for thus robbing the story of her gentle presence, and in the *Scotichronicon* we have curious indirect evidence in her favour. A comparison of the English and Cymric versions of the poem shews that wherever *twin-brother* occurs in the one, the Cymric word *Llallofan* appears in the other. Merlin would therefore often be addressed as *Llallofan*, and accordingly in the Latin *Scotichronicon*, a Scottish source totally independent of and unconnected with the Cymric poems, we find Merlin described as 'eum, qui vulgo Lailoken vocabatur.'

Gwendydd's pet name for her brother had thus become associated with Merlin long after its original meaning had ceased to be intelligible to the monkish chronicler.

When we come to treat of the personality of Merlin's mysterious early love we tread upon less firm ground. That she was originally distinct from Gwendydd is proved by the fact that Merlin speaks of her to his sister. In one version of the *Avallenau* she is spoken of as 'the lovely nymph with pearly teeth,' who guarded Merlin's apple-trees, and Villemarqué, always picturesque, calls the maid *Splendeur*, "qui, lorsqu'elle sourit, découvre une rangée de perles tout à fait dignes de son nom.' In the Cymric poems she is variously called *Hwimleian*, *Huimleian*, *Chwipleia*, *Chwibleian*, and *Chwivleian*, in which different forms it is not difficult to trace such French romance forms as *Nimiane*, *Nimainne*, *Viviane*, *Vivienne*, etc. In Mr. Skene's work the words are translated *Sybil*, as best suiting her character. The whole subject of Vivien is an interesting study which would require a paper to itself, since it is from the blending of the two characters, Gwendydd and the Sybil, that we get the Vivien of romance. As the general reader is unfortunately apt to form his or her opinion of this, the great Delilah of romance, from Tennyson's powerful delineation, I can only remark in passing that in the early stages of the Merlin romances she is far from being what Tennyson describes her, the nameless waif subtle as the serpent of Eden.

To return to Merlin himself, we have no direct evidence as to the exact date of his death. Hollinshead merely states that he flourished about the year 570, thus corroborating at least the date of the turning-point of Merlin's life, the battle of Ardderyd (573). A *Brevis Cronica* attached to an old copy of Wyntoun's chronicle gives under date 605, 'about this tyme Merlyng the prophet of Brettane deceissit with greit peunance'; and the *Scotichronicon* states that 'Merlin and S. Kentigern died in one and the same year,' which, according to the *Annales Cambria*, would be 612. The implied date of the *Avallenau*, as we have seen, would bring him down to 69'

arriors

Sometime, therefore, during the first quarter of the 7th century may safely be considered as the period of Merlin's death.

As to the manner of his death, we have again to fall back upon the *Scotichronicon*. It tells the tragic end to a tragic life. By the banks of upper Tweed at Drummelzier, or Dunmeller* as it was anciently called, Merlin was attacked by the shepherds of Meldred, a princeling of the district, and stoned and beaten to death. His body was then flung into the stream upon a sharp stake, on which it lay impaled. Villemarqué's short but graceful comment on this account is well worth quoting:—

'Depuis l'antique Orphée jusqu'à l'Orphée celtique, combien d'autres sont morts de même ! C'est la lutte éternelle de la force brutale contre l'intelligence, douce et sublime inspirée du ciel, dont le royaume n'est pas de ce monde.'

The French *savant* has here given the true key-note from which to estimate Merlin's place in history and romance. He was the personification of intellectual force at a time when might was right. Nor did Merlin despise bodily strength. We know how proud he was of his golden torques glistening in the battlefield, of his sword and his shield, and if he wept over his apple tree by the river side, as the brave Abderahman I. of Spain did over his palm tree, he could also send through the Wood of Celyddon that trumpet-blast of prophecy which ever since has kept ringing in the ears of the expectant Cymri, of the time when—

'The Cymry will be victorious, glorious will be their leader,
All shall have their rights, and the Brython will rejoice,
Sounding the horns of gladness, and chanting the song of peace and happiness.'

During the sad gloomy years that closed his life, extended as it was far beyond the era to which he properly belonged, his position was unique. Hated by the Christian Cymri at the Court of Rydderch, whom possibly he had at one time treated with proud disdain as traitors and apostates, feared by the

* Ultra oram Tuedae fluminis praeuptam, prope oppidum Dunmeller,—so runs the Chronicle.

peasantry who looked upon the aged seer as one in league with the devil, as one who clung to some old-world paganism, the creed of the devil, no wonder he cried from his inmost soul—

‘Death takes all away, why does he not visit me?’

No wonder people thought he was insane, he was so far above them in intellect, they could not be expected to understand him then. They did when it was too late. The old nature-worshipper at that time stood alone. Had he not seen what no eye had seen, to quote Professor Veitch’s fine lines—

‘Weird sights not utterable in mortal words,
Strange forms o’ morn, shapes in the weather-gleam
That silent move and pass along the rim,
Clear set, of the dim world that engirds the hills.’*

We find in the old Merlinian poems, an intimacy with and a reverence for nature which could only come from a deification of nature. We can well imagine that to Merlin Christianity was not a gospel of peace. It was already associated with fratricidal struggle, it was the origin of all his woes, and to him peace was associated only with—

‘The silence that is in the starry sky,
The sleep that is among the lonely hills.’

The *Avallenau* was addressed to neither friend nor patron, not even to Gwendydd, but to his ‘Sweet apple-tree which grew by the river-side.’ In his poems ’tis not always the hum of men that you hear. ’Tis ‘the voice of waterbirds whose scream is tumultuous, the lowing together of cattle about the ford.’

We now come to consider how our Merlinus Caledonius,

‘Magnified by the purple mist
The dusk of centuries and of song.’

became the great Merlin of tradition and romance.

* From *Merlin and other Poems* (Blackwood) 1889. In Prof. Veitch’s *Merlin* we have what might be called the poetical first-fruits of the new heresy in the treatment of Arthurian tradition, the first poetical recognition of our *Scottish* Merlin, if you except Leyden’s references to him in his ‘Scenes of Infancy.’

As time wore on the unremitting attacks from Scots and Saxons began to tell on the little Cymric kingdom of Strathclyde. For a time Stirling was the common march of the three races, and Hollinshead tells us that on the old Stirling bridge the following couplet was carved:—

‘ I am free march as passengers maie ken,
To Scots to Britains and to Englishmen.’

But in 756 Rydderch's capital of Alclyde* fell into the hands of the Scots, then Cumberland and Westmorland were lost, and at last in 870 the final exodus took place, when in the words of Hollinshead, the Cymri ‘departed into *North Wales*, where they placed themselves in the country between Conway and the river Dee, out of which they expelled the Englishmen (that were in possession thereof) and therewith they erected a kingdom there which they named *Stradcluid*, maintaining wars against the English manie years after.’ (Reprint of 1805, Vol. I., p. 278).†

As in the case of the English Cymri who were unable to reach Wales or Brittany, many of the Scottish Cymri remained to become eventually part of the Scottish Border stock. For a long time, however, they were known and described by their Scottish and Saxon contemporaries as the *Wealas*, *Stradclud Wealas* or *Walenses*.

The great body of the Cymri, however, must have gone southwards to North Wales, and it was natural that they should carry with them their traditions, their songs of the bards in which were preserved their nation's hopes and fears. It was their Arthur who had won the twelve battles. It was their Merlin who had prophesied a happier time in the future.

‘ A mystery to the world, the grave of Arthur,’

says an old Cymric poem, and deep down in the national heart there slumbered the hope that the mystery had some connection with their king's final triumph. Arthur therefore

* The early Cymric connection with Alclyde is still shewn in its present name of Dunbarton—*Dun Bretton*—the fort or castle of the Britains.

† Mr. Skene quotes an entry from the *Brut y Tywysogion* to the same effect.

was their great king and Merlin was his prophet, and although this connection between king and prophet existed only in romance, there was really only an interval of thirty-one years between Arthur's last battle and Merlin's, between Camlan and Ardderyd. It was natural, too, that the names should be finally localised in Wales, and by the twelfth century both the Welsh localisation and nationalisation of the Merlin myth was fully established. The close of the eleventh century had been a brilliant era in Welsh history and literature. For the first time for nearly a hundred years Welsh princes sat on the thrones of North and South Wales, and during that period Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote his *Historia Britonum*. From the date of that epoch-making book an almost impenetrable veil of mystery gathered around the true history of Celtic Britain. But for Geoffrey's pseudo-history we might have had a less ample but purer stream of true history. On the other hand it is to Geoffrey also that we are indebted for the rich flood of Arthurian romance which in the Middle Ages deluged the literature of Europe.

Now, Geoffrey's *Historia* is so intimately connected with the development of the Merlin myth that it requires some little attention, and the first thing that strikes the reader in this connection is that Merlin is no longer Merlin, the prophet of Celyddon, but *Merlin Ambrose*, the prophet of *Caermarthen*. In order to ascertain how this difference arose, we must examine the materials on which Geoffrey founded his wonderful romance-history. We learn from such earlier works as Gildas (560 A.D.), and Nennius (*circa*, 738), of the deeds of one *Ambrosius Aurelianus*, or Aurelius Ambrose, as he is also called. When Vortigern, in 449, took the fatal step of seeking aid from the Saxons in order to keep the Picts and Scots at bay, he found that this alliance was opposed by a Roman-British party under Ambrosius Aurelianus. This latter faction belonged, as the name of their leader indicates, to the class of Britons who had thriven under Roman rule, who had even given Emperors to Rome itself, and who were alarmed at this dangerous alliance with their traditional enemy. After a long civil war the Saxon party was defeated, and the Roman party made

Ambrosius *Guledig*, a Cymric title which corresponded very much to the *Dux Britanniarum* of the Romans. He was even more literally the successor of the Roman *Comes Littoris Saxonici*, for the wars of Ambrosius were more particularly connected with the defence of the *Saxon shore*, whilst his successor as *Guledig*, Arthur, was more or less connected with the defence of the northern walls.

The name of Ambrosius, 'the great king among the Kings of Britain,' as Nennius calls him, naturally lent itself readily to the myth-forming element, and so an account of what may originally have been simply the first meeting between Vortigern and his future rival, Ambrosius, is embellished with stories of buried dragons and enchantments. In this old legend of Nennius we find the germ of the Merlin Ambrose myth. It is the story of Vortigern's futile attempt to build a tower of refuge amid the mountain recesses of Snowdon, of the strange upheavals of the site, and as strange disappearance of the building materials. Then follows the wise men's gruesome counter-charm. The site must be sprinkled with the blood of *a child born without a father*. In the end a child is brought who tells Vortigern that the convulsions are due to the struggle of two buried dragons. The boy-wizard proceeds to warn the King against continuing to build on the site, and explains the significance and bearing of the incident on the future fortunes of the country.

"What is your name?" asked the King. "I am called Ambrose" (in British *Embresguletic*), returned the boy; and, in answer to the King's question, "What is your origin?" he replied, "a Roman consul was my father." Then the King assigned him that city, with all the western provinces of Britain.*

It is curious that the supernatural part of this story agrees exactly with the legend of the bard Taliesin. He, too, was *born without a father*, and, whilst yet a child, cast a spell over the bards of Maelgwn, as young Ambrose confounded the wise men of Vortigern. Both also uttered words of warning to the kings before whom they stood.

* Giles's *Nennius*, p. 24, ed. 1841.

The part of the story, quoted in full, leaves no doubt that it refers to Ambrosius Aurelianus. Dr. Guest, in his *Origines Celticae*, puts the date of Vortigern's accession down at 447, and that of his successor, Ambrosius, at 463, so that the latter could easily have been still a youth in the early days of Vortigern's reign. The boy is even called in the above passage *Embresguletic*, that is, Emrys or Ambrosius the Guledig. The next statement, that his father was a Roman Consul, is corroborated by the account of Ambrosius given in Gildas, where it is said that his parents (ancestors) were adorned with the purple.* The grant of 'all the western provinces of Britain' further favours the supposition that, denuded of its supernatural embellishments, this was merely a meeting between two rival princes; and, lastly, the site of this dragon-haunted castle is still known as Dinas Emrys, the Fort of Ambrosius, *not of Merlin*.

In the face of all this, when Geoffrey of Monmouth comes to tell this story of Nennius in his *Historia*, he takes the momentous step of describing the boy, not as Ambrose, but as '*Merlin who was called Ambrose*,' and henceforth Merlin Ambrose. According to Nennius the boy was found at Gleti in Monmouthshire. Geoffrey relates how he was found at the gate of 'a city called afterwards Kaermerdin.' Now Kaermerdin, or Caermarthen, is simply the Roman *Maridunum* contracted to 'Merdin,' and the Cymric *Caer*, a town, prefixed to it; but by the magic touch of Geoffrey's wand, Caermarthen becomes no longer the town of Maridunum, but the town of Merdin, Myrddyn, or *Merlin*.† (The Breton form would be still more exact, for Merlin is there called *Marthen*.)

* It has been conjectured that Ambrosius was descended from Constantine the Usurper, whose career is given in Gibbon's *Roman Empire*, ch. xxx.

† It is curious that Spenser in his *Faerie Queene* should refer to this very change from Maridunum to Caermarthen,—

' To Maridunum, that is now by change
Of name Cayr-Merdin cald, they tooke their way :
There the wise Merlin whylome wont (they say)
To make his wonne ' (abode).—Bk. III., c. iii., st. vii.

As may well be supposed, this was not Geoffrey's only fabrication. His story of Stonehenge, and his ingenious linking of the historical Ambrosius and Arthur, by making them brother and son respectively of his fabulous Uther Pendragon, are further examples.

Geoffrey of Monmouth thus proved, long before Shakespeare's time, that there was something in a name after all, and as his *Historia* penetrated into lands where the ancient Cymric tongue was unknown, his legend of Merlin Ambrose quickly spread at a time when court, camp, and grove alike hungered for stories in romance.

From the Merlin Ambrose of Geoffrey of Monmouth it is an easy transition to the Merlin of Romance. The striking features of the histories of the Scottish and Welsh Merlins are seized upon and moulded to suit the spirit of the time, the spirit of mediævalism. It would be interesting to study this development in detail, but here I can only indicate its leading features.

In the romaunts Geoffrey's story of the *child born without a father* is most wondrously developed. We saw that he had copied his story from Nennius, who possibly caught up some tradition regarding Taliesin, and which again may have had its origin far back amid the druidical beliefs of the spirits of the air holding communion with the sons and daughters of men. This, indeed, was a popular superstition all through the middle ages, and many were the wonderful stories told of such *incubi* and their supernatural offspring.* In Merlin's case the fiction was made the groundwork of a great allegorical romance. Even as Christ was both 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man,' born of a Virgin, so Christ's victory over Satan could only be nullified by the birth of a being who was both son of the Devil and born of a virgin. Such was the high keynote on which the mediæval Romance of Merlin was pitched, and the opening chapters describe how Satan's scheme for thus ruining mankind was attempted, and how signally it failed. The child

* See Hector Boethius, quoted by Hollinshead; Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Part III., Section ii.; Luther's *Colloquia Mensalia*, etc.

Merlin who was to be his agent *was* born, but all Satan's efforts were counteracted by the spotless purity of Merlin's mother. Merlin endowed with the wiles of the Devil his father thus turns these very powers into factors for good instead of evil.* Merlin is thus made the personification of a second victory of Christ over Satan, and the reader is prepared for the further development of Merlin's character from that of a pagan prophet to that of the adviser and friend of the typical Christian King Arthur. The Merlin of romance becomes the prophet-founder of the Round Table and the originator of that most sacred of all quests, the search for the Holy Grail. He is at the same time the genius of the battlefield. Amidst the Lancelots and Gawaines of the bravest and most chivalrous court in Europe, Merlin's golden dragon was ever in the front of the battle. 'And Merlin wente from o bateile to another and satte upon a courser, and cried lowde, "Now lete se now gentill knyghtes, now is come the day and the houre that youre prowessse shall be shewed." And when the king and princes heard Merlin's voice they constrained to do their utmost.'† Have we not here the Merlin of Ardderyd, proud of his golden torques, glistening in the battlefield?

Wisest of counsellors, bravest of warriors, Merlin was also the truest of lovers. The vague reference in the Cymric poems to Merlin's apple-trees and to the nymph with the pearly teeth who guarded them is developed into one of the most charming episodes in the whole romance, namely his courtship of Nimiane in the enchanted orchard. Merlin's story, however, is a tra-

* It was this very connection between Merlin and the Devil which afterwards brought these romances into disrepute, when master-minds like Rabelais and Cervantes turned the extravagancies of chivalry into ridicule. An example from Cervantes is the burlesque poem on Merlin in *Don Quixote*, beginning:—

'Yo soy Merlin, aquel que las historias
Dicen que tuve por mi padre al diablo.'
(I am Merlin, of whom the histories tell
That I had the Devil for my father.)

Don Quixote, Pt. II., cap. xxxv. .

† See Early English Text Society's beautiful reprint of the *Romance of Merlin*, fifteenth century.

gedy, and in the pretty scene in the orchard, although the fairy knights, squires, maidens, and jongleurs come tripping in to the sound of timbrels and tabors, and singing as they come, the burden of their song is ever, 'Vraiment comencent amours en ioye, et fynissent en dolours.' Here was the cloud no bigger than a man's hand appearing on the horizon even on the happy morning when Merlin poured forth his first love plaint to Nimiane. Over and over again in the romance when Merlin speaks it is with the quiet mournful dignity of the Merlin of Tweed, the prophet of the Cymri.

In the last scene of all when Nimiane or Vivien, like another Delilah, learned the fatal secret of Merlin's power, they 'fond a bussh that was feire and high of white hawthorne full of floures, and ther they satte in the shadowe.'

'Then, in one moment, she put forth the charm
Of woven paces and of waving hands,'

and Merlin lay enchanted for ever.

At Drummelzier, in Peeblesshire, where the Powsail burn flows into Tweed, a thorn still blossoms in the spring over the traditional grave of the Scottish Merlin, and there, we too can sit in the shadow. Looking upwards and around from that old thorn by the river Tweed to the green rounded hills of the Borderland, we see a deeper meaning in Merlin's own words—

'Are not the buds of thorns
Very green, the mountain beautiful, and beautiful the earth?'

In Scottish literature, no doubt, his name has been almost entirely associated with his prophetic character. His prophecies linked with those of Thomas the Rhymer were in the old days household words to generations of Scotchmen, whilst his personality was lost in that final exodus of the Cymri from Scotland to Wales. Saxon historians necessarily knew little of the ancient British prince, prophet, and bard, but local tradition has preserved for thirteen centuries the memory of his last resting-place.

ARTHUR GRANT.

ART. VI.—THE NATURAL BASIS OF SPEECH.

THE origin of man, and the time of his first appearance on earth as a being of intelligence and purpose, are problems still dark and difficult, however eagerly the scientific writer of to-day leaps to his conclusions, as the ancient thinkers also leaped to theirs, three thousand years ago. The earliest indications of this presence—after the great ice age—are undated; the oldest human remains shew differences of stature and of skull, as great as any now existing; but as yet our knowledge is confined to the evidence of caves in Europe and America; the great fields of Asia and Africa are almost untouched, and the conclusions based on such imperfect data, may be destined to a rude overthrow when researches are carried further afield. In Europe we find the delicate long-headed race of low stature, the tall flat-headed people, the little round-headed Esquimaux-like man of Auvergne, the giant of more than seven feet in height, the tall and massive round-headed race of central and eastern Europe, to say nothing of lost races, whose custom of burning the dead has left us in ignorance of their physical type. The skulls are silent, and never can tell us the language once spoken by the man, or the colour of his eyes and hair, or the beliefs as to a future in which he died: the evidence of metals, or of polished stone, is evidence only of civilization, and not of date; the absence of written record buries the past in oblivion; and the only enduring monument of 'articulate speaking man' is that which language may be made to afford.

There is therefore no more interesting or valuable study than that of the origin of language, as casting a light which, dim though it be, is yet brighter than any other we can use, in considering the great question of the unity of race, and of the earliest home of mankind; and in such connection also there is no more important problem than that of the natural growth of intelligent speech. In Asia we can carry back our researches for five thousand years, among civilized races who

wrote, and wrote in strictly grammatical speech ; and can compare and contrast the various groups of language, which belonged to the Mongol and the Aryan, the Semitic peoples and their distant cousins of Egypt.

Already it is clearly perceived that the roots of speech in every case are few and simple, and that words are built up from such roots in endless variety. The Aryan roots have been reduced to about 150. in all, the Mongol roots are not more numerous, nor probably are the Semitic, although these languages advanced and enriched themselves more rapidly perhaps than any others. Although five thousand years ago the great branches of language were already rigidly divided from each other, by grammar and by methods of formation, and had nevertheless borrowed from each other many foreign words ; yet when each branch is reduced to its roots a striking similarity is found, in every case, to mark all those original stems which expressed the commonest ideas of sound and movement, of light and vision, of odour and of food, and even more advanced ideas concerning labour and love. In all these cases we find mankind to be distinct from the brute, in as much as he was able consciously to utter two successive but different sounds, which together formed a single and distinct idea ; and these double sounds, representing true speech as distinct from animal cries, are common to all the oldest families of Asiatic language.

This then is the true definition of speech, as distinct from imitative sounds ; and the distinction between reasoning man and the brute. The varying tones of animals are familiar to those who know them well, and indicate clearly various states of fear or contentment, of wrath or delight. The imitation of natural sounds is found even among birds, like the parrot, whose fleshy tongue gives to him an unusual advantage ; but no animal deliberately combines two sounds of different class so as to form a single abstract idea ; and even when it attempts to imitate such combination it is only the variety of tone which is caught, and not the distinct consonantal sound. Such at

least is the result which appears to arise from listening to the echo-like tones of a parrot's utterances.

Yet there is no actual barrier between the imitation of natural sounds and the first attempt at speech. Mankind was gifted with an organ as superior to that of any animal as is the lowest known of human skulls to that of the ape. The mobile lips, the even teeth, the flexible tongue, and the arched palate, together formed an instrument superior to any that the higher animals possess; and rendered the differentiation of sounds easier and more complete. From the throat could be produced the guttural, from the roof of the mouth the palatal, from within the teeth the dental, and from the lips the labial; and as the muscles were expanded or contracted the vowel sound became broader or deeper, with the intermediate and weaker variations which belong to less extreme conditions of feeling. With such an instrument most of the sounds of nature could be imitated, with sufficient exactness to make them recognisable by aid of signs.

If we trace back the Asiatic roots of speech (not hypothetically, but by an exhaustive comparison of the actual stems) to the single sounds from which they spring, we find them to be naturally arranged in five groups, to which two others were added later. The five represent the five senses, and refer to breathing—connected with the nose: to sound—with the ear: to swallowing—with the mouth: to sight—with the eye: and to touch and movement—with the limbs. The two groups which follow are work and love. In each class there is a cross division, according as the idea is expressed with different parts of the vocal instrument. For breathing we have roots which are guttural, others which are dental, and others again which are labial; and so in each of the other groups as well. The same sound may mean very different things; and until the distinction was made more evident, by the use of combined sounds, from which arose the secondary roots, the distinction must have mainly depended on the accompanying action. It also no doubt depended on tone, and on accompanying expression; and to all these methods not only the language, but

even the writings and the still surviving actions, of primitive men, bear witness clearly.

The language of the Bushman,* whether on account of its never having advanced from the most primitive condition, or because it has gradually retrograded to such a state, perhaps best presents to us the earliest of human attempts at speech. Unlike that of the thick-lipped Bantu race, which is conspicuously marked by its many labial and vowel sounds, the Bushman's vocabulary is mainly guttural. Yet even the Bushman is far advanced in language, beyond the stage when only imitative sounds existed. He has something which can be distinguished as a pronoun for each person of singular and plural, and even some representation of case and gender; he forms plurals by reduplicating the sounds; and he has an elaborate system of nine clicks, which distinguish words otherwise alike. The rest is done by imitative actions; and the Bushman is so lively an actor as to be able often to dispense with any words at all. He is an artist whose rock drawings clearly distinguish the peculiarities of the various animals which he draws, and even of various races—such as Kaffres and Boers, with whom he comes in contact. He has moreover the knowledge of fire, made by the fire drill; he scratches with his nails a lair in the earth; and uses rude spears as well as bows and arrows, together with a hollowed rounded stone, which forms his digging instrument with a piece of wood thrust through. Even the Bushman is not wholly primitive; but in his language we have an example of the various early methods of distinction in speech, made by tones and clicks, by combinations and repetitions, and eked out by dramatic acts.

The use of action is common to all primitive races, and is the resource even of civilized man, in countries where the language is unknown to him, and his own language unknown to the native. The Italian peasant has his well known signs, by which a conversation may be carried on without a single spoken word. The Arab in like manner emphasises all he says

* *The Bushmen and their Language*, by the late G. Bertin, M.R.A.S., Journal Rl. Asiatic Society, Vol. xviii., Part I.

by signs, which are conventional, and which the European has to learn as a new language, since the familiar symbols of his own country are not the same. Among the Chinese and Thibetans, and quite independently among Hottentots, the use of tones in speaking has grown up, in consequence of the decay of the vocabulary, which makes the words so closely alike—though distinct in older dialects—as to necessitate new distinction. Even among ourselves tones often take the place of distinct utterances, and are relied upon more than the actual words used. For mankind has always striven to convey a meaning with the least possible effort, and to speak only with as much distinctness as was needful in order to be understood at all.

It will be readily allowed, in the case of all ideas which are actually connected with sound, that imitation of natural sounds may be the origin of speech; but it will be objected that such an origin can hardly be supposed in any class of words which refer to light and sight. Yet if these have a natural origin we must surely be able to give to them a natural explanation, and this will form an important question for consideration. The same method applies to all stems which are connected with ideas of work and of love; and from such original ideas we must go on to further consideration of the growth of languages, the origin of the names of natural objects, of weapons and of things made by man; and last of all to words for metals and colours, which carry us into the age of early civilized life. We have also to consider whether such words, together with those denoting climate and fauna and custom, and the yet more abstract ideas of gender, number, and person, serve to throw any light on the first habitat of man, or on his earliest attempts at social life.

The sounds which are represented by the earliest simple roots, or stems, may again be divided into classes independent of their actual origin. Thus we hear, or are accustomed to suppose that we hear, in nature, sounds which are guttural, labial, or dental. There are hissing sounds, as we say, in the whisper of the wind, in the burning of damp wood, in the murmur of the stream, and in the breathings of men and

beasts, as also when the arrow or the spear are hurled through the air, or the fire is extinguished with water. There are guttural sounds in animal cries, and even in the sharp echoes due to blows. There are labial sounds in the puffing and pauting of man and beast, and of the wind; while the impact of blows, the patter of feet, the beating of the drum, and similar noises, appear always to have suggested an imitation by a hard dental. Whirring noises, and the growlings of beasts, form another class, and the liquid sounds of water flowing freely. Finally there are the involuntary interjections, such as the guttural *ugh*, which accompanies or is caused by a blow (a true *clamor concomitans* because involuntary), and the universal cries of joy and grief, of surprise and enquiry, which repeat themselves in every language. When the roots of speech are examined they will be found to represent these various sounds; and since these include all that the human voice is able to utter, it follows that from these by some method of differentiation, the human vocabulary must be made. Roughly speaking, man can say K, S, T, R, L, B; and when we add a nasal *ng* and the vowel sounds *ah eh* and *oh*, we have the whole of the apparatus before us, though the combinations may result in tens of thousands of words. The hissing sound may be modified, and may also pass by intermediate steps into the dental *d* or *t*: the R and L are in early speech but little distinguished, from each other or from T; the guttural may be modified into a group of no less than eight forms, as *g, q, c, ch, kh, h, j, and gh*, with other intermediate or softer varieties; and the labial may be modified as *m n p f* and *v*; but the letters A, E, O, K, S, T, R, L, B, represent the great genera under which all human words and sounds may most conveniently be classed.

When we turn to the various classes of roots it is, in many cases, easy to understand their origin in natural sounds; and to see the connection with roots of similar sound in other classes; and when discussing such an explanation it must be borne in mind that actual, and not supposititious roots are intended, which can be proved to be coextensive with the whole range of early Asiatic speech.

Thus if we take the first group connected with ideas of breathing, and so of living, we find that the roots are as follows:—

Vowel.	Guttural.	Dental.	Labial.
WA, 'to breathe.'	GA, 'to live.'	SU, 'produce.'	PU, 'produce.'
		AS, 'breathe.'	BU, 'breathe.'
			MA, 'to be.'

The first of these sounds meant originally to blow like the wind; from it came the Egyptian and Aryan *au*, 'to blow,' and the Assyrian *au* for the wind. We can hardly doubt that the sound is the natural imitation of the whistling of a current of air. The guttural root *ga*, which is universally used in connection with the ideas of 'birth,' does not produce any words connected with the air, and its explanation is perhaps to be sought in its connection with ideas of speech and cries of living things. When however we turn to the dental sounds, we find in them imitations of the whisper of the breeze, and of the panting sounds produced by men and beasts. From these come the Egyptian *us*, 'to create,' and *aas*, 'spirit:' the Aryan *as* 'to breathe,' and *su*, 'to generate,' or 'cause to breathe:' the Mongol *es* for 'spirit,' and *is* 'to live'—all softened in other dialects into the panting sound *ah*; and from such an origin also come the Akkadian *us*, 'man,' the Aryan *ish*, 'vigorous,' and the Hebrew *esh* for 'man'—the breathing one. When again we turn to the labial *pu* or *bu*, we easily discover an imitation of the puffing sound, which is produced by the lips when the breath is expelled. We still speak of the puffing of the wind, and regard the sound as a natural imitation. This easily passes into the *vu* sound, which in early languages is not distinguished from *m*; and for this reason the widely used verb *va* or *ma* for 'being,' may be traced to the same natural origin. To this root belong the Akkadian *ba*, 'to create,' the Egyptian *pu*, 'to be,' and *fau*, 'to beget,' the Aryan *bhu*, 'to be,' and *pu*, 'to beget,' the Hebrew *pah*, 'to blow,' and many words for child or offspring, such as the Egyptian *fua*, and the Finnic *pu*, with the later Aryan *pu-er*; and words again which signify growth, either regarding the growing thing as yet a child, or as swelling and blowing

out. All words for life seem thus to find their natural origin, in the imitation of the sounds of the air, and of the breathing being.

The second class of roots, connected with sound, presents even less difficulty, because the imitative origin is yet more evident. The roots are these :—

Vowel.	Guttural.	Dental.	Labial.
A, 'ah.'	KA, 'cry.'	RA, RU, 'roar.'	BHA, 'speak.'
E, 'eh.'	GU, 'cry.'	NA, 'speak.'	MU, 'bellow.'
O, 'oh.'			

The three first are exclamations which recur in all Asiatic speech, and it is remarkable that while *ah* or *ha* is an expression of joy and surprise, admiration and desire, *oh* seems almost always to be an expression of woe. The natural cause may be found in the fact that pleasurable emotions expand, and painful ones contract the muscles of the face, so that the mouth is naturally formed into the shape which determines the vowel uttered. The child's natural cry of pain is the same all over the world, and the grunt of interrogation is also the same among all.

The gutturals in this class appear to imitate the cackling sounds of men whose language was, like the Bushman's, largely guttural. It is by the root *ka* that all races imitate the crowing of the cock, and the caw of the raven. The cuckoo is so called, not only by Aryans, but by Arabs as well, and the origin of the many words for speech and cry, which come from this guttural root, is evident enough—such as the Egyptian and Akkadian *ka*, 'speech,' 'cry,' the Aryan *agh*, 'speak,' *gu* 'bellow,' the Hebrew *gàh*, 'bellow,' the Mongol *gu*, 'say ;' and hence also the Aryan *kau*, for the lowing animal or 'cow,' which in Mongol speech is nasalised as *ong*.

The labials also are imitative; for *bha*, 'to speak,' in Aryan is the Hebrew *pih*, 'to speak,' and may be compared with the Egyptian *ba*, for the sheep. It is no doubt connected with the root *bu*, 'to breathe,' already met, while *mu*, 'to bellow,' survives unchanged in our nurseries, and produced the Akkadian *am* (also found in Egyptian) for the bull, and *am* or *im* for the 'wind,' or bellowing tempest. It was

also weakened into *au*, from which come a large number of words meaning 'to groan,' 'cry,' 'breathe,' 'sing,' and 'live.'

The third class of roots are those connected with eating, drinking, and choking, intimately connected with the preceding.

Guttural.	Dental.	Labial.
GHA, 'swallow.'	AD, 'eat.'	PA, 'feed.'
AG, 'choke.'	AS, 'eat.'	PI, 'drink.'

In this class the gutturals present no difficulty, as they appear to be imitative of swallowing and choking sounds, naturally connected with the throat. The dental is more difficult to explain, but may perhaps be connected with a root of the fifth class, which signifies to strike—the action of the teeth being here intended. The labials also are not easily explained, unless the sounds are imitative of those natural to the lips when eating and sucking. The sound *pa* is often produced by babies when anxious to suck, and even among beggars is made to intimate hunger; but the sound produced by supping a liquid is more nearly represented by the widely spread word *su* for 'water,' which occurs in Mongol and in Berber speech alike. It is remarkable that the Aryan *swarb*, 'to suck up,' is very like the Semetic *sherb*, 'to drink,' and suggestive of an original natural sound. The old word *ap*, for 'water,' which is found in Akkadian, in Aryan speech, and in Turkish, is no doubt to be connected with *pi*, 'to drink.'

The fourth class is that which requires the most careful consideration, since ideas of light, sight, fire and brilliance, do not suggest any connection with sound. Yet the roots common to all the Asiatic languages which express these ideas are numerous.

Vowel.	Guttural.	Dental.	Labial.
AI, 'bright,'	AK, 'to see,'	DI, 'see,' 'shine,'	BHA, 'shine.'
	KV, 'bright,'	IS, 'light,'	
		US, 'burn,'	
		SAT, 'see,'	
		AB, 'burn,' 'shine,'	

Each of these requires separate consideration, but it is generally clear that there might be two natural sources whence

such words might come ; the first being an exclamation drawing attention to some object, and originally accompanied by a sign pointing it out, and the other applying to words which denote burning, and to the light and heat of the sun, which would at first not be distinguished from the burning of fire. In this latter group the words may spring from imitation of the various hissing, spitting, crackling and roaring noises which accompany fire ; nor is it necessary to suppose that a knowledge of producing fire must first have been acquired, since fires due to natural causes must have been observed long before the great discovery of the firestick, which was perhaps itself due to observation of natural phenomena.

The Semitic words for sight appear to cast most light on this subject. When the Syrian peasant wishes to point out a distant object, he extends his hand in the direction, and vociferates in a rapid and tremulous tone *ha-ha-ha-a-a-a!* This is a conventional exclamation which is universally used among them, yet the syllable is connected with a well known Hebrew word *ha*, 'behold,' 'lo,' which occurs also in Syriac and in Arabic. This again is no doubt the same as the Hebrew *hah*, a cry of joy, answering to the Aryan *aha!* The origin of the root *a* for 'seeing,' is thus apparently explained by an actual instance still observable ; and the words for light which come from the root would be derived from the original exclamation meaning 'behold.' Among these we may recall the Akkadian *ya*, 'glory,' and *ai*, 'moon,' the Egyptian *aah*, 'moon,' which is also found in the Turkish *ai*, and in the Chinese *yueh*, while a later derivative may be the common Semitic '*ain* for 'the eye.'

The guttural root *ak* or *ka*, 'to see,' will thus appear to be only a stronger form of the exclamation *ah*. It occurs in the Egyptian *ka*, 'see,' in the Aryan *ak*, 'see' (whence the word 'eye,') and in the Akkadian and Turkic *ak*, for 'bright,' 'silvery,' 'shining,' 'white.' Presumably the root *KU*, which is very widely disseminated in many languages with the meaning of 'brilliant,' 'precious,' 'gleaming,' 'burning,' may have had originally the same derivation from the old exclamation.

The root *di* or *ti* is very difficult to understand, but widely spread. Thus we have the Akkadian *te*, 'flame,' the Aryan

di, 'shine,' *idh*, 'kindle, and many other derived roots in Egyptian, Hebrew, and Mongol languages. It is perhaps to be regarded as a variation of the roots in S, or as derived from an exclamation like the Aryan *da*, 'there.' The root is connected with light; and *sai* or *si* for 'sight,' is quite as widely distributed, and might be connected with a hissing sound calling attention. This again is only a variant of the original *ah*, for in Aryan and Semitic speech alike, the *s* of one dialect becomes the *h* of another. The root *us*, to burn, which is found in Aryan speech with *was*, 'to shine,' and in the Hebrew *ash*, 'fire,' suggests a connection with the hissing sound of the fire; and the same explanation may be suggested for AR to 'burn,' as connected with AR 'to roar,' whence is derived the ancient name of the dog (*ur*), and of the lion (*ari*). The labial root BHA, 'to shine,' is the most difficult of all to understand. It is found in the Egyptian *ba*, 'illumine,' the Aryan *bha* 'to shine,' and the Hebrew *yapha*, 'shine,' and from it come many secondary roots meaning to shine, burn, or be white.

The fifth class is that of movement and impact, which presents less difficulty than the preceding. The commonest roots of this class are the following:

Vowel.	Guttural.	Dental.	Labial.
YA, 'Go.'	AK, GA, 'go.'	TA, 'beat.'	PA, PAD, 'step.'
		DA, 'put,' 'take.'	
		DA, DU, 'go.'	
		AS, 'throw.'	
		SA, 'go.'	
		IS, 'speed.'	
		RA, RU, 'go.'	
		RI, LI, 'flow.'	
		AL, 'rise.'	
		NA, 'go.'	

It is remarkable in this list that the large majority of the roots are dental. The vowel root I or YA is not widely spread though it occurs both in Aryan speech and in the Egyptian *i*, 'go.' The origin of this, and of the guttural, which occurs in the Akkadian *ga*, 'send,' the Egyptian *ga*, 'remove,' the Aryan *ga*, 'go,' the Hebrew *aga*, 'flee,' may perhaps be sought in an exclamation used in driving animals. Thus the Italian and

the Arab alike drive their beasts with the strong guttural exclamation *hah*, and the familiar click used in driving a horse among ourselves belongs to the same class of sounds. As regards the labial it occurs in the Egyptian *bu* and *peh*, 'to go,' the Aryan *pad*, 'to go,' the Turkic *pa*, 'foot,' but the commoner form is *pat*, as in the Medic *putta*, 'go,' Egyptian *pet*, 'foot,' Hebrew *abad*, 'wander,' Turkic *but*, 'foot.' Whatever be the original form, it would seem that a pattering sound is intended, and we still use the root in speaking of the pattering of feet.

The strong dental is found in the Akkadian *ta*, 'drive,' 'beat,' in the Egyptian *ta*, 'beat,' and in the Chinese *ta* 'beat;' and many secondary roots are formed from it in all Asiatic languages. It was no doubt imitative of the sound of impact, and the roots *da*, 'to put,' *da*, 'to go,' *da*, 'to take' or 'give,' are variations of the original *ta*, and represent the sound of hand striking hand, and of the foot striking the earth, the motion expressed being usually not rapid; whereas from the root *sa* spring words which signify violent or rapid movement—running, hurling, and the rush of water. These find explanation through the root of the first class already discussed. The words for arrow and javelin, which are connected with *as*, 'to throw,' seem to indicate the swish of the air as the projectile whistles through it, and the same swish accompanies the running of living things, and the rapid flow of the torrent. The palatals are however less easily understood, though by common consent the liquid sound appears to have been made to represent the melting of snow, the flow of water, and the licking of the tongue. In all families of speech *r* and *l* are undistinguished in early stages: thus we have the Akkadian *raa*, 'irrigate,' *ari*, 'flow,' the Egyptian *aru*, 'river,' the Hebrew *yar*, 'river,' *rah*, 'drink,' the Turkic *ir*, 'flow,' the Finnic *zur*, 'flood,' the Aryan *ri*, 'go,' 'flow;' and on the other hand the Aryan *li*, 'flow,' 'melt,' with its secondary form *lik*, the Hebrew *lakh*, 'moist,' the Mongol *ilu*, 'overflow,' and the Chinese *lau*, 'flow.' A very remarkable resemblance is also found in words for rising up, as in the Akkadian *il*, 'rise,' Egyptian *ar*, 'go up,' Aryan *ar*, *al*, 'go up,' Hebrew *al*, 'high,' and Turkic *al*, 'high.' The root *na*, to go, is also widely spread, as in the Akkadian

na, 'go forward,' Egyptian *na*, 'go,' Aryan *nas*, 'go,' *nak*, 'reach,' Hebrew *nagà*, 'to come to,' which may however belong to the guttural class. It is not easy in these cases to understand the origin of the sounds.

There remain to be considered the ancient roots which have reference to work and to love, of which the first is the larger and more primitive, including—

Vowel.	Guttural.	Dental.	Labial.
WA, 'bind,'	GA 'bend,'	SU, 'join,'	AP, 'join.'
		AR, 'join,'	
		NA, 'join,'	

A great many words for work also spring from the root TA, 'to beat'; and still more numerous are the secondary roots, such as *sap*, 'hew,' *kut*, 'cut,' *kar*, 'make,' etc. It is difficult to trace the origin of these early words for work, though GA, 'to bend,' might be connected with GHA, 'to choke.' The fact that most of the words for work are secondary roots, would seem to indicate that the formation of these roots accompanied the advance of human intelligence, in power of manufacture and in early arts. The same is very remarkable in connection with words expressing love. These are all secondary, with exception of the Aryan *aw*, 'to desire,' which compares with the Turkish *oi*, 'fancy,' and the Chinese *oi*, 'love,' and may perhaps spring from the old root AW, 'to blow' or 'breathe.'*

The occurrence of these simple roots, in languages of such distinct classes, does not by itself prove the original unity of speech. Such words as *mau*, for the cat, (occurring in the Egyptian and Chinese alike), might arise independently in different countries; and the imitation of natural sounds may

* The meaning might be 'to pant after' or 'yearn for'; but it should be observed that kissing is not an universal human custom, and that an older sign of affection, common among savages, consists in smelling or snuffing the face of the beloved one, which may indicate the origin of the word. The Aryan *bas*, 'kiss,' is the same as the Semitic word for kiss, but in other languages the words are very different, though all apparently imitative.

have led to like results in independent instances. But it is not only the simple primary roots which run through all Asiatic speech: the secondary and sometimes the tertiary roots are also common. There are not less than 170 roots in all which can be so traced, and many derived words are also common to languages which are very widely separated by grammatical construction; as has been observed over and over again by all students of comparative philology. These coincidences are too numerous to be passed over as merely accidental, and especially important when we consider the method of formation of the secondary roots.

The secondary roots are of two classes, namely, first those which are reduplications, and secondly those which are formed by combination of two primary roots.

The course of time caused these combinations to be so elided and shortened into monosyllables that their origin was thereby obscured, but in many cases it is very clearly traceable yet. The reduplication gave the impression of continuous action of one kind, whereas the secondary category enabled man to distinguish sounds and actions which were akin, but not identical; and it was on this basis that language rose to become what it already was five thousand years ago.

As an instance of reduplication may be noticed the root *kak*, common to Aryan and Finnic speech, with the meaning to 'cackle,' and clearly a reduplication of *ka*, 'to call.' In the nineteenth century was invented the nursery word *puff-puff* for an engine or train, derived from its puffing continuously; while the word *puff* itself is only a reduplication of the older *pu*, to blow or pant. The category of roots which combine two distinct sounds is best understood by the consideration of what are called 'clam-shell' words in Chinese, which are common in the spoken rather than in the written language, and due to the disintegration of the original dialects, which has rendered so many words indistinguishable from each other. Thus to 'spy' is expressed by *kwei-kien*, 'to peep-look'; and *ta-shui*, 'to strike-sleep,' means to fall asleep. Chinese also gives us instances of reduplication, such as *kien*, 'to look,' and *kien-kien*, 'to look earnestly' (that is to repeat the look), but

even with these aids great confusion would exist without the use of tones; for *fu* according to its tone signifies 'to call,' 'to support,' 'a treasury,' 'a wife,' 'riches,' or 'father.'* Chinese, indeed, is not a type of primitive, but rather of decayed language, and nothing is more unsafe than to trust to its vocabulary, although the lessons to be drawn from its grammar are of the highest interest.

The secondary roots seem, then, to have arisen from the primary, just as the clam-shell words have been devised in Chinese, with the object of clearly distinguishing varieties of meaning; and, as in the Chinese, they (and the tertiary roots also) are sometimes due to the prefixing of some word, such as *as*, *ta*, etc., signifying action. The prefixed *s* in Hebrew, in Assyrian, in Egyptian, and in Aryan speech, has a causative meaning, and represents the old verb *As*, 'to be' or 'become'; while the prefixed *t* is the remains of the old verb *ta*, 'to beat,' 'to compel,' and so 'to cause.' As instances of the clam-shell arrangement, we may recall *BAR*, 'to shine,' found in all Asiatic languages, and probably a combination of the two primary roots already mentioned, *BHA*, 'to shine,' and 'AR,' 'to burn'; or in another class *RAG*, 'to go,' from *RA*, 'go,' and *GA*, 'go.' The Semitic languages are so rich in these secondary roots, and have so few left of the primary, as to lead to their grammatical arrangement in dictionaries under the headings of trilateral or bisyllabic roots; though only in about a third of the cases is the root truly trilateral, being often formed either by reduplication, or by a vowel, and presenting in the imperative its oldest form as a monosyllable.

The Asiatic languages are divided into four great groups, which again are connected in two pairs. The first pair includes the Egyptian which is agglutinative (or in other words, has not as yet softened down the joints of speech by the wear and tear of the words), and the Semitic languages which are inflexional (that is to say, which have been so melted down by time as often not to show the mode of building up the word); but these two groups are connected not only by a large

* E. J. Eitel, *Dictionary of the Cantonese Dialect*, p. 19.

vocabulary, including names of colours and numbers, particles, and common verbs, but also by the use of the pronouns ANK, 'I,' and ANT, 'thou,' and by the grammatical structure which places the genitive after its nominative, and which distinguishes the feminine by the addition of T. To this great group belong also the Berber languages of North Africa. The second pair includes the Mongol or Turanian languages, which are agglutinative, and the Aryan, which are inflexional; and these, though perhaps less intimately connected than the preceding, are distinguished by placing the genitive before the nominative, and by the use of the pronouns M or V for 'I,' and T or S for 'thou.'

It would seem that the separation of these groups must have occurred very early, and before the use of pronouns and of a regular syntax had arisen, but, on the other hand, there are demonstratives, and a plural form, which serve to tie together all four families of speech, just as they are also connected by the secondary roots. Thus the demonstratives *ma*, 'this' (from MA, 'to be'), *sa*, 'that' (from AS, 'to exist'), and KA, 'who' (from GA, 'to be'), occur throughout all Asiatic speech, however much the various families may differ in the specialising of other pronouns. The oldest method of forming the plural by reduplicating the word—as in Bushman language, in Akkadian, and in Chinese—seems to have given way at an early period to the suffixed N, to mark 'multitude.' Thus *na* is the Mongol plural, found also in Akkadian and Hittite. In Semitic languages N is the common masculine plural, as also in Egyptian, and it is one of many plurals used by the Aryans. The connection of Egyptian with Semitic, and of Mongolic with Aryan speech, has been indicated by many well known scholars. The ultimate connection of all four families is shown by the identity of roots and demonstratives, and of many simple words.

Such then briefly sketched appears to be the natural basis of speech, as indicated not only by the most ancient languages, but also by the exclamations and the imitative words of our own time, and by the customs of savages and of primitive peasants. There is nothing arbitrary or conventional in

the origin of human words; but there is a true distinction between intelligent language and animal cries; and already five thousand years ago the great families of Asiatic speech had become widely distinguished, by structure and grammar even more than by vocabulary, and had (with exception of the Aryan) been committed to syllabic writing in at least three different scripts, which only resemble one another in those signs which refer to the simplest ideas of movement, grasping, beating and pouring, or in emblems which represent animals, and the early weapons and manufactured articles (pots, vases, boats, thrones, houses, altars, and the like) which man was able to construct.

We may now turn to the simple names of animals, to words denoting climate, and to those which are connected with arts and civilization; and may thus endeavour to learn something of the common home and early manners of the original Asiatic stock. The names of weapons (even including the bow), of colours, of numbers, and of deities, do not run through the whole circle of the various families, as do the simpler ideas already noticed. They are formed on the same principles, but form very various roots. Thus the names of weapons denote thrusting, cutting, striking, and hacking; and defensive armour is named from roots meaning to cover, to hide, to strengthen, or to protect. In the same way the name of the bow usually comes from one of several roots meaning to bend, but the root is not the same one in every case. The abstract idea of colour is very late, but the four chief colours are very early named. The colour red is connected with words for fire and for blood; blue is connected with words for the sky; white with words for light and shining; and black with words for burning. Yellow and green are little distinguished in early languages, and are connected with words for the sun and for light. Purple and other secondary colours were only distinguished in later times. The Semitic and Egyptian languages agree in the words for red, white and black, and connect them with blood, light and burning; but no such comparison is possible in other cases. The names of numbers are connected, as has often been shewn, with the fingers

and the hand, but these are more variable and distinctive than perhaps any other class of words. The names of metals come from roots meaning to be yellow, white, red, or dark, to be heavy or strong; but the discovery of the use of metals was not made till long after the separation of the great stocks, in the various cradles in which they grew up as distinct races. Of all the names of deities only those which come from the root *as*, 'to breathe,' seem to suggest any connection; but it is from this root that the Sanskrit *asura*, the Zend *ahura*, the Norse *Æsyr*, the Akkadian *es*, the Turkic *es*, and the Egyptian *aas*, appear all to have been formed, meaning in every case 'the breathing' or 'living' one.

The animals named by early man were those most conspicuous, most terrible, or most useful, and appear to include the lion, and perhaps the dog, the ox and perhaps the sheep, the ass and not impossibly the camel, but not the horse. Animals distinguishable by the cries they uttered appear to have been named from those cries—especially in the case of birds; but animals which had no distinctive cry were named from some marked peculiarity—the hump, the horns, the speed, or the savageness, which chiefly distinguished them.

Names for the lion were formed from the root RA or LA, 'to roar,' which appears to be clearly imitative. Thus we have the Akkadian *ur*, 'lion,' and the Turkic *ars-lan*, where the suffix signifies 'beast.' In Hebrew we find *ari*, 'lion,' and from the cognate roots *la*, 'to roar,' come the Hebrew *labi*, the Aryan *leo*, and perhaps (if not a loan word) the Egyptian *labu*. It has been supposed that these names are loan words from Semitic speech, but since the root is common to all the various languages, it appears possible at least that the lion was named from the very earliest times.

Among the many names for cattle none are commoner than those which come from the roots MU and BU, 'to bellow.' Hence we have the Akkadian *am*, 'bull,' the Turkic *en-ek*, 'cow,' the Egyptian *am*, 'cattle,' and the Mongol *buku*, 'bull;' but a more distinctive word is TOR, which seems to mean probably 'horned,' and which appears not only as *Taurus*, but as the Semitic *Thor*, and the Mongol *Shor*. The bull, whether tamed

or wild, was no doubt well known to early man. The names for goat are also suggestive of connection, and include the Aryan *ais*, the Semitic *az*, and probably the Akkadian *uz*. For sheep, perhaps the oldest word is the Egyptian *ba*; but there is a word for lamb which seems to be widely distributed, as the Semetic *kar*, the Greek *kar*, and the Finnic *kari*, probably from the root KAR, 'to enclose' or 'guard,' as meaning a herded flock. From the same-root come words for pasture, no doubt allied.

The ass is generally supposed to bear the same name in all families of speech. In Akkadian its sound is doubtful, but in Turkic speech it is *as-ek* (with the noun ending in *ek*) while in Egyptian it is *su*. The Aryan *asinus* has been compared with the Semitic *athon*, for 'ass,' and all these words seem to come from the old root AS, 'to blow,' or 'breathe,' and to be thus connected with the softer form *ah*, and so with the note of the animal, which is its greatest peculiarity. In other languages the ass is called *khara*, 'he who cries out,' from a similar origin. It may be conjectured that the ass was not unknown to primitive man.

The names for the camel are various, but the oldest seems to be *gam-al*, or the 'beast with the hump,' which has been thought to be a loan word from Semitic speech, but which has no true Semitic derivation. Another loan word is the name *ab* or *hab* for the elephant, which occurs in Tamil, in Sanskrit, in Egyptian, and in Semitic speech, but which was probably invented in or near India. The names for the horse are all very various, agreeing only in their derivation from roots meaning 'to run,' or 'to be speedy.' The taming of the horse seems only to have occurred in a time of early civilization, long after the separation of the various Asiatic stocks. Nor is there any word for the dog, which is common to all the languages under consideration, though the Egyptian *huns* appears as the Chinese *huen*, and the Aryan *kun*. In Mongolic speech *kono* is the wolf,' and Semitic races, who hated dogs, derived his name from KALB, 'to yelp,' which is also an Aryan root. The root KAN, or KUN, from which the other name proceeds, has also the meaning of making a noise, whence come other words for

sound, such as the Hebrew *kon*, 'to sing,' Turkic *kiing*, 'to make a hollow noise,' and Chinese *cheung*, 'to sing.'

Passing over the names of such birds as the cock and the cuckoo, which give no evidence of original derivation, since they may have been separately invented, it may be noted that hardly any bird, unless it be the duck (Semitic, *but*, Egyptian *apt*, Chinese *aap*) seems to have been named in a primitive period. The Aryans also had no known common name for fish, though the Egyptian *Kha* is the same as the Akkadian *Kha* or *Khan*, the Mongol and Finnic *Kala*, and the Chinese *gu*, all meaning 'fish.' The Semitic word *Samak* is quite distinct. Among reptiles the serpent was no doubt early named from its hissing, or from its coiling, but the common word, if it existed, seems to have been lost. Snakes being found in so many parts of the world, the evidence due to such a word would have little importance.

The names of trees were also given in later times, but there is a word for wood which may be very ancient. The Semitic *ez* or *etz* recalls the Greek *ozos*, 'branch,' and perhaps the Finnic *oks*, 'wood,' and Akkadian *iz*. The Akkadian *tir*, for 'tree-trunk,' may also compare with the Aryan *dru*, and with the Finnic *tel* for 'wood.' The names of forest trees, in Aryan and in Semitic speech alike, come from the root *al* 'to rise up,' or 'become strong.'

Of all weapon names the only words which present any affinity are those which connect the word for stone with the root *sak*, 'to cut.' This root is common to all the various families of speech, and its connection with the Aryan word for stone (Latin *Saxum*) has been long pointed out, with the very natural deduction that the original cutting instruments were of stone—a fact which is proved by the widespread use of flint instruments, not only in Europe but also in Egypt and in Asia. The Egyptian *sen* and the Turkic *sang* alike mean 'stone,' and in Arabic we have *suwan* for the 'flint stone,' all which words may come from the old root, *Sak*.

As regards agriculture it is remarkable that the word for seed and sowing is found in all branches of Asiatic speech. In Egyptian we find *su*, 'seed,' and in Akkadian *se*. The

Mongolic is *is*, and *sa-sa*, means to sow,' as does the Aryan *sa*; the meaning of the root may perhaps be clear to those who have heard the hissing sound which is produced by the scattering of seed. It is almost impossible to suppose that the word can be a loan from any particular language, and its wide distribution seems to argue a very great antiquity for some form of rude agriculture. This view is also supported by the appearance of the root *Kar*, 'to enclose' in all Asiatic speech. The English *acre* finds its equivalent in the Akkadian *agar* for 'field,' which is the Turkic *akyer*, the Finnic *aker*, the Greek *agros*, and Sanskrit *agra*. In Egyptian we find *har*, 'a field,' and in Semitic languages (as in Greek) *car* for 'pasture.'

The oldest word for a habitation appears to have been *ab* or *bu*. Both forms occur in Egyptian, and in Akkadian we have *ab*, 'house,' which is the Turkic *oba*. In Sanskrit, *bhu* means not only 'to be' but also 'to build,' whence *bha-vana*, 'a house,' and the origin would therefore seem to be from the root *bhu*, 'to exist,' as meaning the place where a man dwelt or lived. In Hebrew we have *bu*, 'to enter into a house,' from which perhaps *beth*, 'house,' is really derived. There are several other verbs meaning 'to enclose,' from which widely distributed terms for dwellings have arisen, and it is to be noted that the secondary verb *dag*, 'to cover,' or 'roof,' is common to Aryan, Semitic, and Mongol speech.

Some indications also exist to shew the very early knowledge of pottery, and of rude sewing; and in the early lake dwellings, the dolmen tombs, and similar remains of prehistoric ages, we find both rude pottery, and the rude joining of skins and stuffs to be common. The verb *tok*, meaning 'to mould,' may be compared with the Akkadian *tag*, 'to make,' the Egyptian *takh*, 'to beat,' the Aryan *dhigh*, 'to mould,' the Hebrew *tavakh*, 'to daub,' and the Turkic *tog*, 'to smooth.' The Aryan *su*, 'to sew,' compares with the Finnic *sovo*, 'to weave,' and with the Semitic *sawa*, 'to join;' and the Aryan root *wab*, 'to weave,' or *ap*, 'to join,' 'to bind,' recalls the Hebrew *a'ub*, 'to wrap,' the Turkic *ip*, 'to bind,' the Chinese *ipi*, 'clothes,' and the Egyptian *ab-ti*, 'to spin.'

How early the discovery of fire was made we may perhaps

judge from the root *pah*, 'to cook,' which is recognisable in the Egyptian *pes*, Aryan *pak*, Hebrew *aphah*, and Turkic *bis*, 'to cook': few indeed are the savage races which know not how to make fire, by rubbing sticks or by the fire drill; and, as we have already seen, the common words for fire appear to be widely distributed over all the various families of Asiatic speech. The vicinity of the Caspian, which was known to the Persians as the 'land of fire,' and of Caucasus, which is intimately connected in Greek legends with Prometheus, the inventor of fire, are not improbable regions for the first discovery of fire. The Caspian itself often blazes with the burning rock oil on its surface: the Parsee still comes from afar to worship the holy fire of this region of petroleum; and this rock oil was as well known to Herodotus and to Darius, as to the Russians of our own time. (See Herod. vi. 119.)

As regards the social relations, it is well known that the old words *Pa* and *Ma*, for 'father' and 'mother,' are widely used, being either children's terms, or coming from the roots which signify 'to generate' and 'to make.' The words for brother, sister, son and daughter, are on the other hand very various, though, as already noticed, there is a very ancient and widely-used word *pu* for 'child,' from which the Semitic *ben*, known also in Egyptian and in Berber speech, may be an offshoot.

It remains to consider the words which are connected with climate and with the course of time. There is an ancient root *kar* or *kal*, from which many words for cold are taken. The Turkic *kar*, and the Aryan *gal*, have the same meaning: the Semitic *sheleg*, 'snow,' compares with the Aryan *snigh*, 'snow,' and the Semitic *barad*, 'cold,' 'frost,' with the Aryan *prus*, 'to freeze.' As regards time, the word for the moon (Egyptian, *aah*, Akkadian, *ai*, Turkic *ai*) comes from the root 'to be bright,' but words for the sun are innumerable. From the root *sar* or *sal* come words for time, such as the Turkic *sal*, 'year,' the Zend *sare-da*, 'year,' and the Semitic *sar*, 'a cycle.' It is well known that the earliest year of ancient races was lunar (amongst Semitic tribes, Aryans, Akkadians, and Egyptians alike), and that the year was originally divided into three seasons among all these various peoples. It is not necessary, or

indeed possible, to suppose that such a system was borrowed by any one of these races from another.

The evidence of language must not be pressed too far, and the possibilities of loans or of independent origins for words must always be kept in sight. Yet this evidence is so abundant, and of such varied kinds, that it can hardly be doubted that the Asiatic languages, like the Asiatic races, had a common origin, and that the Asiatics had advanced to some rude conditions of social life before the separation of the original stock. Not only did man then possess intelligent speech, but he had already named the animals with which he was familiar, he already had stone implements, and sowed seed, and pastured cattle, he had already, perhaps, learned to make rude pottery, and to roof his hut or tent: he had some conception of the seasons, and some idea of spirits not incarnate. He had, in short, reached that stage of progress which various scholars have independently established, as representing the earliest known social condition of each of the great stocks. Like the Bushman, he may already have learned to draw, and, indeed, the prehistoric representations of the mammoth and the bison, of fish and deer, found in European caves, shew how very early such presentments of animal forms were attempted, agreeing with the wide distribution of the root *sar* or *sor*, with the meaning of scratching, drawing and writing, and with the fact that so many primitive emblems are common to the Akkadian, the Egyptian, the Hittite, and the Chinese systems of hieroglyphic writing. But as yet man knew neither weapons nor metals, had neither named colours, nor attempted to count beyond two or three; and civilisations grew up on the Euphrates, the Volga, and the Nile, which were distinct and native.

If we would further inquire as to the centre from which the ancient Asiatic stocks divided off, the evidence of language would seem to point to a temperate region, where cold and snow were not unknown, and yet where the lion probably existed, and perhaps the camel; where the ass had been tamed, and pasture for flocks existed. This region also was no doubt central, for it is well determined that Eastern Asia was peopled

from the West, and Europe from the East, while the great civilisations all arose not far from the eastern shores of the Mediterranean. The healthy highlands of Armenia present the required climate and the required fauna, in a combination which it would be difficult to find elsewhere, and in a central situation, having the Aryan cradle on the Volga to the north, the Semitic home on the southern Euphrates to the south, and the Mongol centre near the Caspian to the east. It is in this region, perhaps (to which the traditions of so many races point), that the home of primitive man may hereafter be found when the exploration of caves and prehistoric dwellings is carried beyond the present narrow limits of Western Europe. Already it is known that lake dwellings exist in this region, like those of northern Italy, or those which Herodotus described in Thrace. Already it is certain that the Akkadians and the Hittites pushed south and west from Armenia, and that some of the most Archaic Aryan customs are to be discovered among the Iron or Ossetes of the Caucasus. The racial character and physical type of the Egyptians is Asiatic rather than African, and their language is closely connected with the speech of the southern or Semitic family of Asiatic man.

How early the great separation occurred we have nothing to tell us. The races and their languages and civilizations were already distinct and somewhat advanced about 2500 or 3000 B.C., and according to some scholars even a thousand years earlier; but in an illiterate age these changes may have been wrought with startling rapidity. Among the Caffres the change of dialects is so rapid that in the third or fourth generation an isolated family becomes unable to understand the parent speech. All the variations of European language, as is now shewn by those who have discarded the old genealogical theory in favour of the more reasonable supposition of the development of many contemporary dialects, may have been wrought out in less than five thousand years, and were especially rapid before the art of writing became known. The Egyptians and the Mongols seem to have been the first to learn to write, and their languages have been the slowest to change: the innumerable dialects of China seem all to have

arisen within the last three thousand years, and the identity of the common roots of speech over the wide area of Asia and Europe is in favour of a short rather than of a long period of development. But these are questions concerning which science at present gives only uncertain indications, though such as they are these point to the natural origin of all human speech; to the common ancestry of all Asiatic, and perhaps of all other human families of mankind; and to a common home in the temperate regions of Western Asia.

C. R. CONDER.

ART. VII.—THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL HISTORY OF EUROPE.

Third Lecture.

WE have not much material of very early dates from Russia; the earliest probably comes from the kitchen-middens on the Baltic, whence some very short and broad skulls are reported to have been gotten.

Thus we have in Russia something like the same difficulty that we have in the west. Long heads—long and very narrow—may have prevailed; but short ones did occur, and were not merely the product of rickets or hydrocephalus, but indicate the existence of a brachycephalic race or race element. Almost all parts of Russia abound with kurgans or tumuli of different kinds, mostly sepulchral. Of these probably the oldest are in the south, and are supposed to belong to the Scythian period. The few skulls got from them are mostly long, but in the rich barrow-tomb of a Scythian king, described by Von Baer, the heads which he took to belong to the ruling race yielded an average index of 81. The philological evidence is thought to point rather to the Iranian affinity of the Scythians; but the evidence of these skulls, and that given by Hippocrates as to their physique, in conjunction with their character and history, make me think that they were Turanian. And I must plead guilty to the heresy, in spite of

Professor Rhys, of believing the Kimmerians, the sons of Gomer, to have been either Kelts or Gauls, not unrelated to the Kymri of Wales and to our own Strath-clyde Welshmen.

The growth of the broad-headed element is shown in the following table by Bogdanof; it relates to the Government of Kiev:—

		Dolicho.	Meso.	Brachy.
Scytho-Sarmatian Period,	-	6	1	1
Early Slavish Period,	-	9	2	7
9th to 18th Century,	-	10	6	6

Here the early population, which may have been Finnish, Germanic, Lithuanian, Sarmatic,—who can tell?—is replaced by the Slavs with their moderately broad heads; but once established, the Slavish type does not seem to have varied much. The anthropological history of Russia, from, say A.D. 4 or 500 up to 1200, may be summed up thus: 1. Emigration or vanishing of Germanic and Sarmatic tribes, Goths, Alans, perhaps Rhozalani. 2. Spread of the Slavs from their old centre, supposed to have been Poland, Galicia, Volhynia, over all western, central, and north-western Russia, destroying or rather incorporating the numerous Finnish tribes who were their predecessors, or in some instances pushing them out of their old seats; whence, 3rd, Migration of some of the Finns towards the west, those of the Tavastian section, whose modern descendants are mostly fair and with moderate breadth-indices, moving into Finland to mix with the Swedes, or into Esthonia, whence they expelled the Letts, a Lithuanic, Aryan people—those of the Karelian division, generally darker in hair, and broader in head, also moving westwards, but in the rear of their brethren.

Nothing is more calculated to throw doubt on the extremely high valuation of skull-breadth as an indication of race, than the phenomena of that kind in the Finnish tribes. For there is a certain amount of general physical resemblance among them all: it is not merely that their languages are related; yet nevertheless they vary extremely in index of breadth; thus the Lapps stand at about 84·7, (Hallsten says 86·5, Von der Horck, 86·5), the Chuds at 83·3, the Finns of Karelia about

82, of Tavastland 80,* which is also that of some skulls from ancient Kurgans at Saivatapala; the Esths stand about 78, the Liefs, their nearest kindred, the same, the Vesses and Vöts 80, according to Mainow, but Iwanowski makes the heads of the latter rather longer. The same kind of facts are encountered among the Oriental Finns, but the details of these may as well be deferred until after the consideration of the great Tartar invasion, which complicated the anthropology of eastern Russia considerably. The facial physiognomy seems to be more characteristic than the cranial. The skull usually gives the impression of squareness, whether viewed from above or from behind, but in some tribes, and particularly in the Bulgarians, it may be styled cylindrical. The face is broad in proportion to its length, from the development of the cheekbones; the brows level and but little prominent, the orbital openings wide and low, the eyes narrow and often a little obliquely set, the nose straight or hollow and prominent at the tip if anywhere. These points seem to be common to most if not all of the Finnish or Ugrian tribes; they appear, for example, in the Mordwins, and not unfrequently in the Bulgarians, though these last are much mixed with Turkish as well as still more largely with Slavic blood.

Coloration varies in all these tribes. In the Esthonians proper the hair is said to be generally yellow, or yellowish brown, and straight; this is a race-character. The temperament seems to be a mixture of the lymphatic and melancholic; Von Baer remarks that some are truly melancholic, and that these are apt to have black hair; they are said, accordingly, to be patient, slow to anger, self-restrained, but persevering, and formidable when once roused. All this again seems to be common to almost all the Ugrian race.

The Merians, who of all the greater Ugrian tribes we know, were earliest and most completely Russianized, though I have little doubt that others had disappeared so early that their very names had been lost—the Merians who inhabited the central provinces around Moscow have been minutely studied

* See Gustav Retzius as to the Finlanders.

as to their ethnology, their arts and modes of life, by Count Uvarof, who opened an immense number of their sepulchral barrows or kurgans. Their name is not mentioned in history later than A.D. 907, and doubtless they were already by that time much mixed with Russians. Many localities retain the names they gave, much, let us say, as localities in Aberdeenshire or Fife retain their old Keltic names; this permanence of names is more likely to occur where the relations between the waxing and the waning race have been friendly on the whole, as was probably the case between the Merians and the Russians. For though the Merians were tall and strong (their stature was from 5ft. 6in. to 5ft. 10in.), they were a pacific people, and though their civilization was by no means of low type, they were poor. They had ornaments of bronze and silver, however, and seem to have acquired pearl, silk and fine cloth by trade with the Arabs and Bulgarians. The rite of Sutti, which Ibn Foslan, who travelled among them in 921, and saw the obsequies of a prince, has described, may have belonged to them as well as to the Slavs.

As they were taller than the modern population, so were they longer-headed, with an index of breadth varying a good deal, from 65 upwards, but averaging perhaps 73 or 74, which is less than that of any existing Finnish tribe. Their hair was rather dark than light brown, if we may trust to the colour of such as is found in the graves.

Further north also the process of Russification was always going on. The populations of Novgorod and Pskov, energized by a cross of Swedish blood through the Varangians, spread their colonies among the Finns of the north as far as Archangel and the Petchora. Howorth thinks the Votiaks or Vod were pushed by them eastwards to their present seats in Viatka, much as the Esths were driven westward (the Letts to this day call the Esths 'Iggauns,' 'the expelled ones').* The suggestion that the Vods were the Budini, (Vodini) of the Greeks seems inevitable.

* It is said, however, that the Novgorodians found the Votiaks in Viatka in the 12th century.

For the Budini were noted for their red hair, and the modern Votiaks are among the reddest or most rufous of men; they are commonly said to be all redhaired, but Malijew's figures do not bear out this extreme statement. He gives the following percentages—red hair 11, flaxen 7, light brown 15, brown 29, dark brown 32, black 2, grey 4. But no less than 47 had red beards. They have rather broad heads (79·8), are rather short and thick set (5ft. 4½in.), their eyes are oftener blue or grey than brown. On the whole, except for the comparative deficiency of black hair among them, their colours are not very unlike those of the people of Athol and Mar, where red hair is more abundant than in any other part of Britain.

The Votiaks are not far behind in civilization. They are said to have learned much from the Tartars, but not to have mixed blood with them, though these same irrepressible invaders penetrated even beyond them, to their kindred tribe, the Voguls in the Ural mountains.

The dreadful energy and persistence of these Mongols in their two great invasions of Russia in 1237 and 1239, is as impressive as their atrocious cruelty and destructiveness. Of all the settled portions of the country only Novgorod and the north-west escaped, owing to a sudden thaw rendering the previously frozen ground absolutely impracticable. City after city was taken, sacked, burned, and its inhabitants massacred; to submit was usually death, to attempt resistance was worse. Reading the story in the pages of Howorth or Karamsin, one compares it with that of Khorassan, which was the richest and most civilized province of Western Asia before the Mongols entered it, but which they left a desolate wilderness, a condition from which it has never recovered. But one may better compare the ravages of the Mongols in Russia to those of the Danes in Britain. Though the latter were less destructive, they achieved their success owing very much to the same causes, the greater hardihood of their men, their superiority in weapons and generalship, the subjection of the victims to an emasculating form of religion, and (this was more marked in Russia) the disuse of arms by the inferior classes. If the Scotch had lagged behind in civi-

lization, such as civilization was at the period of our Danish invasions, they were perhaps on that very account better able to resist a barbarian invader than were the Saxon English. To show how great was the fear of the Tartars even in remote countries, we may quote Gibbon, cited by Howorth, who says that through fear of them the fishermen of Sweden and Frisia failed, in 1238, to attend the herring fishery on the British coast; and that from this cause herrings were dear.

It was not only the Slavic inhabitants of Russia that were swept with the besom of destruction. Bolgari, the old commercial mart of Eastern Russia, the metropolis of Old Bulgaria, the region whence had issued both the Magyars and the Bulgars of the Danube, was utterly destroyed. The people thereabout had probably been a mixture of the two Finnish types already spoken of, of which the one is represented by the Esthonians, the other, darker and with broader head, by the Tchuds; but ancient skulls have been little sought for there. The remnants of the earlier Turkish races in the south were partly incorporated: others, as the Khomans, fled westwards, and were received in Hungary, where their descendants still remain, but do not exhibit their ancient Turkish breadth of head: the cause of the change was probably their long sojourn in Little Russia, where the prehistoric population, from the time of the Scythians, had been mainly long-headed, and may have been incorporated.

The Mongols were of course but a minority, and a rather small minority, in the great Golden Horde, the majority of which was composed of the debris of various Turkish tribes, more or less mixed with those of conquered nations, Persians, Circassians, Alans, and so forth. There was at least one Englishman in Batu Khan's army. The Mongol and Turkish types are well known, and were probably originally identical or nearly so; but the Turks, lying to the west of the Mongols, came earlier into contact with the Iranian nations, and by mixture with them beautified their own type. The original one, which may be called Turanian, though some anthropologists look on it as an infantine form arrested, is free from most

of the points to which Schaafhausen objects as primitive or savage; it is large and capacious, without large frontal sinuses or protuberant occiput or projecting jaws. As a rule, no doubt these people are of low intellectual power; but some of their early monarchs were able men. There are curious legends about the origin of Jinghiz Khan's family from a supernatural ancestor, who is represented as fair and blue-eyed; but whether this is an astronomical myth, or whether it points to early admixture of the ruling stock with a higher race, I will not hazard an opinion.

The moral qualities of the Mongols are thus summed up by a Persian writer, and could not be better adapted for savage and irregular warfare. 'They have,' says Vassaf, 'the courage of lions, the endurance of dogs, the prudence of cranes, the cunning of foxes, the farsightedness of ravens, the rapacity of wolves, the keenness for fighting of cocks, the tenderness for their offspring of hens (here is one redeeming feature), the wiliness of cats in approaching, and the impetuosity of boars in overthrowing their prey.'

During the decline of the power of the Golden Horde, and after its adherents had been broken up into the three Khanates of the Crimea, of the Nogays and of Kasan, their incursions continued exceedingly destructive. They are even said to have carried off, when they sacked Moscow in 1571, no less than 800,000 captives—a great exaggeration doubtless, but not without some foundation. Great numbers of these must have perished on the journey, but on the whole the Slav element in the south and on the Volga must have been increased in this way; but it is not so clear how it came to pass that the Tartar element was largely imported into Great Russia or Muscovy, which however, we shall see, was certainly the case.

Since the capture of Kazan and the reduction of the Crimea to a Russian province, only one striking anthropographical change has occurred, viz., the emigration *en masse* of the Kalmuks from the steppes of the Lower Volga into the Chinese empire. By this event, the pure Mongol element in Europe was reduced to small dimensions, and it is said that those who remain have no tendency to increase in numbers.

The modern population of Russia proper is in overwhelming majority Slav, and mostly falls under the great divisions of Great, Little, and White Russians—the Little Russians occupying the regions east and west of the Lower Dnieper, the White Russians the Middle Dnieper and Upper Dwina, the Great Russians the whole north and east; but while the area of the two smaller divisions is uninterrupted, that of the larger is broken, especially in the east, by the territories of a number of Finnish and Turkish tribes. And the Muscovites themselves must be looked upon as a people who, however pure Slavs they may have been at their starting points, have in the course of their rapid expansion included and assimilated large alien populations similar or identical with those which still remain recognizable, a people, too, whose purity of type must have diminished *pari passu* with their advance, just as the purity of the Saxo-Frisic type in Wessex gradually and visibly lessens as one travels westward from Hampshire or Berkshire, or that of the Anglian type from Berwickshire towards Linlithgow.

The Tartar element in the very purest Great Russians is not a negligible quantity. Several of the names for money, as *altun*, *kopek*, several of those for measures of capacity or weight, as *arshin*, *kile*, *aghash*, the name of their national drink, *kwas*, the names of some court officials, the use of the word 'Christian' as a somewhat contemptuous term for the lower classes, and many characteristics in their habits and manners, are Tartar. All these points, it is true, do not prove anything beyond intercourse; but Von Hammer gives a list of 122 Russian families of known Tartar origin. 'Among these,' says Howorth, 'are some of the best known in Russian history.' I may quote Glinski, Godunof, Goloviu, Dashkof, Narishkin, Opraxin, Rostopchin, Turgenef, Uvarof, the last the name of the nobleman to whom we owe so much in Merian archæology. To the Merians, by the way, the Russians are thought to owe the so-called Russian bath. Bogdanof thinks that the Mordwins, one of the brachycephalic Finnish tribes, whose remains seem to occur in ancient kurgans, may also have contributed to the formation of the Muscovite type. The portraits of modern Mordwins which he publishes might easily be paral-

leled in this country, and confirm my belief in the presence in these islands, and particularly in Scotland, of an ancient Finnish element of population.

Be these things as they may, there is sufficient evidence to the existence of a fairly well-defined and permanent Great-Russian type of man. As to its stability, Taranetzky says that, having carefully examined the ancient Slavish skulls disinterred in Novgorod by Von Wolkenstein, (which date from the tenth or eleventh century), he is unable to find the least difference between them and those of the present generation, whether in the measurements or the general contour and aspect. The hair, too, seems to have been of the prevalent modern colour, a rather darkish brown.

Taking as a basis the very careful and laborious memoir of Taranetzky, one might say that, in the portion of the country which he deals with, the Great-Russian type was perhaps purest in the governments of Twer, Pskov, and Novgorod, rather less so in those of Kostroma and Varoslav, of Olonetz and Vologda and St. Petersburg, and least of all in the most remote, Archangel. The stature is rather short: calculating from Anuchin statistics, I should say 1650 millimeters or 5 feet 5 inches in the adult man. The eyes are small and grey, or sometimes dark; the hair varies through different shades of brown. The skull is fairly capacious, broad (about 81), of good height (about 76), flattened at back and often at the top, and on the whole of form between an ellipse and an oblong (which I take to be what Taranetzky and Bogdanof mean by 'biscuit-formed'). This is the Sarmatic form of Von Hölder, and most of the Russians I have seen have exhibited it. It accords well with the somewhat square and massive frame. The frontal sinuses are little developed; the nose is broad and often rather flat; the face not so broad in the pure type as where the Finnish element is strong, but with the same oblong compactness as the skull.

The Little-Russians (Malorussians), every one agrees, are different from the Muscovites in physical and moral characteristics. Inhabiting a much richer soil, they are conspicuously taller than their northern kindred, whose struggle for life is

often very hard. 'Brunette with black eyes and an oily skin,' says Barchewitz, 'fond of greasy feeding and of music.' Their country has been the camping-ground of so many and so diverse nations and races, that it would be useless to discuss the derivation of their types, which are probably numerous. The White Russians border on the Lithuanians and Poles, and have probably mixed with both, and perhaps the blond element in them has thus been strengthened; but they inhabit the very swampy country about the Dnieper, the Prypek, and the Beresina, a country where it is said that everything—the vegetation, the cattle, the birds—take on a colourless or pale hue, and where, accordingly, Poesche and his followers conceive that the blond type must have originated.

This speculation, and the closer relation of the Lithuanic language to the Sanskrit than that of any other European tongue, which seems pretty well established, make it extremely desirable, on scientific grounds, that both the Lithuanians and the White Russians should be visited in their own country, and their physical type and archæology investigated by some competent authority. I am happy to say that one of the most competent men in Europe, Professor Virchow, has undertaken the task, and I believe he is even now engaged therein. At present we really know less of the Lithuanians, so far as these matters are concerned, than of many a small tribe 10,000 miles away. *

The Letts, it is true, who are the nearest kindred of the Lithuanians, are not quite so unknown. They are a mesocephalic people, that is, their skulls yield a breadth-index of 78. They are of good stature, and of fair complexion, with blue or blue-gray eyes, and flaxen or brown hair, soft and wavy. The old Prussians, of whom a few skulls, belonging, it would seem, to the long Germanic or graverow form, have been measured, were another branch of this stock; their descendants are still long-headed, but apparently less so than the ancients. These people have undoubtedly been long in contact with the Finns

* Virchow's investigation seems, unfortunately, to have stopped at the Prussian frontier. His results, so far as published, are not conclusive.

on the north-east, as well as with the Scandio-Germanic people who dwelt in Livonia, Esthonia, and Finland, before the westward movement of the Finns.

I have yet to speak briefly of most of the non-Aryan tribes of eastern and south-eastern Russia. The Votiaks and Voguls have already been mentioned. Excluding, then, the Russians, the race elements are, first, the Ugrians or Finns, who, notwithstanding the general resemblance already spoken of, vary considerably both as between tribe and tribe, and within the limits of the tribe, in form of head, and still more in colour of the hair and eyes, probably by reason of ancient and partial crossing of blood with Asiatics; and second, the Turks, in some cases crossed with Mongolic blood. The invaders are probably more mixed, on the whole, than the invaded, to judge from the cephalic index.

Thus the Cheremisses have a stature of 5 ft. 3·7 inches, and a breadth-index of 76·8, and are, in great proportion, blond; they are the remains of a spirited and once formidable people, who still sacrifice in secret in consecrated woods. The Chuvashes, more Tartarized in blood and language, are a little broader in head; some think them to be Turks Finnized rather than the reverse, but it is more probable that they are the remains of the old Bulgarians.

The Mordwins in two divisions, the Mokshas and the Ertsas, belong to the broad-headed division of the Finns, and, on the whole, incline to be dark. Their index is variously reckoned, but is well beyond 80.

The Tartars of Kassimov, in Riazan, who are Moslems, do not now mix with their neighbours, but we may conclude that they once did so, for their index of breadth is but 81, and but 15 of 30 had black hair. The Tartars of Kasan, who dwell where once the Bulgarians may have dwelt, and who must have mixed largely with captives from the surrounding tribes, have an index of only 79·2, less than that of the Russians.

We come now to the Bashkirs, the Metcheriaks, and the Teptiars, all undeniable mongrels; they are Finnish tribes which have been so infiltrated with Turk blood that they are

now more Turk than Finn, and more Tartar than the Tartars themselves. The Bashkirs are tall, strong, and dark-haired, with but few exceptions; they seem to exhibit a variety of types, the result probably of comparatively recent crossings. Some have the round, large, low heads of the Mongols, others the round, high head, and large, coarse aquiline nose of the high Turkish or Turcoman type; others, again, according to photographs I have seen, exhibit the comparatively prominent occiput, cylindrical head, and retroussé nose of the Bulgarians. Accordingly, some report their breadth-index .at 79, more at 81 or 82, Ujfalvy as high as 84.

The Metsheriaks were undoubted Finns from the Metchera, west of the Volga; the Turkish cross has improved their physique, and they are very fine large men, with the dark complexion and round heads of the Turks.

Further south the Nogays and the remainder of the Kalmuks retain their original Central Asiatic types; the latter, as Metchnikof points out, exhibiting, in their large round heads, short, thick noses, large outstanding ears, short chins, and legs short in comparison to the trunk, the proportions which Quetelet assigns to the children of the highest or so-called Caucasian type of men. To these points he adds the peculiarity of the Mongolian eye (which frequently occurs as a juvenile condition in Western Europe), and the late appearance of the beard.

But the Tartars of the Southern Crimea are a different people. They are settled agricultural folk, but there is no good reason for ascribing any change in their features to that fact.* They appear to have absorbed the remains of the Greeks of the Cimmerian Bosphorus, and, what is to us still more interesting, those of the Tetraxite Goths, who are known to have existed hereabout as a distinct tribe as late as the 16th century. Busbequius saw one of these people then, who, he says, had the appearance of a Fleming. And I have myself seen, mixing with men whose eyes and complexion betrayed the Mongoloid strain, Tartars

* The sedentary Bashkirs are said to be more Mongoloid in physique than their nomad kindred.

whose eyes, hair, complexion, and features would have passed muster among ourselves. It had for me a kind of pathetic interest to look at these men, to recognise their kindly blood, to see in them the descendants of the companions of Kniva and of Hermanric, to know that the nationality they once belonged to had passed away and been forgotten, and that to which they now adhered was in progress to the like extinction.

Of the quarternary and even of the neolithic populations of the Balkan peninsula, so far as I am aware, nothing whatever is known. The earliest period of which we really seem to know anything is that of the Mycenaean civilization, the era of bronze and gold and of Cyclopean constructions. I am glad to see that Professor Sayce is declaring in favour of the view which connects this intimately with Egypt. Evidently Greece was a meeting ground of several races. The northern portions of the peninsula were in the possession of two of these, the Illyrian and the Thracian, both reputed Arian, though in the case of the former the claim is doubtful: it is not so long since the philologists admitted it: and I do not think the Albanian language, the modern representative of the Illyrian, has even yet been thoroughly analysed. Galen speaks of the Thracians as a fair race: I do not think much, however, of such statements, when used, as he used them, to support a theory. It would be convenient to believe that the Illyrians were short-headed and swarthy, but I know of no evidence from ancient sources on these points. Fligier would deduce most of the old Greek nomenclature from either Myrian or Thracian etymologies, but that there was an early stratum in the country of people who spoke a Turanian tongue, as argued for by Hyde Clark, I entertain little doubt, and all the less since the identification of the Hittite physiognomy has, coupled with other lines of argument, proved the early presence of Turanians in Asia Minor.

That the Hellenes proper were a race of the type we most of us call the long-headed Aryan, there seems no doubt. Nicollucci found an index of 75.8 in 26 ancient Greeks. The skulls that have come down to us from the classical period are gener-

ally long, rather narrow and high; and blond coloration was common and admired among the Greeks, at all events in the early historical period. You will remember that almost all of Homer's heroes were xanthous—blond or chestnut haired—Minerva was grey-eyed, but Juno 'βούπις' ox-eyed—probably with dark as well as large eyes. The earlier subject races, Pelagic or what not, may have been dark—Hector was dark-haired. The doctrine of the temperaments, taken with the physical traits attributed to each of them, indicates that there was much variety of colours among the Greeks of the classic period.

The Hellenic race was very prolific in its palmy days, but like all military and exclusive castes it dwindled after a time: the true Spartans, for example, seem to have become almost extinct. Two natives of Sparta, whom I once had an opportunity of examining, might have belonged to some primitive Turanian race.

The history of the Peninsula, in relation to ethnology, is not very complicated. The Kelts in the north disappeared early: some think the northern Croats, who are not so tall or so dark as the southern Croats, are merely Kelts Slavonized, while the Southerners are Illyrians. The Thracians lost their nationality and language, and accepted the Latin; the Illyrians, at least the southern portion of them, holding a poorer, more mountainous and difficult country, succeeded in retaining their tongue, of which the Skipetar (Albanian), is the modern representative. The Latin occupancy probably scarcely affected the blood: the Gothic was transient; but the Slavonic was extensive and permanent, influencing more or less the whole country down to Cape Matapan, and changing the language of more than half of it. In the people of Servia and Bosnia I think the Slav element really preponderates; they are taller and finer men than the Russians, but have the same make of body and often of countenance; and a great many of them have light brown hair and answer to Procopius's often-quoted description of their forefathers. In the Bulgarians the Finnish or Ugrian element is strong, and there is much Turkish blood, some perhaps brought in with the Ugrian, some, especially in Eastern

Bulgaria, by the Ottomans: the Slavs succeeded in giving the language, perhaps more owing to the prestige of religion therewith connected, than to their actual superiority in number; but the 'dour,' sturdy national character is rather Finn than Slav. As to the skull-form, Kopernitsky says it is neither one nor other; but he had probably in his mind the Finns of Tavastian Finland. The form is long, rather narrow, *cylindrical*, with very regular curves and absence of frontal or parietal bosses. The forehead is remarkably recedent, and the face prognathous, the cheekbones not particularly wide. This must surely be the true Bulgar type, for it is neither Slavish nor Turkish, nor have we any reason to think it old Thracian. To my eye it resembles that of the Cheremisses. Both Slavish and Turkish types do, however, occur, mixed with the one described; in what proportions we do not yet know.

The Thracians, once thought most populous of nations, cannot of course be extinct. Their debris are to be found among the Roumans or Vlachs. Whether the Transdanubian Roumans, who appear to be on the way to become a considerable nation, have a Thracian nucleus or substratum, or a Dacian one; whether, that is, they are descendants of Trajan's colonists and Romanized Dacians, who remained in the Transylvanian mountains when Aurelian recalled their fellows across the Danube, or whether, as Fligier and others think, they were Romanized Thracians, who in some time of disturbance, long after Aurelian's day, migrated northwards across the Danube into some vacant tract in Transsylvania, or perhaps were transported thither by the Avars,—matters little ethnologically; the Dacians and the Thracians were near kindred. They are probably a good deal mixed in blood, especially with their Slavonic neighbours; their complexion is usually dark, though there are a good many blond Roumans in the Bukowina; their heads are broad (82·8, Weisbach) and of good height, and rounded; their faces broad, but well featured, with nothing of the prognathism of the Bulgarians.

But there are other Roumans in the far south, perhaps of greater interest, though comparatively few in number. They are called Roumans, Vlachs, Zinzars; they are mostly shep-

herds and herdsmen, who wander along and across the ridges and elevated mountain valleys of Pindus, and towards Parnassus and Ceta. Remote and secluded, they have been little studied; but they must be the descendants of the old Roman provincials, perhaps of Macedonian or Thracian blood. They are described as having sharply drawn features and long shaggy fair hair.

And in the recesses of Mount Rhodope, between the Hebrus, the Strymon and the sea, among the Pomaks or nominally Moslem Bulgarians, has been preserved an oral literature of great interest, in the ballad form, and containing sundry words which appear to be Aryan but not Slavonic, and may very well be Thracian. These ballads have for subjects, Alexander the Great, and Philip, and contain allusions to Orpheus, and to other personages who may be referred to Greek mythology. A controversy like that about Ossian arose about these poems; but I believe their genuineness is now allowed. We must suppose therefore that we have in the Rhodope the remains of Thracians who were still un-Romanized in speech when the Slavs and Bulgarians overran the land. It may be noted that the heroes in these poems are always described as fair-haired, but Fligier says this epithet could not be applied to the present generation in Rhodope.

Here are fine opportunities for any enterprising Englishman with money and a taste for travel and adventure, and with sufficient brains to be able to pick up a language. But alas! such men usually seem to care for nothing but 'killing something.' Men of the type of Campbell of Islay are wanted; but alas! men so gifted and so disposed are few.

The Albanians, the modern representatives of the Illyrians, are men of good stature, with long faces and prominent, often pointed noses; their heads are remarkably short and broad, with the greatest breadth placed far back. The first skull ever obtained for measurement yielded to Virchow an index of 91·5, and a small series of 3 from Scutari gave to Zampa one of 89·5—extraordinary figures. Their colour varies in tribes and in individuals, but I think the most characteristic specimens have mostly lank black hair, lighter colours being due to

Slavic or Greek admixture. The people to the north of them, the Morlachs, or Black Wallachs, in Dalmatia and Montenegro, and the Herzegovina, are of an Illyro-Slavic cross; they are a tall dark race. 'The wife of Hasan Aga,' must have been a brunette, when—

' Wide through Bosnia and the Herzegóvina
Spread the tidings of her matchless beauty.'

These people have been examined by the indefatigable Weisbach. They have an average stature of about 1690 millimeters, and in a mountainous district 1720, or nearly 5ft. 8in., the highest average ascertained in Southern Europe; and the highest stature is found in the south, *i.e.*, the most Illyrian and least Croat region, and goes with the blackest hair. The index of breadth is 84, which is extremely high. On the whole, Illyria seems to have been a focus for broad heads and dark colours.

Among modern Greeks there are considerable physical differences no doubt. Some portions of their country have been colonised *en masse* by Slavonians, others, as Attica, by Albanians. Even the so-called national dress of the Greeks is the Albanian kilt or fustanella. Still the old type is far from being extinct, either in Europe or in Asia; the ideal of the sculptors was perhaps always rare, but I have seen it, living and breathing, and kissing my hands, in Asia Minor.

Nicolucci found modern Greek skulls smaller in capacity than the ancient, and decidedly shorter; still, the index was under 80 (79·2), the height was good (75). Weisbach found a breadth-index of 77·4 in Greeks of Constantinople, 78·3 for the Peloponnese, 80·7 in a large series from Bithynia, and 83·8 in another from Selymbria in Roumelia. The last result is curious; one must remember that Greek means Greek by religion and language, or not always even that. The divisions of peoples in the Levant are very sharply accentuated; inter-marriage, for example, between Turk and Greek, or American and Greek, hardly ever occurs, but one must not treat these divisions as necessarily ethnological. These so-called Greeks of Selymbria belong to the Greek community; that is all that

can be positively asserted. As to their race, all that one can be pretty sure of is that there is very little Greek blood in them.

J. BEDDOE.

ART. VIII.—KOSSUTH AND KLAPKA.

(With Personal Recollections.)

IN the stormy year of the Hungarian War of Independence, and for a long time afterwards, no Magyar patriot enjoyed so great a reputation, next to Kossuth, as the then still very young General Klapka. During the heroic struggles of 1848-49 he had rapidly risen in the army, and been the victor in not a few battles; having to deal, not only with the Imperial Austrian army, but also with dangerous counter-insurrections of disaffected races at home. For a short while Minister of War, he concluded his career as the courageous defender of Komorn, the last stronghold of his finally vanquished country's cause; obtaining an honourable capitulation after Görgey's surrender at Vilagos.

It was in the house of our dear friend, the German poet, Freiligrath—himself an exile—that we first made Klapka's acquaintance in London. I have him in my remembrance as a man of middle height and pleasant features, of kindest, most good-humoured and sympathetic character. German he spoke perfectly, with the accent and the intonation of a Viennese. That was the language in which we exclusively conversed with him. Altogether he gave us the impression of being rather one of our own German countrymen, so thoroughly had he the ways and manners of an Austrian from this side of the river March. His early bringing up, in polyglot Hungary, as well as his later residence, for years, in the Austrian capital, easily accounted for this seeming peculiarity.

George Klapka was born at Temesvar amidst a considerable Teutonic population. As a boy, he had spoken German, at first, as his mother-tongue. The only other language he

learnt at that time was Latin. This was, so to say, a national and political necessity in those days; Latin being then still much used in Hungary as an official language, in matters of State administration, as a means of communicating between the many-tongued populations under the Crown of St. Stephen.* Magyar was only learnt by young Klapka a little later, when completing his education in a grammar school at Kecskemet. Transferred to Vienna as a lieutenant of the Hungarian Nobiliary Guard, he evidently became quite imbued there with the German-Austrian manner of speech and tone. Hence it always required an effort on our part to realize the fact of his not being one of our nation. In his whole frame of mind, also, he was of that cheerfulness and joyful disposition which was held to be a characteristic of the light-hearted Viennese—especially of the men of the former generation.

Hungarians and Germans were at that time considered natural allies for the sake of the recovery of freedom. In 1848 their cause had been closely connected. In October of that year, the Germans of Vienna—as Kossuth still acknowledged, later on, in an enthusiastic speech at New York—had nobly risen in support of Hungary. On their part, the Hungarians had sought to repay the debt when the Austrian capital had in the meanwhile been surrounded and beleaguered, by moving an army corps towards the threatened town. Only it was then too late.

Of the general feeling existing between Hungarians and

* I myself remember having had to converse, at the age of about sixteen, with a Hungarian miner, of Slovak race, in Latin, as he mangled the German tongue in a rather trying manner, when showing us at Karlsruhe, in south-western Germany, some curiosities he had brought there for exhibition. His Ciceronian attempts, it is true, were such that 'the walls became tarnished black from his Latin,' as the phrase then was. Again, later on, during political imprisonment in 1848, when holding converse, from cell to cell, with fellow-sufferers, in the language of the Romans, I was astonished, after our liberation, to hear from the wife of the warder that she had understood many things we had shouted up and down, but that she willingly kept silence. She had been in Hungary as a sutler! Hence she could speak what was usually called 'Hussar Latin.'

Germans, years ago, this is what Bartholomew von Szemere, Minister of the Interior, and President of the Council of Ministers in Hungary during the Revolution, still wrote in 1860, in an English-written book dedicated to Richard Cobden:—

‘Why should we hate the Germans? Are we not chiefly indebted to them for our literary and intellectual culture? Were they not our masters in the sciences, arts, and manufactures? Have not our youth for the last three hundred years studied in the German universities, and returned home with rich stores of knowledge? And those who have settled in our country, have they not won our respect, confidence, and admiration by the purity of their morals, the mildness of their character, their sober and regular lives, their progress in agriculture and all the useful arts, in which they have set us excellent examples? Add to this that the Germans sincerely love their adopted country, that they have completely identified themselves with its dearest interests. Though still Germans in language, they are Hungarians in heart. Thus, in 1848-49, the Germans, with few exceptions, were most ardent defenders of our liberty and national independence. Assuredly, if there is any country where the German name is venerated, it is Hungary.’

In the same work, Szemere gives the race-statistics of his country. It had a population, at that time, in round numbers, of 14,200,000. Among them, the Magyars—who undoubtedly constitute the kernel of the body politic—counted not more than 6,150,000. The remainder was made up of Germans; of Slavs of various description (Croats, Serfs, Ruthenes, Slovaks), each section with a speech of its own; and of Wallachs or Roumans, who, like their kinsmen in Moldavia and Wallachia, speak a daughter language of Latin. Even this enumeration does not give a full idea of the confused state of tribes and tongues; for there are in Hungary quite a number of smaller fragments of nationalities, heaped pell-mell, side by side, or athwart each other, as sediments from repeated historical migrations. Be it enough to say that the four chief races of the kingdom are as distinct, in blood and speech, from each other, as a Turk is from a Swede, or a Russian from an Italian.

Owing to the centrifugal or separatist tendency of some of those populations, the rising for freedom, which was officered by the Magyars, experienced a great deal of trouble. All the

more valuable was the support given to the Hungarian cause by the progressive German element within and without the border. I have sometimes had occasion to talk this subject over with General Klapka. As a rule, he did not easily enter with anyone into details, either of the campaign at large, in which he had fought, or of the Vendéan attempts at a counter revolution made in the Wallachian, Serbian, and Croatian districts. Yet, he now and then spoke to me of these internal struggles with a heaviness of heart and a bitterness to which he otherwise was not much given.

In his speeches in the United States, Kossuth also dwelt with great seriousness on these fatal events, which had preceded and facilitated the Russian intervention. Declaring that Hungary was historically and geographically well mapped out by its range of mountains and the system of streams, he denounced those who would 'cut off our right hand, Transylvania, and give it up to the neighbouring Wallachia; cut out, like Shylock, one pound of our very breast, the Banat, and the rich country between the Danube and Theiss, to augment by it Turkish Serbia, and so forth.' 'It was a Russian plot,' he maintained, 'a dark design to make out of national feelings a tool for Russian preponderance all over the world.' For this purpose of Muscovite world-dominion, he said, the idea of Panslavism had been invented. The Poles he praised for having, alone among the nations of Slav origin, withstood this 'Satanic temptation.' On the other hand, Kossuth declared—

'The German race is a power the vitality and influence of which you can trace through the world's history for two thousand years. You can trace it through the history of science and heroism, of industry, and of bold enterprising spirit. Other nations, now and then, were great by some great men. The German people was always great by itself. . . . The hearts of the German and the Hungarian are linked closely. They throb like the hearts of twins which have rested under the same mother's breast. They throb like the hearts of brothers, who, hand in hand, attain the baptism of blood. They throb like the hearts of two comrades on the eve of battle, decided to hold together like the blade and the handle.*'

* The quotations are in Kossuth's own English.

Again, Kossuth, speaking in that curious prophet-like strain which marks all his utterances, exclaimed:—

‘Now, by the God who led my people from the prairies of far Asia to the banks of the Danube—of the Danube, whose waves have brought religion, science, and civilization from Germany to us—by the ties of common oppression—by the ties of the same love of liberty, and of the same hatred of tyranny—by the remembrance of the day when the Germans of Vienna rose to bar the way toward Hungary against the hirelings of despotism—and by the blood which flowed on the plain of Schwechat from Hungarian hearts for the deliverance of Vienna—by the Almighty Eye which watches the fate of mankind—by all these I pledge myself, I pledge that the people of Hungary will keep to this covenant honestly, faithfully, and truly, in life and death.’

This was uttered by Kossuth in a farewell address before the German citizens of New York, in an immense assemblage, to which he spoke in German. I quote it because it sheds a curious light on some later action of Kossuth, to which I shall presently come.

In exile—as is too often the case among those whom the storm and stress of defeat has cast away into foreign lands—there was for some time not much contact between Klapka and Kossuth. In his ‘Memoirs,’ Klapka avows that he had then little or no knowledge whatever of the plans of the ex-Dictator of Hungary. In public, the name of Kossuth had a grand sound on this and the other side of the Ocean, even as that of Garibaldi in later years. Among the Hungarian exiles themselves, however, there existed a good deal of disunion; some of the most prominent among them assailing Kossuth’s claim of exclusive leadership, or denouncing him even as politically untrustworthy.

Thus he was stated to have declared that ‘Providence had marked him out as the chosen one for the salvation of Hungary;’ that on this ground he claimed absolute obedience from his fellow-exiles; that he would resume the dictatorial powers which he had laid down towards the end of the War of Independence; and that he would crush all those who refused allegiance to him. This, and much more, was charged upon Kossuth, in print, by his former Minister, Bartholomew von Szemere. I simply give the statements as they were made.

Count Ladislas Teleki, formerly the Hungarian envoy at Paris, declared that the resumption of Kossuth's title as Governor and Dictator, after having abdicated of his own free will in 1849, was 'a Pretender's policy;' that it was intolerable to ask the exiles to become his 'obedient, blind tools;' and that the only proper way of conducting the affairs of the Emigration was to appoint a committee. These charges and attacks naturally led to a rupture between Teleki and Kossuth.

Szemere went further by making a strange revelation. In the most distinct terms he asserted that, when the Hungarian rising was pressed closely by the combined Austrian and Russian armies, Kossuth had asked him and Count Kasimir Batthyany, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to send a deputation to the Czar at St. Petersburg for the purpose of praying him to *allow a Prince of the Russian Imperial House—the Duke of Leuchtenberg—to become King of Hungary!* Szemere further stated that he and Batthyany had energetically refused to be a party to such a negotiation, but that Kossuth, when already at Widdin, on Turkish soil, had once more written to his agents to exert themselves for getting a Coburg prince as ruler of Hungary, or, if that were not probable, to work for the acceptance of the crown by the Russian Duke of Leuchtenberg.

Anyone conversant with the race-statistics of Hungary and the Panславistic intrigues, then rife, could not but see that the Magyar realm, as a bulwark against Russia, and as an independent country, would thus have been destroyed. The offer in question came, fortunately, too late. General Paskiewitch, it is true, wrote to St. Petersburg: 'Hungary lies at the feet of your Majesty.' But the Emperor Nicholas did not dare to keep her there.

I am not aware that Kossuth has ever answered Szemere's charges. From his collected 'Speeches' in England and America it will, however, be seen that Kossuth, after 1851, resumed the anti-Russian propaganda with an extraordinary zeal and eloquence. Meanwhile Klapka stood aloof from the bickerings which are the bane of every wholesale proscription. In London he made the acquaintance of Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin,

and Louis Blanc, but without sharing at all their way of thinking. To the ex-Triumvir of the Roman Republic, Klapka gave the advice that 'he ought to follow the example of Manin, Farini, Gioberti, and d'Azeglio—that is, to devote his whole strength and his powerful influence to Piedmont, where alone there was still a solid pivot from which, at a given moment, the lever for freeing Italy could be set to work.'

It was a strange misreading of Mazzini's character to make such a proposition to him. Moreover, though Piedmont, supported by the Napoleonic alliance, and paying for it by the cession of Savoy and Nice, became afterwards the means of beginning the fray, there can be little doubt that the real formation of United Italy was owing to the subsequent independent action of Mazzini and Garibaldi. Cavour had never aimed at more than at an aggrandized Piedmont in the north. He did not believe, at first, in the possibility of creating a united Italy out of populations so variegated in race and temperament as those of the north and the south. Cavour had even yielded tacit consent to a Muratist—that is, Napoleonic—intrigue in Naples. When Garibaldi went forth with his Thousand to Sicily, Cavour expected that 'the fool' (*il pazzo*) would come to grief with his two half-leaky vessels.

Garibaldi would never afterwards speak any more to Cavour. He actually refused shaking hands with him. '*Questa canaglia!*' was his indignant outcry in regard to the Sardinian statesman, when the King made an attempt at a reconciliation. I know, from a conversation with Garibaldi in 1864, how bitterly he felt against Cavour.

The contact between Klapka, who held with the Government at Turin, and Mazzini, was but a passing one. They were not 'friends,' as has been erroneously stated in obituary notices concerning the Hungarian General. In harsher words than I care to repeat here, Mazzini once expressed himself about Klapka before me. Still, I remember how eager the great Italian leader showed himself repeatedly, in after years, for resuming relations with him, in case I were able to bring this about. A military leader like the famed defender of Komorn was, indeed, of no mean value among men organizing

armed insurrections. It was after Kossuth had broken with Mazzini that the latter asked me whether there was no means of approaching Klapka. But such as matters had come to be, the chances for a renewal of intercourse between these two men were gone.

Like most Hungarians, General Klapka, who alternately resided in England, in France, in Switzerland, or in the East, had formed an early connection with the Government of Louis Bonaparte. It was done through Prince Napoleon, the son of the ex-King Jerome, once known as the 'Mountain Prince,' the 'Red Prince,' and then as 'Plon-Plon.' There was an additional link, between Klapka and the Paris Government, in the person of Mr. James Fazy, the democratic but somewhat dictatorial ruler of the canton of Geneva; Fazy's financial enterprises being connected with those of the Court of the Tuileries.

Prince Napoleon was, under the Empire, the head of the so-called *démocratic ralliée*. His task was, to gain over foreign democrats—Poles, Hungarians, Italians, even Germans, if possible—for the ambitious and aggressive policy of him whom true Liberals and Republicans only spoke of as the 'Man of December the Second.'

The cause of the Hungarians, it is true, was then little understood at Paris. The knowledge of all Eastern affairs seemed to be a book of seven seals for the immense majority of public men and writers in France. Many years afterwards, I still found a distinguished French historian, who had been a member of the Provisional Government of 1848, naively holding the belief that there were 'fifteen millions of Greeks' in European Turkey. He had mixed up the Hellenic race with the Greco-Catholics of the Orthodox Church, who by blood or speech belong to the Slav and Wallachian stock. It was as if one were to describe the Roman Catholics of Germany as 'Romans' or 'Italians.' I still remember the startled look of surprise which came over that dear friend's face when I told him the real state of things. Until then he had always patronised the establishment of a Hellenic Commonwealth out of his fifteen millions of 'Greeks.'

Who the Magyars were, seemed to be an insoluble mystery to many French politicians. Klapka liked to tell how Count Teleki, when at Paris, in 1849, as envoy of Hungary, was one day told by M. Bastide, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, that 'the Hungarians, being Slavs (!), ought to place themselves at the head of the Catholic Slavs in the East (!)' It would have been impossible to crowd a greater deal of nonsense into such a few words. In truth, the Magyars of Hungary are kinsmen of the Turks and the Finns. From such daily experience among French politicians, the health of Teleki actually suffered most severely. He became quite bilious under the continual infliction. Klapka, however, took it easy, in accordance with his jovial temper.

Being on friendly terms with Prince Napoleon, Klapka made it a point not to become a member of strictly Republican and Revolutionary organisations. This was an honourable way of acting on his part, considering that, by close contact with exiled leaders who carried on war against the French Emperor, he might have heard many things of importance. There was then a 'Central European Revolutionary Committee' in London, of which Mazzini, and Ledru-Rollin were the most prominent members. It opposed Napoleon III., by word and deed, in the most resolute and most passionate manner—to such an extent that the time has perhaps not come yet for giving all the details. General Klapka held aloof from this organisation. Kossuth, after a while, joined it.

Together with Mazzini and Ledru-Rollin, the ex-governor of Hungary signed outspoken Republican manifestoes, in which his name was placed first. In this way he formally and publicly bound himself to fight, on Republican lines, the two most dangerous autocrats of the west and the north namely, the perjured President of a Republic, who had waded through blood to an Imperial throne, and the despotic ruler of an overgrown Empire whose Cossack lances had stabbed Kossuth's own fatherland.

In 1859, however, a painful fact came out. Whilst remaining a member of the Central European Revolutionary Committee, Kossuth, without the knowledge of Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin, and the other fellow-workers, had entered into secret relations with

Napoleon III., on the eve of the Italian war of 1859. This was a grave fact, considering the nature of that Committee and the aims and objects of its chief members. In words of great indignation, yet with that touch of humour of which he showed himself a master in familiar intercourse, Ledru-Rollin described to me how Kossuth, at a time when his underhand dealings with Louis Bonaparte were not yet known, exhibited strange signs of uneasiness in their last Committee meetings, walking constantly round and round the table, whilst talking and professing to take an interest in the discussion. This itinerant behaviour, in not too large a room, struck the observant French leader as very odd.

In later years, Kossuth himself put on record the conversation and the secret negotiation he had had with Prince Napoleon and with the French Emperor at Paris. He then also avowed that he had entered into relations, before the Italian war, with the Government of the Czar, through the Russian Ambassador at Brussels. The agent he employed for that purpose was a Mr. Johann Ludvig. The underlying idea was, that Austria, attacked in front by the united French and Sardinian forces, ought to be threatened *from the rear by Russian arms.*

Now, for years past, Kossuth had denounced the Muscovite Empire as the standing menace of Europe. In speech after speech—both in England and in America, and then again in England—he had called for the deliverance of Poland as the alpha and the omega of European security. He had gone even so far as to implore the United States to lend their army and navy for a war against ‘the colossus with the brazen forehead and the feet of clay’—certainly a surprising misjudgment of American policy. The Polish and the Hungarian cause, Kossuth had declared to be indissolubly bound together. Yet, now, he literally sent word to the Czar that Hungarians were *not* a revolutionary element by profession; adding this significant hint:—‘Russia could give the Poles at least the privilege of a great race as a substitute for the freedom they were deprived of. But Austria could give us nothing.’*

* See Kossuth's *Memoirs of my Exile.*

These were the thanks for the bravery of General Bem and the other Poles that had fought for Hungarian freedom in 1849. As to Kossuth's secret negotiations with Prince Napoleon and the French Emperor, the details, given by himself, are equally instructive.

First of all, the Prince stated that Hungary, if detached from Austria, should not adopt a Republican form of government, but constitute itself as a monarchy. To this, Kossuth, though apparently still a member of the London Republican Committee, not only at once assented, but even designated the monarch whom he should like to see on the Hungarian throne.

'I cannot refrain,'—Kossuth said to Prince Napoleon—'from expressing my conviction that my nation would offer the crown of St. Stephen to your Highness.'

Thus Kossuth intended establishing a vassal Bonapartean Kingdom at the south-eastern frontier of Germany, whilst France was well known to aim at the conquest of the Rhine frontier. Germany, whom Kossuth once had called the twin-brother, the dear comrade of Hungary, and with whom he had pledged himself to keep the fraternal covenant honestly, faithfully, truly, in life and unto death, was to be caught in the rear by a Napoleonic force.

However, the son of the ex-King of Westphalia at once declined the offer of the Hungarian crown with remarkable haste. Perhaps he preferred gay Paris to a residence on the Lower Danube, where probably he would have felt as if he were already in 'half-Asia,' according to the expression of a well-known German novelist. Perhaps the cousin of Napoleon III. also knew that Russia would not tolerate a Bonapartist kingdom near her own frontier, and that, in case Hungary were detached from Austria, the Czar would probably try to pocket the result for himself. Be that as it may, Prince Napoleon, at any rate, gave quite a good reason for his refusal. 'The Bonapartes,' he observed, 'have learned by bitter experience that they cannot set up thrones for themselves abroad without provoking against themselves a hostile coalition of Powers.'

In a former speech before prominent Hungarian exiles, soon after his first landing in England, Kossuth is stated to have

declared that they might be sure of two things: 'first, that he would not allow himself to be forced to accept the crown of Hungary for his own person' (rather a strange refusal, as nobody had thought of offering it to him); 'secondly, that he would never serve under a King.' Yet here, in his negotiation with Prince Napoleon, he entered a downright royal road. The Prince having declined the offer, Kossuth stipulated—and this was quite natural—that he himself should be at the head of the warlike enterprise which was to be organized. The words he used on that occasion give the impression of his having reserved for his own person a very wide margin of possibilities as to his future status as Regent of Hungary.

Here I may mention that Mazzini—who in a great European crisis was, as a rule, excellently informed—asserted distinctly that there had been a plan, in 1859, *of offering the crown of Hungary to the Russian Grand-Duke Constantine*; 'a condition,' he added, 'which I am forced to say had been accepted by some of the Hungarian agitators; perhaps with mental reservations equal to those of Count Cavour, and equally pernicious.' Remembering what Szemere wrote of Kossuth's proposal, in 1849, in regard to the Russian Duke of Leuchtenberg, this statement is remarkable indeed. Mazzini also mentioned that the French Government had bound itself not to move the Polish Question in the course of the Italian war, and that Russia had pledged herself, in case Germany interfered as the ally of Austria, to send a Russian army against both. Lastly—so Mazzini said—it was stipulated between Paris and St. Petersburg that the treaty referring to the restrictions of Russian naval power in the Black Sea should be torn up.

It is noteworthy, therefore, that Prince Napoleon, in the interview with Kossuth, at which Klapka and Teleki were present, said to the Hungarian ex-Governor:—'You have nothing to fear. Certainly not Russian intervention. Care has been taken of that, I can positively assure you.' So, after all, the amateur policy of Kossuth and his agent Ludvigh had not been required for the purpose of 'fixing' the Czar.

In the subsequent interview with the French Emperor, the

question was raised as to what could be done to prevent England, then under the government of Lord Derby, from siding with Austria. Kossuth, on the strength of his intimacy with English Liberal leaders, actually made the following promise in reference to the overthrow of Lord Derby, which Napoleon desired:—‘I will take upon myself the task of carrying this into effect.’ He further promised to ‘show to your Majesty (Napoleon III.), in writing, the engagement of the new English ministers to observe neutrality.’ Nay, Kossuth made bold to say that he hoped it would, ‘suit the convenience of Her Britannic Majesty, to assure your Majesty of the benevolent neutrality of England, in an autograph letter.’

It may be brought to recollection here, that though in 1859 a Tory Ministry was ‘in,’ the majority of the House of Commons was a Liberal one. Parliament had ousted the previous Palmerston Cabinet on account of its subserviency to the French Government in the matter of the Conspiracy Bill. It was, therefore, always possible to overthrow the Conservative Government, which only existed on sufferance. In point of fact, the Derby Ministry was overthrown after Kossuth’s visit to Paris. Palmerston and Russell, who were among the new ministers, thereupon wrote letters to Mr. Gilpin, M.P., binding themselves to absolute neutrality. ‘Mr. Gilpin,’ Kossuth reports, ‘immediately handed the letters to me, authorising me to make discreet use of them, and more particularly to show them to the Emperor Napoleon.’

In such wise, the home and foreign policy of England was shaped in those days.

Klapka and Teleki, who for a considerable time had stood aloof from Kossuth, seem to have played rather a mute part in the conversation with Prince Napoleon. They were not present at the interview which afterwards took place between the French Emperor, the Prince, and Kossuth. The negotiation being so far completed, they, however, formed with the latter, a ‘National Hungarian Committee,’ in view of the coming war.

For Kossuth it must have been an unpleasant reminder when Prince Napoleon, during the interview with the Emperor,

sarcastically twitted him with the question :—‘ Apropos of the Republicans, what will your friends Ledru and Mazzini say to all this ? ’

Kossuth replied :—‘ Certainly they will not be pleased with it. I have often said to Ledru-Rollin and Mazzini that I would contract an alliance for this purpose, not only with an Emperor, King, Sultan, or any other despot, under whatever name he might be known, but with the very Devil himself. *Seulement je prendrais garde qu'il ne m'emporte pas.* (Only I would take care that he does not outwit me).’

This is Kossuth's account. It stands, however, to reason that a man could not be a member of a Revolutionary Republican Committee whose activity extended over all Europe, and which endeavoured to upset the throne of the criminal perpetrator of the Paris State-stroke, as well as the power of the Muscovite Autocrat, and at the same time reserve to himself the right of suddenly going over to those arch-enemies of freedom. I have been on terms of intimacy with Ledru-Rollin and Mazzini during all the time of their sojourn in England ; and I can say, without fear of contradiction, that they were most indignant at Kossuth's unexpected ‘apostasy.’ So they called it. I can also aver that our old friend, Mr. P. A. Taylor, the Radical member for Leicester, opposed Kossuth at a public meeting in London at the suggestion of Mazzini himself.

Kossuth repeated the phrase about the alliance with the Devil before English audiences. He did not care—so he gave to understand—whether Louis Napoleon or the Czar was called the Devil. In public it was not known then that he had really approached the Russian Government and personally confabulated with the French Emperor. However, in the end, he was outwitted by the Devil. Even though the Derby Cabinet was overthrown, and the new English Ministry gave a pledge of neutrality, Napoleon III. suddenly broke off the Italian war by the Peace of Villafranca, without doing anything in the direction of Hungary.

There was much surprize in Europe at this strange termination. I can testify that Mazzini alone was not surprised. On the very eve of the famous New-year's greeting, or warning,

which Napoleon III. addressed to the Austrian ambassador, Herr von Hübner, Mazzini had detailed to me the plan of the forthcoming Italian campaign. His information turned out correct on every chief point. He said the project was to wrest Lombardy from Austria by French arms, Russia having practically been won over to the scheme. In presence of such a coalition, the war would be a short one. If Austria were to ask for peace, peace would at once be concluded.

I cannot enter here into the reasons which made Mazzini look upon such an enterprize as '*un affreux gâchis, une guerre déshonorante*' (a horrible mess, a dishonouring war). Be it enough to say that, together with many prominent Italian exiles—among them, Crispi, the later Premier—he signed a protest against a war, instigated from the most selfish motives, by Louis Bonaparte. In point of fact, Italy had to pay for it by the loss of Savoy and Nice; the latter the birth-place of Garibaldi, whom Cavour had induced to lend his sword.

In the interview with the French Emperor, Kossuth had happened to mention the question of German Unity. 'Ah, as to that,'—Napoleon III. airily exclaimed—'that suits me in no wise. I don't mind *two* Germanies; but *one* Germany—no, that does not suit me.'

Kossuth gaily answered with a phrase the Emperor himself had used before:—'Indeed, one must never wish for the impossible.'

Curiously enough, in an interview which an American correspondent had with Kossuth on February 25th, 1890, the latter gave forth the following opinion:—'There must be *two* Germanies. Prince Bismarck knows that. He affects to despise the statesmanship of the late Napoleon III., who believed in two Germanies. . . . Bismarck's hands may be strong enough to hold the sections of the Empire together now; but when he dies, they will fall asunder. The interests of the North are too entirely separate from the interests of the rest of Germany.'

What a misreading of German feeling and nationality! Prince Bismarck has for well nigh three years been deposed

from all political power; but Kossuth's prophecy has proved utterly groundless. And what an idea to assume that Hungary, with its chaos of races and languages, and with at least some of its populations rather backward in culture, should be entitled to full political unity—which nevertheless, I believe, she is, but that the country of Lessing, Herder, and Wieland, of Goethe and Schiller, of Kant, Fichte, Hegel, and Feuerbach, of Rückert, Uhland, Heine, Herwegh, and Freiligrath, of Jakob Grimm, and so many other thinkers, poets, and scientific inquirers, should be split asunder!

In 1862, General Klapka came to my house to inform me of a strange project Kossuth had elaborated for the formation of a so-called 'Danubian Confederation.' Besides Hungary, with its appurtenances or semi-dependencies (such as Transylvania, Croatia, Slavonia, the 'Military Frontier,' and Dalmatia), this new political structure was to include Roumania, Servia, and 'the countries connected therewith.' Now, with Servia, no countries were or are connected. Kossuth, therefore, can only have meant Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Bulgaria, all of which—like Servia—are inhabited by people of the Slav stock, or, as is the case with the Bulgars, by an originally Tatar, but linguistically Slavonised, race. A 'mighty state of thirty million inhabitants' was thus to be created.

Strictly speaking, all the lands in question together had not so many inhabitants. The question was consequently, whether Kossuth did perhaps aim at drawing even some Austrian provinces, belonging at that time to the German Bund, into his Danubian Confederation scheme, owing to their having a mixed Slav and Teutonic population. Be that as it may, the whole plan was one which could not but be looked upon by true Magyars with the utmost suspicion.

Kossuth proposed that the Government seat of the new Danubian Confederation should alternately be at Pesth, Bucharest, Agram, and Belgrad. Pesth, in 1862, had still much more of a German character in the composition and language of its population than is the case now. Bucharest is the capital of a country speaking an idiom of Roman origin. Agram and Bel-

grad are Slav. Thus, the seat of Government would, in three cases out of four, have been in non-Magyar or rather anti-Magyar countries!

Kossuth further proposed that the Constituent Assembly of this Confederation should choose the official language for the federal administration. Now, seeing that in Hungary itself there is a large Slav population, though with rather discordant dialects, and that Kossuth wanted to add further Slav countries to it, it truly looked as if Hungary was meant to be thrown into the hands of the Panslavistic Propaganda which he himself had once fought with tooth and nail. Many Russian emissaries were then active all over the East. How if the new Constituent Assembly had declared the *Russian* language to be the fit medium for official intercourse?

Between the Governments of the French Emperor and the Czar, there were then apparently negotiations for combined action. It need not be said that Kossuth's design would have been simply a castle in the air, if he had not hoped to get armed support for it from powerful Governments. He had already declared in 1859 to Napoleon III. that he would not think of moving in Hungarian matters without such armed support from established Powers. The surmise thus easily suggests itself that the project of a Danubian Confederation had been elaborated by Kossuth under Russian and French influence.

General Klapka, when informing me of this plan, said:—'I have been asked to add my signature to it. But even if I wished to do so, I cannot, and will not do it; for in my country they would look upon me as a *traitor to my fatherland*.'

For years before, Klapka had preached a European war against the Muscovite Empire—a war in which Poland, Hungary, and Italy, supported by France, England, Sweden, and Turkey, should play a part, 'so as to break down, for ever, Russian preponderance in Europe.' A whole work of Klapka* was devoted to that object. In 1862, he knew well enough the mood of his countrymen to recoil from the proposition of adding his name to Kossuth's dangerous manifesto.

* *La Guerre d' Orient*. Genève, 1855.

Our London 'Society for German Union and Freedom,' which had always stood to the cause of Italian independence, and to the rights of Hungary and Poland, issued a strong protest against Kossuth's scheme. The protest was written and signed by me. In that pamphlet it was said:—

'We can only deeply deplore this defection of a man who had occupied so distinguished a position at the head of the Hungarian Revolution; whose name was connected with the most glorious events of the War of Independence; and whose intellectual power is an important one. The friend of Hungarian freedom is painfully struck by these newest ideas of Kossuth. It was not for this that the people of the Danubian plain bled in its heroic struggle. Not for this did hosts of *honveds* fight against the united arbitrary rulers of Austria and Russia. Not for this had Vienna risen, when, by its revolution of October, 1848, it came to the rescue of the sorely-pressed neighbouring country. Not for this did Kossuth once receive a Government mandate from the representatives of his nation; not for this did Komorn hold out; not for this had Batthyany, and with him a number of the proudest, the bravest Hungarians, died the death on the gallows. Among thinking Hungarian patriots there can only be sorrow and grief at seeing that the once highly influential leader has fallen into an error whose consequences would be even worse than the treachery of Görgey.'

It was said at the end of that German protest that the best champions of the Hungarian cause at home would certainly share in the views thus expounded by the London 'Society for German Union and Freedom.' This expectation was not deceived. The Magyars distinctly spurned Kossuth's strange plan.

The last time I saw General Klapka personally was at a little banquet he gave in London to Count Teleki, the German poets, Freiligrath and Kinkel, and myself. It was previous to Teleki's departure for Hungary, where soon afterwards he met a tragic death by his own hand, from political motives not even now quite cleared up, but which, to all appearance, had reference to a miscarried project of a fresh war in which Napoleonic France, the Italian Government, and Russia were to play their part. In 1866 Klapka organised a Hungarian Legion on the side of Prussia, but the attempt came to nothing. In the later war of Russia against Turkey, Klapka strongly opposed the Czar's policy, in consonance with

the views of the large majority of his countrymen, who would fain have seen Austria, Hungary, and England forming a defensive alliance with Turkey.

In home politics General Klapka—who returned to his fatherland in 1867, in consequence of the amnesty, and was elected a member of Parliament—once more drew away from Kossuth. Henceforth he followed more the lines of the statesmanship of Francis Deak, to whose efforts—next to the defeat of Austrian arms in 1859 and in 1866—the restoration of Hungarian self-government was mainly owing.

The Magyar realm is now one of the freest countries in Europe within the bounds of a constitutional monarchy. Its Parliamentary power and its liberty of the Press are as large as those of England. And whatever one may think of the existence of a kingship, the progress achieved under the so-called ‘Compromise’ at all events constitutes a state of things a thousand times preferable to what Kossuth, in his fits of dangerous aberration, intended bringing about, first, towards the end of 1849, then in 1859, and again in 1862. For, the connection of self-governing Hungary with the German-Austrian power—and, through the Triple Alliance, with Germany and Italy as well—shields her against her most insidious Panslavic and Russian foes; whereas, the Leuchtenberg scheme, the Napoleonic dream of Kossuth, and the ‘Danubian Confederation’ design, would have cut the Magyar element adrift from its secure moorings, swamped it amongst hostile races, destroyed entirely the historical basis of the Hungarian realm, and made an end of its time-honoured representative institutions, its reformed laws, and its present remarkable popular freedom.

KARL BLIND.

ART. IX.—HOW THE SCOTTISH UNION HAS WORKED.

IN a circular issued by the Scottish Home Rule Association in August, 1892, it is said:—

‘While it has found it necessary to investigate the history of the Scottish Union and its results—so as to demonstrate that the Scottish people

have as much reason as the Irish to complain of the evils of incorporation and the over-centralisation which it has caused—the Scottish Home Rule Association bases its demand of Home Rule for Scotland mainly upon utilitarian grounds.’

The following account occurs in an article originally published in this *Review* under the title ‘The Union of 1707 Viewed Financially,’ and subsequently issued in pamphlet form by the above named Association :—

‘Very few years had elapsed after the Union when the Scottish leaders, alarmed at the critical condition of the country, had to meet together and consider how its trade was hampered and destroyed by prohibitions, regulations, and impositions, laid on by England; how it was drained of money, and how the country was experiencing the very evils which the opponents of the Union had predicted, while at the same time the *English* Government and Parliament were treating the Scottish representatives in such an arbitrary manner that it seemed clear that redress was not to be expected under the Union, and that the only remedy lay in its dissolution. Without further entering into the question we may assume that valid grounds were not wanting for discontent in Scotland when such an ardent supporter of the Union as the Duke of Argyll declared that he was of opinion that a Union which had been so often infringed, should finally be dissolved, and proved the sincerity of his declaration by supporting a motion for repeal, which motion was only rejected in the House of Lords by the narrow majority of four votes.’

In a speech at Derby, December 19th, 1887, Lord Salisbury said :—

‘Was the Union accepted at first by the Scottish people? On the contrary, it was repelled. It was intensely unpopular, it created countless, constant resistance; nay, if you will but look below the surface of things, you will say that the two great uprisings of 1715 and 1745, though nominally Jacobite were really protests against this Union with England, which Scotland most impatiently bore; but there was no Mr. Gladstone or Sir William Harcourt in those days, and English statesmen stood to their guns, and the union which had been denounced as a source of misery and humiliation to Scotland was accepted as its proudest boast, and probably there is no part of the United Kingdom in which the dissolution of the Union would be rejected more emphatically than in Scotland at this hour. Why should we not hope for the same result in respect to Ireland?’

When speaking at Perth, October 5th, 1889, Lord Randolph Churchill is reported to have said :—

‘The methods by which the Parliamentary Union between Scotland and England were carried into effect were quite as much open to attack as, and

even more open to attack than, the methods by which the Parliamentary Union between Ireland and England was carried into effect. There can be no question whatever that a considerable portion of the Scottish Parliament at the time of the Scottish Union was bribed, there can be no question whatever that the majority which carried the Union in the Scottish Parliament acted under corrupt influence, that is an historical fact—nor can there be any question whatever that the Scottish Parliament in passing the Union did not represent—on the contrary, it entirely misrepresented the wishes and feelings of the Scottish people. Suppose that popular clamour in Scotland in the early part of the eighteenth century had been yielded to; suppose that the Union had not been carried into effect, what would Scotland have been now? Does not this throw a vivid and most instructive light upon the feelings and upon the attitude of the Irish people at the present day? The displeasure of the Scottish people lasted for more than fifty years and then gradually died out.'

These passages taken from authoritative exponents of the opinions held by their respective parties are sufficient to show that Unionists and Scottish Home Rulers are at one in their view of that period in the history of Scotland inaugurated by the Union, however much they may disagree as to the lessons of that history and their application to problems of the present day. Whether they be right or wrong, it is so far satisfactory to find men so opposed to each other about the policy for the future agreeing to go back to Scottish history for assertions, if not for information, bearing upon questions now pressing for settlement. In doing so they are but following in the steps of the Government that carried the Irish Union. 'When the question of Union between Great Britain and Ireland,' writes the Duke of Portland,* the Home Secretary in Pitt's administration, 'came under the consideration of His Majesty's Ministers, the Duke of Portland employed Mr. Bruce, the keeper of the State Papers, to collect in his office, the precedents in the history of the Union between England and Scotland, which might illustrate the subject, for the purpose of bringing in aid of the intended arrangement with Ireland the wisdom and experience of former times.' And in fact of all the cases which have been referred to in the Home Rule controversy as likely to throw light on the causes of the

* Note prefixed by the Duke of Portland to copy of *Bruce's Report on the Union*, in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

Irish trouble, or to suggest remedies for it, there is none more promising to repay investigation than that of the Scottish Union—containing, as it does, so many of the same elements which entered into the later problem of the Union between Britain and Ireland. In both cases a country far inferior in size and population, with its own consent sank the most distinctive sign of its separate existence—an independent Parliament—in the legislative assembly of a larger State. In both cases an international feud that had lasted for centuries, had accumulated such a fund of mutual animosity as made the successful working of either Union seem hopeless from the outset. In both cases the long-continued attempts of England to bring about the unity of Britain by measures of force or intrigue, had defeated their own end, and had resulted merely in arousing a spirit of detestation which gave to Englishmen the epithet of ‘oor auld enemies’ in the one country, and of ‘the hated Saxon’ in the other. While, therefore, the mere fact of the similarity of the two problems would justify an investigation into the working of the Scottish Union, a further reason is found in the striking dissimilarity of their issues. The one, in spite of a little friction in its initial stages, and a few defects revealed in recent years, has on the whole conduced so much to the prosperity and contentment of the people of Scotland that if it is not exactly what Lord Salisbury has called it—‘Scotland’s proudest boast’—it is still a measure to be looked back upon with satisfaction. The other has been attended with so much friction in Parliament, and has proved the source of so much discontent in Ireland, that the country has in the recent general election expressed its decision that the present system is a failure, and must be amended. When two experiments resembling each other so closely in their main circumstances display so startling a contrast in their ultimate issues, it may naturally be expected that an inquiry into the extent and causes of the success of the one will throw some light on the causes of the failure of the other.

But we fear that ‘the precedents in the history of the union between England and Scotland’ have been misread, and ‘the wisdom and experience of former times’ consulted in vain by

both Unionists and Scottish Home Rulers in their eagerness to square history with their preconceived political schemes. The latter, thinking to strengthen their case by proving the existence of such evils as have prejudicially affected the Irish Union, have sought to show that the Scottish Union has worked badly, owing (they say) to the immorality of the means by which it was carried, the unpopularity with which it was attended, and the economic ruin and political slavery which it entailed. The Unionists accept most of these statements, and endeavour to make out a complete parallel between the two Unions; with the object, however, of showing that if both are alike in being the offspring of immorality and the parent of discontent, the ultimate success of the one through the mere lapse of time is a precedent for expecting the ultimate success of the other. But we believe it can be shown, in opposition to the bad politics of the one party and the bad history of both, that the Scottish Union has never been the cause of such distress and discontent as have arisen under the Irish Union; and that 'the most successful piece of statesmanship of the eighteenth century,' as Leslie Stephen has called it, owes its success to the one essential element which differentiates the working of the two Unions—the deference shown by the Imperial Government and Legislature to the opinion of Scotchmen in all matters relating peculiarly to themselves. And if the principle of Home Rule has thus been at the root of the successful working of the Scottish Union, it will follow that the remedy for such defects as have revealed themselves under the pressure of the modern necessity of much legislation, lies in the extension and embodiment of that principle in a form adapted to the needs of the present day. Home Rule for Scotland should therefore be advocated, not as in the case of Ireland, out of recoil from, and in antagonism to, the Union as the source of distress and discontent; but rather on the broad ground that the success of a Union carried out on Home Rule principles is a warrant for the application and adaptation of those principles to modern wants, whether the necessity arise in Ireland or in Scotland. There is thus room for Home Rule within the Union; and though Unionists may still fairly

insist that the obtaining of Home Rule is of small importance compared with the retaining of the Imperial supremacy, yet they must admit that there is nothing inherently antagonistic or incompatible between the two.

The questionable statements that have been put forward by Scottish Home Rulers in support of a ruinous line of argument, and endorsed by Unionists so far as suited their own case, are these: that the Union of 1707 was carried by bribery in opposition to the almost unanimous opinion of the country; that it continued to be so unpopular for half a century that it was with difficulty the English withstood the attempt at repeal and two determined risings of the people; that this unpopularity was to a great extent caused and wholly justified by the extreme distress it brought upon the country; and that the wants of the Scottish people were neglected and their desires thwarted by an alien Executive and a Legislature, in which their representatives were swamped by those of England.

The assertion that the Union was carried by foul means against the wishes of the majority is intended to give plausibility to the contention that the Union has worked badly, by creating the impression that a measure brought into existence amid unfavourable circumstances must have produced unfavourable results. But this is to appeal to an imaginary cause to explain an imaginary effect. The charge of bribery has been examined and refuted in an article in the preceding number of this *Review*; we have now to consider how much truth there is in the statement that the opposition to the Union was all but unanimous. The oft-repeated but futile attempts at Union on the part of the Scotch, previous to 1707, are enough to show that in at least one powerful section of the nation—the trading community—the desire for the scheme was so deep-rooted and persistent that failure and delay were unable to overcome or alter it. Not only merchants favoured the Union; ‘at first it took generally with Scotchmen,’ says Lockhart, the most able and active of the anti-Unionists. This view is supported by the proceedings in all the representative bodies which can be taken as tests of the opinion of the country—the Parliament, the Assembly, and the Convention of Burghs. In Parliament the Act was carried by 110

against 69 ; and in the division on the first article, which was perhaps the most critical, as up to that time there was a good deal of uncertainty as to the state of feeling on the subject, the numbers were 116 for, and 83 against, leaving a Unionist majority of 33. Not only was there a majority of the whole House, but there was also a majority in each of the three classes of which the House was composed ; the nobles being 46 against 21, the barons 37 against 33, and the burgesses 33 against 29. The decision given by Parliament must be taken as the deliberate opinion of the electorate ; for in the election of 1703, which took place at the time of one of the abortive attempts at Union, the question most prominently put before the electors,—both in the royal proclamation summoning the Parliament, and in the election address of the candidates—was that of union or no-union. And the people ratified the Parliamentary decision of the question in the only way open to them by returning a Whig or Unionist majority in the first general election after the Union—that of 1708.

The Assembly, from the large number of laymen it contained, may be considered almost as sure a reflector of the opinion of the country as Parliament itself. We find that this body took no prominent part on the one side or the other, its action being confined to three things wholly neutral and colourless. It ordered ‘a general fast and humiliation,’ under pressure (it is said) of the Jacobites, ‘men who were little used to fasts,’ and ‘who would be ashamed to hold up their faces,’ said Fletcher, who knew something of the underhand dealings of the time, ‘if we were to tell what we knew.’ There was also an address to the Parliament praying that the interests of the Church might be secured by a special Act. Another address containing the provisions to be inserted in such an Act was the last utterance of the Church on the subject. In addition to this negative evidence we have something more positive as to the state of feeling among the clergy from one whose intention it was to magnify the opposition to the Union throughout Scotland. Lockhart says, sarcastically, ‘the brethren for the most part were guilty of sinful silence ;’ and that ‘no sooner did Parliament pass an act for the security of the Kirk than most of their zeal cooled, and many of them

quite changed their notes, and preached up what not long before they had declared anathemas against.'

The Convention of Burghs at first sight seems to supply evidence of a feeling against the Union; for that body petitioned against the Treaty, though it might have been expected of all classes in the country to support the Union, representing as it did the trading interest of the community. But an analysis of the vote in the Convention shows rather that a majority of the merchants was not opposed to the Union. Of the 66 votes possible, 24 were given for petitioning against the Treaty, 20 against petitioning, and 22 were unrecorded. But the minority of 20 represented towns whose population and wealth surpassed that of the towns represented by the 24 of the majority; and even though the non-voters were reckoned as anti-Unionists, the whole of the opponents of the Union would be outnumbered in wealth, reckoned on the basis of taxation, in the proportion of more than two to one.

If, therefore, we look for the feeling of the country only to the constitutional organs for its expression, there is no evidence of that overwhelming opposition to the Union which is so often asserted and so readily believed. We are referred instead to the evidence of *petitions* and *mobs*. It is true that almost every shire, burgh, village, and corporation in the kingdom petitioned against the Union; and we may say that all through the months of November and December in 1706, when the Treaty was being fiercely debated, it snowed petitions in the Parliament House. If, then, we set aside all other evidence, and value that of the petitions as decisive, we must accept the conclusion that Scotland was unanimous against the Union. But in doing so we should be attaching far more value to these petitions than petitions generally deserve, and far more than contemporaries attached to them. Lockhart, in trying to explain away the uniform style and expression of the petitions, practically admits that they were machine-made and the result of wire-pulling.

'That vile monster and wretch, Daniel Defoe, and other mercenary tools and trumpeters of rebellion,' he said, 'have often asserted that these addresses and other instances of the nation's aversion to the Union proceeded from the false glosses and underhand dealings of those that opposed it in Parliament, whereby the meaner sort were imposed upon and deluded

into those jealousies and measures. I shall not deny but perhaps this measure of addressing had its first original as they report.*

Amid such a snow-storm of petitions there was a solitary one in favour of Union from Ayr, but not even this qualification has to be introduced in considering the evidence of mobs. At Dumfries, a body of two hundred men, following the Cameronian method of expressing their views, publicly burned the articles of the Union. At Edinburgh a riot took place on the 23rd of October, in which several prominent Unionists, such as Defoe, were put in peril of their life. At Glasgow the mob attained most success; 'it assaulted from the closes with curses and stones; the former did not much hurt except to the givers, but the latter wounded several of the inhabitants.' A number of these stalwart heroes actually set out from Glasgow for Edinburgh, armed with weapons as crazy as their opinions, but on hearing of the approach of a detachment of soldiers they were seized with a sudden access of modesty, which prevented them from carrying out their original intention of expressing their views forcibly to Her Majesty's servants. Thus 'all the gall and ill-humour of the party vented itself at the mouth,' as Defoe says; and the only conclusion the whole evidence warrants is that the anti-Unionist opposition was great in noise if not in numbers.

The second assertion, employed to lend colour to the contention, that the Union worked badly from the unfavourable circumstances amid which it was started, viz., that it continued to be unpopular for half-a-century, is one of those statements peculiarly misleading, from being true in one sense and false in another. Most people would understand by 'the Union' the system under which there was a united legislature, but in this sense the assertion contains very little truth. It is true, indeed, that a small section of patriots, led by Fletcher and Belhaven, strenuously opposed the Union, solely on the ground that it involved the extinction of the national legislature—the organ of the national existence, and the symbol of 'that independence so heroically maintained for 2,000 years.' But in the case of Scotland we cannot narrow the meaning of 'the Union' to the system of a united

* *Lockhart Papers, 1817.* Vol. I., p. 167.

legislature. We have been accustomed to such a narrowing in the case of Ireland, and have thus come to overlook one of the most important characteristics of the Scottish Union—the complexity of the settlement that goes under that name. Four questions, each by itself important enough to be called a revolution, were settled by the Treaty—free trade, the Church, the succession to the throne, and a united legislature. Now, the settlement of each of these questions proved objectionable to a different section of the community, and gave rise to a distinct set of opponents of the Union. The failure to keep this in mind has led to a great deal of the confusion of thought that exists when it is said that the Scottish Union was unpopular. It is at once supposed that there was a deep feeling of discontent because of the absorption of the national Parliament in the Imperial; whereas, much of the unpopularity was really directed against other parts of the settlement. By the establishment of free trade there was a temporary dislocation of industry and commerce, and the individuals on whom this misfortune fell naturally cried out against the Union. The settlement of the Church on an apparently unalterable basis irritated the Episcopalians, who, only eighteen years before had been displaced from their position of supremacy—a position which they still hoped to recover, and towards which they actually made some progress during the Tory administration of Queen Anne's reign. It was equally distasteful to the ultra-Presbyterians, who saw their Covenant set at naught, and an abomination like the Anglican Church recognised and secured by the same guarantees as the backsliding yet Presbyterian Church of their own country. But it was the settlement of the succession to the throne which provoked the keenest and most determined opposition to the Union. As the arrangement between England and Scotland formed the surest guarantee for the Protestant succession, and therefore the most insuperable barrier to the schemes of the Jacobites, it became the object of their greatest detestation. In fact, the greatest part of the unpopularity of the Union is to be credited to the resentment the Jacobites felt at being so effectually balked of their favourite project. But they were shrewd enough to conceal, as far as they could, the real ground of their opposition, screening themselves

behind ultra-Presbyterians and patriots as opponents of other parts of the Union settlement. This is established on incontestable evidence both by Defoe and Lockhart. The former speaks of the coalition against the Union as—

‘A monstrous conjunction of opposite and discording parties, where the Jacobites cried out for the Hanoverian succession, the Episcopalian for security to the Presbyterian Church, and the Tory against breach of the Covenant.* It was the most monstrous sight in the world to see the Jacobite and Presbyterian, the persecuting prelatie non-juror and the Cameronian, Papist and Protestant, parle together, join interest, and concert measures together ; to see Jacobites at Glasgow huzzaing the mob and encouraging them to have a care of the Church, and the high-flying Episcopalian dissenter crying out that the overture was not a sufficient security for the Church.’ †

Lockhart candidly admits that he played upon the fears of all sections of the community, and avows the object of all his anti-Unionist scheming to have been something very different from dissolving the union of the Parliaments.

‘I was at a good deal of pains,’ he says, ‘to publish and disperse among West-country Presbyterians who would not assist the King (i.e., Prince Charles), out of a principle of loyalty—papers which showed the consequences of the Union, and how impossible it was for the Scots to subsist under it.’ . . . ‘As my chief, nay only, design by engaging in public affairs was to serve the King, I had that always primarily in my view, and at the same time I was very desirous that the Scottish nation should have the honour of appearing as unanimously as possible for him.’ ‡

The anti-Presbyterian legislation was forced on for the same reason :

‘I pressed the Toleration and Patronage Acts more earnestly than I thought the Presbyterian clergy would be from thence convinced that the establishment of their Kirk would be in time overturned, as it was obvious that the security thereof was not so thoroughly established by the Union as they imagined.’ §

But the most striking illustration of the way in which the Jacobites worked upon material for discontent is that motion for Repeal in the House of Lords which is invariably referred to as triumphant proof of the widespread unpopularity of the Union. The motion originated in the failure of the Scottish members to prevent the imposition of the Malt-Tax.

* Defoe's *History of the Union*, 1709, p. 12.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21.

‡ *Lockhart Papers*, I., 418.

§ *Ibid.*, I., 418.

'And I believed,' says Lockhart, 'this affair of the Malt-Tax, as it touched every man's copyhold, and was a general grievance, would be the best handle to inflame and keep up the spirit and resentment of the Scots against the Union, the effects whereof I did conclude would tend to advance the King's interest.' *

The support given to the motion by the Whig lords, which brought it within four votes of being carried, was insincere, and the result of jealousy.

'Argyll, it was believed, declared himself against the Union with a design to break an egg in the Earl of Mar's pocket.' . . . 'Whether the Scots Lords did acquaint the Ministry, and that the Whigs suspected, their appearance in this affair was only from the outside, I will not take upon me to affirm, tho' I'm afraid there were some such underhand dealings by some who were deepest concerned in the administration of public affairs, and hence I believe it proceeded that the English did not enter far into the merits of the motion.' . . . 'Some who appeared outwardly zealous enough for the dissolution at London, thought fit to crush the design of addresses by their secret influence when they returned to Scotland.' †

When so much of the feeling against the Union was created and fostered by the Jacobites for their own ends, it is needless to show that the risings of 1715 and 1745 were not genuine protests against the Union. If there were any truth at all in the statement, we should expect to find those towns which had shown the most determined opposition to the Act of Union joining heartily with the rebels. Yet Glasgow, which had been the focus of discontent with the Union, was the most resolute opponent of the Separatist Jacobites.

The third statement brought forward to prove the baneful effects of the Union—that Scotland suffered severely for many years from the acutest economic distress—is a very one-sided account of the changes that necessarily followed the introduction of so sweeping a commercial revolution as that of free trade with England and the Colonies. But the century which has witnessed the momentary distress occasioned by the introduction of machinery into all departments of labour, followed by a material prosperity without a parallel in the world's history, ought to be able to judge rightly of a change which was essentially and permanently beneficial to Scotland, though for a time and in indi-

* *Lockhart Papers*, I., 418.

† *Ibid.*, 430, 436.

vidual cases, it might be the cause of much distress. If the import of English cloth injured for a time the native woollen manufacture, the labour that was thus deprived of its usual outlet was turned into new channels, and thus was laid the foundation of that linen manufacture, in which to this day Scotland stands pre-eminent. The surplus linen available for export doubled itself in each of the decades 1728-38-48, and increased steadily, so that a century after the Union the amount exported annually had multiplied itself almost twenty times. The rise of the great ports in the West was immediate, and Glasgow and Greenock may be said to be Union-made towns. In 1707 a voluntary assessment was made in Greenock for a harbour, which, when completed in 1710, covered an area of ten Scotch acres. The Glasgow merchants, not having ships of their own to trade with to the Colonies, in 1707 obtained Whitehaven vessels; in 1718 Scottish ships began to cross the Atlantic, and in 1735 Glasgow alone had 67 vessels, with an aggregate tonnage of 5,600. The same story of increasing wealth was told by a rising revenue. The Excise, which in 1708 produced only £35,000, rose steadily, till in 1713 it produced £62,000, after which it continued to fall so much that, in 1735, Forbes, the Lord Advocate, thought it necessary to draw up a memorandum as to the causes of the decrease. These he found not in the diminished prosperity of the country, but in the fast-spreading use of untaxed tea, 'that pernicious drug,' and in smuggling, which at that time—the time of the Porteous Riot—was regarded with favour by all but the revenue officers. By the middle of the eighteenth century, Scotland had fairly entered on that marvellous career of industrial enterprise and commercial prosperity, which were soon to give her a foremost place among the nations; and want of capital alone delayed to the second half of the century a success which might otherwise have signalled the earlier half, if only Scottish merchants had been able to make full use of the opportunities, secured by the Union, of unfettered trade with England and her Colonies.

The remaining assertion on which most reliance is placed for proving the unsatisfactory working of the Union—that Scotland suffered both in legislation and administration from the overwhelming superiority of England—is one of those statements

that have a *prima facie* appearance of truth, from being so much in accordance with what one might have expected from the circumstances of the case. There would have been nothing unnatural or unexpected in the overriding of Scottish opinion by an English majority, which numbered the representatives of the smaller nation more than ten times over. So far as numbers went, Scotland by the Union assumed the position (as an English peer expressed it) of a county of Britain; with its 45 members, it was practically on a level with Cornwall, which at that time had 44. The experiment was not only a novel one without any precedent from which to prognosticate success; it was also full of dangerous possibilities, which were pointed out at the time of the Union by those prophets of evil who inevitably appear at all great constitutional changes. In a pamphlet by one Hodges, who advocated a Federal instead of an Incorporating Union, the double danger was pointed out, of Scotland being at the mercy of England, and of England being at the mercy of Scotland. 'Though the Scotch with their fifty representatives are to have no power of doing any good to themselves but what the English shall think fit to allow them; yet they will always be capable thereby of doing mischief enough to England with the concurrence of those who are ready to consult their own private interest more than their country.' Both dangers were far from being imaginary—a fact for which no proof is required by men of the present day, who have become all too familiar with their appearance in the most acute form in the case of the Irish Union. Even in the case of Scotland, it was doubtful for a few years after the Union whether these difficulties were not actually to arise under the operation of causes similar to those which have led to the formation of the Irish National party. We shall find that the seeming disregard of Scottish opinion in Queen Anne's reign caused so much dissatisfaction that a National party was on the point of being formed, which would have anticipated by a century the Irish tactics of securing an object by holding the balance between rival English parties.

But there were elements in the Scottish problem which promised a far more satisfactory result than was to be looked for in the Irish case. First, there was so much similarity between the

English and the Scottish peoples in all those factors which go to the building up of a state—community of race, language, religion, and interest—that there was no difficulty in the amalgamating of the two, and in their combining to work harmoniously in a united legislature. So strong had been the influence of these unifying forces, that nothing short of the most powerful separatist agency—a forced union—had kept Scotland and England from becoming one state centuries before its successful consummation. In the absence of any counteracting force, the factors making for union would have free play, and the essential unity of the two peoples might be expected to reveal itself. Second, in Scotland there was no minority with whom the English might sympathise, and in whose favour they might be tempted to use all the power of the new State. The successful resistance of the Scotch against all efforts of the English to obtain a footing in their country, had prepared the way for the successful working of the Union, by removing what the experience of Ireland has shown to be the most dangerous obstacle to political harmony. How great this danger would have been, and how narrowly it was escaped, may be seen from the pro-Episcopalian legislation towards the end of Queen Anne's reign, which more than anything else brought the Union for a time into disrepute, if not into jeopardy. Third, the successful stand made by the Scotch against English domination, had not merely put them in a position to enter into union on an equal footing and as an independent power, but it had also given them a training in habits of political independence. The long centuries of war and watch against a powerful neighbour, ever ready to take advantage of weakness, had taught them to act as one body directed by one will, and had accustomed them to associate in constitutional bodies whenever their national interests seemed to be threatened or neglected. There was, therefore, not only less temptation to the English to override the will of the Scottish people from the non-existence of a minority, but even if they attempted it, they were sure to meet at once with a powerful organised opposition. The intense nationality feeling which had been developed by centuries of conflict, and the traditions of successful resistance to the English, were obstacles to the adoption of a domineering policy which might be taken up more

readily against a people like the Irish, who had no common traditions of independence, and whose whole history was one of subjection.

How far have these dangers of discord and hopes of harmony been realised in the actual working of the Union? This question has a special interest at the present time, for the problem in the Scottish and Irish Unions being essentially the same, we may expect to find the cause and the remedy of any break-down in the one from a comparison with the history of the other.

In answering the question we must bear in mind that there have been three distinct periods in the history of the Scottish Union, each representing a distinct phase in the position of the Scottish members in the united Parliament. The period from 1707 to 1714 was one of friction; from 1714 to 1832, one of harmony; from 1832 to the present time, one of occasionally clashing majorities.

Of the first half-dozen years—the critical period—of the Union, it might be possible to draw a picture in colours dark enough to justify the Cassandra prophecies of the anti-Unionists. In 1708, the Privy Council, that is the Scottish Executive, was abolished; the Treason Act of England was thrust upon Scotland; and Scottish peers were kept out of certain privileges which they maintained were secured to them under the Treaty. In 1713, the Malt Tax was extended to Scotland in spite of the unanimous opposition of its representatives, and this failure to prevent what was regarded as a gross injustice led to the motion for Repeal in the House of Lords which was rejected by only four votes. And most important of all, the rights of the National Church which had been so solemnly guaranteed by both Parliaments, were not merely infringed but subverted by such blows at Presbyterianism as the decision of the House of Lords in Greenshields' case in 1711, and the Toleration and Patronage Acts of 1712. But such a picture would be very misleading from the suppression of facts which are necessary to a true understanding of the case. The Privy Council ceased to have any *raison d'être* when the Parliament of which it was the Executive Committee ceased to be; the Treason Act was rendered necessary by the critical situation caused by the projected French invasion of 1708; and the claims

of Scottish peers were refused by a narrow majority of five in the House of Lords. In all of these measures there was such a combination of representatives from both countries as to make it clear that the votes were given not on national but on party lines. The Malt Tax Act stands alone as the cause of a division on national lines; 'it was the first instance since the Union of a national disposition against Scotland.' But its importance is diminished by the fact that it was really a belated discussion on the adjustment of taxation between the two countries, such as had formed matter for dispute and compromise on the part of the Commissioners negotiating the Union. The Repeal motion and the anti-Presbyterian legislation owed their origin to one and the same cause—the intrigues of the Jacobite party to make the Union unpopular and so drive the Scottish people into opposition to the Hanoverian succession which rested on the Union. This fact is so important, and its suppression has led to so distorted a view of the early working of the Union, that it is necessary to bring forward the most conclusive evidence—that of the Jacobite instigators of the anti-national policy.

'Mar, etc., represented to us that the Queen had commanded them to acquaint us that it would be agreeable to her if we deferred this matter : we yielded, but not without some seeming reluctance and on this express condition that they should report to the Queen that in obedience to Her Majesty we would not insist further at this time, but did expect and demand her royal promise that she would lay her commands on her Ministry to assist us vigorously in obtaining not only a Toleration but also the restoring of the Patronages in the next session.' *

This promise was extorted and its fulfilment demanded in 1712.

'The Earl of Oxford seemed much displeas'd and would once more have persuaded us to wait for a better season. It soon appear'd that the Bill would pass whether he would or not, and that he did not dare oppose it ; but to force his Lordship to appear for the Bill, Carnegie and I were sent from a great body of the Scots members to wait on him and in their name demand his assistance. He was not very fond of this respectful message ; however, he put the best face on't he could, and having promised did indeed give his helping hand to the Bill, which triumphantly pass'd both Houses.' †

'After the Toleration Bill was past, a motion was made for a Bill to restore the Patronages, which the E. of Oxford likewise press'd might be

* *Lockhart Papers*, I., 340.

† *Ibid.*, I., 378.

let fall, but it was pushed after the same manner, and with the same success as that of the Toleration to the great mortification of the Scotch Presbyterian and Whig Party, who saw that the Scotch Tories would not be put off with my Lord Oxford's dilatures on which their chief hopes were founded.*

And in 1714, Lockhart writes with reference to the Resumption Bill: 'The Queen commanded Mr. Secretary Bromley to desire us in her name not to push the Bill any further this time.' † These passages prove clearly enough that however pleasing to the Queen and her Tory Minister, Oxford, pro-Episcopalian legislation for Scotland might be, it was not they but Scotchmen who pressed the Acts, one of which has after more than a century proved disastrous to the Scottish Church.

After all the necessary qualifications and deductions have been made, the point to be emphasised is that measures distasteful to a majority of the people were adopted, and though they originated in circumstances very different from those which gave rise to anti-Irish legislation, yet being the same in their operation they had a similar issue in the formation of a National party. The proceedings of this party form so curious an episode in our history, and its tactics resemble so closely those of the Irish National party that the account of it must be given in the very words of the founder and leader of the party.

'Suppose when this affair, (the Repeal motion) comes to be pursued, a bargain can be made with the Ministry that we shall support them in what they have to demand in this session of Parliament, and they join and enable us to carry through the dissolution of the Union, how far will we think ourselves bound unanimously to agree thereto and perform accordingly? On the other hand, if the Ministry will not come into this measure, and the Whigs will take us by the hand and support us, how far will it be reasonable for us on that condition to join unanimously with them against the Ministry? 'Twas needless to determine either of these points at present, it being time enough when it appeared which of them was most likely to do our business. Nothing more was now necessary than to lay aside private separate views and resolve jointly to concur with any measure and any party that could and would contribute to so good an effect. He said *any* measure and *any* party, because he presumed no measure and no party could be bad which would terminate in so desirable an issue.' ‡

All hands were set to work and application was made to both English Whigs and Tories for forming a party and gaining friends. The Ministry

* *Lockhart Papers*, I., 385.

† *Ibid.*, I., 451.

‡ *Ibid.*, I., 434.

and most of the Tories would not come in to the measure at any rate. The Whigs were glad to see the division and told the Scots they would take them by the hand and support them, nay, procure what they desired, provided they would join heartily with them against the Ministry in all things. But as the Scots saw the Whigs proposed to perform nothing till once they had discussed the present Ministry and were in full power themselves, they answered that their mutual good offices and services must go hand in hand together. After this manner they treated without either breaking up altogether or coming to any agreement with one another.*

This abortive coalition of Whigs and Scotch Tory Repealers left slight traces of its work on the session of 1713. 'Though the dependents of Ministers voted with them as formerly, yet a good number (of Scottish Tories) expressed resentment at the usage they had met with, and by joining with the Whigs and discontented Tories carried several votes to the no small dissatisfaction of the Ministry.' In the session of 1714, 'as parties now were more equal, if we could prevail with the Scots Peers to exert themselves they might force the Ministry to do right things; having the balance and ball at their foot, they might get anything they pleased for their country. I enlarged a good deal on the necessity of this method with the Ministry, who, without they were compelled to alter their ways, would by doing nothing ruin us and themselves likewise.' †

The existence of a National party was thus rendered just possible by the anti-national laws that were passed at the secret instigation of the very men who aspired to be the leaders of the National party. By their underhand dealings they artfully created and fomented that popular discontent which is the indispensable material for any such movement as they contemplated. The artificial origin of the discontent did not prevent it from serving the same purpose as though it had been real; the only difference arising from its being manufactured was that its effects were temporary, and vanished completely with the disappearance of the men who had stirred it up to advance their own ends. There was no material for the permanent antagonism of the Scotch representatives to the English in a system under which, at its worst, its most determined opponent was forced to confess: 'Our opinions were asked and followed in most matters

* *Lockhart Papers*, I., 434.

† *Ibid.*, I., 443.

relating to Scotland; and the Ministry applied directly to us in what they expected or desired from us and our countrymen.' *

While there is danger, therefore, of overrating the amount of friction in the working of the Union in its early stages, there is equal danger of overrating the harmony which forms the characteristic of the next period. One is apt to suppose, from the mere fact that for more than a century there was (with the exception of the Porteous Riot Act of 1737) no open or flagrant discord between the representatives of the two countries, that such a state of harmony is the normal and natural relation existing between the two peoples. The odium brought upon the Scots by the violence of the Porteous mob, by the Jacobite raid into England in 1745, and by the ministry of Lord Bute in 1762—an odium to which expression was given by such writers as Junius, Samuel Johnson, and Charles Lamb—did not disturb the political harmony that prevailed throughout more than a century. But the harmony was to a great extent artificial, the representative system being so corrupt that the Government of the day could secure the return of like majorities in both countries, independently of the real opinion of the people themselves. Besides, there were no great outstanding questions on which it was necessary for the people to decide; the Revolution and the Union had settled to the satisfaction of the great majority of the nation all the disputes in Church and State which had convulsed the Kingdom for centuries. The energies of the people were now devoted to intellectual pursuits, so that the eighteenth century became the Golden Age of Scottish Literature; or to commercial enterprise which was carried on with all the 'perfervid' intensity which had been thrown into the religious struggle of the previous century. The thoroughness with which the old idol had been supplanted is curiously illustrated by a remark of Wodrow's on the loss of £10,000, which the Glasgow merchants sustained by the French capture of vessels in 1709: 'I am sure the Lord is remarkably frowning upon our trade since it was put in the room of religion in the late alteration of our constitution.' Now, questions of trade were precisely those on which there was sure to be least disagreement

* *Lockhart Papers*, I., 338.

between England and Scotland, for the interests of both were identical as against those of foreign nations.

As the Reform Bill of 1832, first allowed the genuine voice of the people to be heard, and as it inaugurated a period in which questions that had slept for more than a century demanded settlement by the legislature, it was to be expected that the harmony which characterised the previous period and which had in it something of the placidity of death, should give place to the variety and difference which are the invariable concomitants of life. In the sixty years that have elapsed since the Reform Act, Scotland has returned to every Parliament a majority of Liberals, while England has occasionally returned a majority of Conservatives, the result being that the one country has suffered from its majority being overridden by that of the other. It might be said that if this is an evil, it affects both countries equally,—that if England has thrust a Conservative Government on Scotland, as a set-off to this Scotland has thrust a Liberal Government on England. But there is an inequality in the chances of the evil happening to each country; England having seven times more members requires a much smaller percentage of a majority than Scotland does to reverse the verdict of the sister country. So far as Imperial affairs are concerned, neither nation has any ground for complaint on this score, the Imperial ministry being necessarily formed in accordance with the Imperial majority. But when we come to matters which concern one of the kingdoms to the exclusion of the other, and separate Acts of Parliament are required to deal with those matters, it has been felt to be a grievance (especially by Scotland which is especially exposed to the evil) that the majority of the one country should vote down measures desired by the majority of the other. The extent of the grievance is not to be determined in the mechanical way which has been resorted to of parading Scotch majorities converted into Imperial minorities by English votes, but rather by the importance of the questions the settlement of which has been postponed or prevented by the English majorities. The Church is the most characteristic expression of the national character, and the institution which lies nearest the heart of every Scotchman; yet this most precious of all the national inheritances was

rent in twain through the inability of English members and English Ministers to understand the feeling which they regarded as sheer folly and fanaticism. Had there been a National Parliament, as in the old days when the almost simultaneous meeting of the two representative bodies of the nation, the Parliament and the Assembly, diminished the liability to a conflict between the two, there never would have been a Church question, or if it had arisen, it would have been settled without delay and without doubt as to the decision of the people. If there is another part of national life characteristic of Scotland, it is her educational system, and here too she has suffered grievously through delay, if not also through misunderstanding. It cannot be supposed that the people whose representatives in 1696 established a school in every parish would with a National Parliament at the end of two centuries have done nothing towards the organization of secondary education or have taken a whole decade to the passing of a University Reform Bill. Such defects have not arisen from an anti-national spirit on the part of England as in the case of Ireland, but seem to be inseparable from a central legislative assembly burdened with the endless wants of a huge modern empire.

Important as it is that the laws of a country should be made in accordance with the wishes of its representatives, it is still more important that the administration of those laws should be in the hands of men who are trusted and honoured by the people. In the Executive department Scotland has had its destinies in its own hand even more than in the Legislative. Though the great body of the people for a long time had no voice in shaping the national policy, it was Scotchmen alone—an Argyll or a Dundas—who played the autocrat in Scotland. The affairs of our country have been exclusively in the hands of our countrymen, and the spirit of self-government has been as active and vigorous under the Union as when there was a separate Independent Parliament. With the abolition of the Privy Council in 1708, the executive authority of Scotland was vested in the Lord Advocate and the Scottish Secretary, who were both invariably Scotchmen, and when the office of the latter was discontinued, in 1725, it only left Scottish affairs more entirely in the hands

of the Lord Advocate, who was of necessity a Scottish lawyer. So completely a matter of course did it become, that Scotchmen alone were to be entrusted with the management of their country's affairs, that Struthers, in his history of Scotland, written sixty years ago, says: 'There has existed an unhappy prejudice among British statesmen that Scotland could not be governed but by Scotchmen.' If with the growing complexity of modern life complaints have been made about the administration of Scottish affairs, those complaints are directed against excessive centralisation, not (as in the case of Ireland) against an anti-national spirit which seeks to govern through an alien bureaucracy. We thus arrive at the same conclusion on the administrative as on the legislative side with regard to the working of the Scottish Union: that such defects as have appeared in recent years are not violations of the spirit of self-government inflicted in wanton presumption on an inferior people, but are merely the inevitable consequences of an antiquated system being called upon to deal with modern wants. This difference is important enough to place the movements for Home Rule in Ireland and in Scotland in wholly different categories. While both countries alike suffer from the transaction of local affairs at Westminster, and both would benefit from the devolution of those affairs to local Parliaments, the remedy in the one case consists in the reversal of a policy which stands condemned by its disastrous results,—in the substitution of self-government for paternal rule; in the other the remedy consists merely in the development and application of the principle of Home Rule which has been at the root of the successful working of the Scottish Union.

The facts that have been adduced warrant the assertion of these two propositions regarding the working of the Scottish Union; that, unlike the Irish, it has in the main proved a conspicuous success, the people having been prosperous and contented under it almost from the first; and that, also in contrast with the case of Ireland, the Union has been carried out in some spirit of respect for the principle of self-government. While these two facts are undeniable it may yet be contended that the connection between the two is one of concomitancy

only, not one of causation. It may plausibly be asserted that the success is to be attributed not at all to the deference and forbearance shewn by England towards Scottish opinion, but to such factors as national character, education, natural aptitude for politics, etc. But though these elements may have contributed in some measure to the favourable result, it may be established on two distinct grounds that unless the principle of Home Rule had been acted on at least to some extent, the Scottish Union would never have turned out the success it has been. In the first place we may compare the two great phases in the relations of England and Scotland, and note their characteristics and their results. In the first, Scotland maintained a formal independence as a protest and barrier against the attempts of England to secure by force or intrigue unity of State or uniformity of religion throughout the whole of Britain; in the second, Scotland laid aside her *separate* independence, while England substituted for her old policy one which allowed Scotchmen to manage their own peculiar affairs. The harmony which has sprung up between the two countries under the operation of this new policy was as completely absent in the first period as was the acknowledgment on the part of England of the right of self-government. When we find one circumstance appearing and disappearing in this way with the appearance and disappearance of another, we may conclude that the one is to some extent the cause of the other. The same conclusion is confirmed by a comparison of the Scottish and Irish Unions—so similar in the circumstances amid which they were entered upon, and so different in their issues. Although there are several points in which the two experiments differ, such as race, religion, national character, and traditions, yet the one outstanding difference consists in this that Scotland has never been wholly without self-government while Ireland has never had even the appearance of it. It may therefore be inferred that the existence of self-government has had something to do with the success of the Scottish Union, and that the absence of it has had something to do with the failure of the Irish Union.

JOHN DOWNIE.

ART. X.—SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN REVIEWS.

GERMANY.

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (July, August, September).—Each of the numbers for this quarter opens with an instalment of 'Frauenrecht,' a new novel from the pen of Herr Karl Frenzel. The horrors of the great French Revolution form the background of the stirring story, whilst for his central figure, the author has chosen the famous wife of the learned Roland. A succession of striking scenes lead up to the well-known dénouement—her death on the scaffold.—'Count Eckbrecht Dürckheim' is the title of an anonymous essay which sets forth the life and work of one who, from the German point of view, deserves the name here given him, of an Alsatian patriot. He was one of the first to accept German rule, and never ceased his efforts to reconcile his compatriots with the new order of things.—'A Friend of the East' contributes a long political article which he entitles 'The later Phases of Turkish Policy.' The paper, which is remarkable for its high literary merit as well as for its valuable matter, deals with the revolution which has taken place in both the home and the foreign policy of the Turkish Empire since the accession of Sultan Abdul Hamid. The sketches given not only of the Sultan himself, but also of his ministers and ex-ministers, are particularly interesting. Information of considerable importance is also communicated with regard to the pan-Islamite agitation. The essay may be looked upon as a weighty contribution to the history of European civilization.—Herr Otto Brahms has done good service by the able manner in which he has edited, under the title 'Roman Letters of Karl Stauffer-Bern,' the letters written by the artist during the years 1888 and 1889. The article brings a striking personality very vividly before the reader, and enlists his sympathies for the victim of an untimely and tragic death.—Under the heading 'Goethe's Vorahnungen Kommender naturwissenschaftlicher Ideen,' there is a reproduction of the address delivered by Professor von Helmholtz before a meeting of the Goethe society, in Weimar. The well-known savant indicates the extent and value of Goethe's researches in the domain of science.—The August number contains another Goethe article, in the shape of an essay by Herr Reinhold Steig, who has chosen for his subject the poet's well-known friend Bettina, the sister of Clemens Brentano, and wife of Achin von Arnim. A number of original letters add considerably to the value of a

most interesting paper.—Two papers, the one philosophical, the other scientific, are contributed by Professor Dilthey and Professor Dohrn. The former takes for his subject the three epochs of modern æsthetics and their present problem; the latter sketches a history of the organisation of the zoological station at Naples.—The Talleyrand anecdotes supply Lady Blennerhassett with matter for an interesting paper, and Herr F. Gustav Jansen writes pleasantly and interestingly about Chopin.—In addition to conclusions of various contributions begun in former numbers, the September part contains an account, by Herr Lenz, of the results achieved by the German historical institute in Rome, and a scientific paper entitled, ‘Ueber Wechselwirkungen im lebendigen Organismus,’—An account of the celebration of the Jubilee of Dublin University is given by Herr Strasburger.

WESTERMANN'S MONATS-HEFTE (July, August, September).—In the three numbers for this quarter light literature figures very conspicuously, and claims a large proportion of space. There is, in the first place, the conclusion of Wilhelm Jensen's novel: ‘Jenseits des Wassers.’ A sketch of student life, ‘Auf der Mensur,’ runs through two numbers; and ‘Die neue Bonne,’ a novelette by Berger, is complete in the July part. Herr Hieronymus Lorm contributes ‘Gräfin Walfron,’ a story in two parts, to the August and September numbers, in which are further two novelettes, ‘Der Wille, zur Illusion,’ and ‘Ein Abend bei Excellenz Laura.’ Finally, Herr Eugen Zabel begins a Berlin sketch, ‘Auf dem Kutschbock.’—The descriptive papers which usually bulk so largely in this magazine are less numerous than usual, though their quality, both as regards text and illustrations, is fully up to the high standard of former quarters. An excellent account of the South-sea islands is accompanied by no less than 20 sketches. A description and history of Oranienburg brings with it a series of portraits of the now imperial, but formerly, only electoral house. Finally, Herr Stern, takes the reader to Stockholm, and proves himself a most entertaining guide.—Going back to the July number, we find a sketch, with portrait, of Goethe's mother.—A short, but instructive astronomical paper by Herr Ehrlich, has the planet Venus for its subject.—Criminality amongst women is dealt with in a most instructive paper by Herr Fald, who does not take a very flattering view of the fair sex. He holds, and statistics appear to bear him out, that women have no higher morality than men; that if there are fewer criminals amongst them, it is merely owing to circumstances; that the nearer their position approaches that of men, the

greater their criminality; and, finally, that when once they have begun a career of crime, they go faster and further than men.—An article of special interest for military readers is contributed by an old officer on the General Staff. It gives a detailed account of the operations before Metz. It is accompanied by two maps, and a remarkably good portrait of Prince Frederick Charles. The same number has two interesting archæological papers—one on ancient portraiture, the other on the oldest herbarium in the world.—In the third number two excellent biographical essays appear. The first of them, which is by Herr Hermann Meissner, is devoted to the artist Max Liebermann, and is accompanied with a portrait of him, as well as with eight illustrations from his works. Mr. Marion Crawford is the subject of the other.

PREUSSISCHE JAHRBÜCHER (July, August, September).—A further instalment of Mr. Marion Crawford's 'Zoroaster,' is in the July number, followed by a paper in which the disadvantages of having a different time in each country are set forth, and a scheme for securing unity in this matter is put forward.—The two next contributions are of more limited interest. One deals with the question of testing apprentices; the other is headed, 'How should we build our Evangelical Churches?'—An article of great erudition is that by Herr Jäger. It is an attempt to determine the character of Alexander, not as a leader and a conqueror, but as a monarch. It is entitled 'Alexander der Grosse als Regent.'—Amongst other very solid matter, August brings a long review of Pfleiderer's history of Protestant Theology. It is an able piece of work; but, so far as the English reader is concerned, omits dealing with the most interesting part of the work—that in which the author deals with English theology and philosophy.—A very interesting and suggestive paper, and one of considerable value for the understanding of Schiller's dramatic works is contributed by Herr Ribbeck. It bears the title 'Schiller and the Idea of Fate,' and shows, how, in most of his productions, the poet has made the hero's destiny depend less on himself and his own actions, than on the force of circumstances.—'Friedrich des Grosse als Morallehrer' is a paper written in all probability by a Prussian, and certainly for Prussians. It does not possess any very great interest for others. 'The Battle of the Eise,' goes back to the middle of the 13th century. It is the account of an encounter between Germany and Russia.—The table of contents for September has one item of special interest for English readers, although, in substance, it will not be quite new to some of them. It is based on the so-called Derby Accounts, discovered by Pauli, and

showing the expenses incurred by the Duke of Lancaster, afterwards Henry IV., on his journey through Germany, after his banishment from England.—‘The Beginning of the Modern Novel’ is less interesting than its title indicates. It is not much more than an account of the old romances of the Middle Age.—Another contribution which deserves to be pointed out is Herr Thimme’s essay, ‘The Connection between Religion and Art amongst the Greeks.’

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. Viertes Heft. 1892.—Dr. Carl Clemen has the first place here with the continuation of his survey of ‘the Present Position of Religious Thought in Great Britain.’ It was begun in last number, and in that first part he sketched the rise and progress of the Evangelical Revival, that breathed such life into all the Churches in the earlier decades of this century, and directed their awakened enthusiasm into channels of practical benevolence. Then he described the origin and influence of what is known as the Oxford Movement. Here he deals with the rise of the Broad Church, and the trend of religious thought resulting from the writings of its most distinguished leaders. Next he passes under review the effects on our doctrinal standpoint of the invasion of the Higher Criticism. The second part of his article is headed ‘Anti-religious Polemics,’ and here he glances at the changes which have come over the thoughts of most of our theologians regarding almost all the traditional dogmas of the Church, through the teachings of modern science, and the philosophical speculations of most recent times. In the third and last part of his article he deals with the various efforts made to adjust the cardinal doctrines of Christianity to suit our altered modes of conception. This part is headed ‘Philosophic Apologetics.’ Dr. Clemen’s object is to show his countrymen the secret, so to speak, of our theological and religious differences, to trace them to their sources and mark out their mutual influence. He hopes in this way to lead his readers to take a more intelligent interest in our religious life and derive practical benefit from their study of us. The article will be read with pleasure and profit amongst ourselves. It is a fair, temperate, and kindly criticism of us, and is written in a spirit of sympathy with the intellectual life out of which all our differences have arisen.—The second article in this number is by Herr Pfarrer Karl Marti, and is the second of ‘Two Studies on Zechariah.’ The first was on the ‘Satan’ of Chap. III. This one is an exegetical study of Chap. vi., 9-15. It is confessedly a difficult passage, and has taxed the ingenuity of all interpreters. It is chiefly, however, with the textual problems that Herr Marti

concerns himself here. The suggestions made by critics are carefully examined, and their defects are noted. And after a very painstaking review of the conditions to be satisfied, he offers the following reading of the verses as furnishing what he thinks the original sense of the passage. 'The word of Jahve came unto me, saying: Take of the gifts of the captivity which were brought by Heldai from Tobijah and Jedaiah, and come thou on the same day, and go into the house of Josiah, the son of Zephaniah, who has come from Babylon. There take silver and gold and prepare crowns and place them on the head of Zerubbabel, and the head of Joshua, the son of Jozadak, and speak unto them, saying, Thus hath Jahve Zebaioth spoken, Behold there a man, Branch is his name, and under him will it sprout; he will build the temple of Jahve. He will build the temple of Jahve, and bear royal honour and sit and reign in his throne, and there will be a priest at his right hand, and a peaceful understanding shall be between them,' etc.—Dr. Bratke contributes an interesting paper on the controversy as to the year of our Lord's death. Of the shorter papers may be mentioned the one on 1st Corinthians, iv., 2, which is also an attempt to make clear an obscure passage of Scripture. The only volume reviewed is Sulze's 'Die Evangelische Gemeinde.'

R U S S I A .

VOPROSI PHILOSOPHII I PSYCHOLOGII (Questions Philosophical and Psychological.)—The thirteenth number begins with the concluding article by M. B. Tchichérin of his lengthened series on the Positive Philosophy and the Unity of Science. The present number occupies itself more especially with the Unity of Science. Comte seems to have contemplated in closing his researches as to the foundation of the sciences by his work on social physics the unification of all the sciences relating to man. Such a unification, he writes, is impossible until the moral sphere is brought under the same principle and point of view as the physical. He then occupies himself with the question as to which of the scientific hierarchy occupies the foremost place? Something is to be said for mathematics from their simplicity and generality as to their forming a unifying element. But this advantage only belongs to the earlier studies in the sciences, which the further they advance, escape more and more from mathematical determination. And the further we advance, this very elementary character renders them by its incompleteness less suited to the point of view constituting the very essence of the Positive Philosophy. The concluding science of Sociology is free from this defect or

disqualification and has every needful property to enable it to stand at the head of the hierarchy of the sciences. It includes in itself all the preceding methods and points of view, which it fills with newer and higher things, so that subordinate to the other sciences on the one side, it rises above them on the other as ruling and paramount. Still he admits that in view of its recent creation as a positive science, it will only be possible to explain its necessary predominance. But in truth, Sociology, as constituted by Comte, had no claim to any such scientific priority, for it was founded, as we have seen, on pure phantasy, nor was it capable of contributing anything else to the other sciences than false conceptions founded on an imaginary evolution. Comte does not even attempt to explain his position that the unity of the sciences demands a lordship of one of them over the rest. But M. Tchicherin dissents from other attempted dominations of one science over another and finds no ground for them. He follows up Comte's theory of the unity of science further. The latter found the general connection or bond of the sciences in two relations, in a logical on the side of method, and in a scientific on the side of the contained sciences. But our critic holds that the understanding of scientific method is one of the very weakest sides in the teaching of Comte. This is shown in his talking about approximating the contents of Sociology to the 'methods of positive philosophy at last complete and therefore indivisible.' He believed that it was needful to communicate only theologico-physical ideas with a certain chimerical elevation, but that the true spirit of the positive philosophy needed only the plain utterance of good sense with methodical clearness on all subjects accessible to the human spirit. If theological philosophy has only been the property of a few, the *élite* of humanity, ascribed in its original form to supernatural beings, it will be the peculiarity of the Positive Philosophy to unite the whole thinking masses of humanity. M. Tchichérin tells us that such a view only indicates a complete misunderstanding of the constitution and peculiarities of all scientific method. Before all, it is not clear what is to be understood under the name of common sound sense. Obviously, Comte restricts this conception to the daily observation of external phenomena. Now how does it stand with ordinary sound sense in the question of religion? What if the huge majority of the human race were asked to conform to the doctrines of the Positive Philosophy and to declare that all theological conceptions are nothing else than phantasmagoria? Even Comte himself admits that man by natural conviction regards external objects as like himself, whence springs the religious point of view, only science brings him to another conviction. If so, his own

theory of common sound sense is put out of court! Further it is shown that this view, that Science is to become the property of the masses, is not justified by history. It was not humanity, but Descartes that first made use of analytical geometry; not humanity but Newton and Leibnitz that invented the differential calculus. M. Tchichérin comes finally to the conclusion, after a lengthened review of Comte's principles as to the Unity of Science, that on the ground of Positive Philosophy, no such unity is at all possible. To reach this, it is necessary to rise from the particular to the general, from phenomena to substances. But this, M. Tchichérin holds to be the turning point which lies before contemporary science, and which can alone lead humanity into a new path, broader, and more closely corresponding to its true necessities than that in which it is now found. The law of historical development, that the dominion of the Positive Philosophy, or otherwise of realism, characterises only a medium degree of intellectual development, in which the particular dominates over the general, involves necessarily a certain inherent insufficiency. We remark a certain analogy here to a historical fact in the animal kingdom, by which a superfluity of nutrition leads to an atrophy of other and higher functions. The prevalence of this lower point of view, the sacrifice of the general to the particular, is seen in the present state of humanity! There are but few great men, because we are content with lower ideals of humanity!—The second article by M. Ivanzoff pursues further the analysis of the scientific views of Professor Huxley. He points out that the uniformitarian theory in geology advocated by Lyell, etc., led to certain conclusions as to the development and finally to the theory of evolution. There are three possible theories. The first holds that such as the world now is, it has ever been. The second holds that the present condition has only had a limited existence. The third is that of evolution. M. Ivanzoff enters into a very copious argument to prove the validity of this theory. First, there are no facts which contradict it, though there are some which seem to be indifferent, such as certain persistent types which only shew that the environment in which they lived, had not undergone change. Then the scanty forms of the record, etc. Secondly, facts if they do not prove, shew a high degree of probability. There are certain intermediate forms as the *Anoplotherium* between the hog species and the ruminants, *Palaeotherium* between the rhinoceros and the tapir, and *Archaeopteria* between birds and reptiles. Thirdly, facts convincing to such a degree that they clearly speak in favour of evolution, forms which are clearly successions of certain older forms, such as between a certain older variety of

horses and the presently existing forms, the older civet and the modern hyena, etc. The contemporary forms of evolution in its application to the existing fauna and flora as well as to the extinct have their ground in the following conclusions, judgments, and physical observations:—(1) Mechanism of the physical Universe. (2) Graduation in structure. (3) Analogy between series of gradations and relations of species both animal and vegetable. (4) Grounds of difference presenting the ground plan of structure. (5) Observation of rudimentary and useless forms. (6) Observation of the influence of the change of external conditions on living organisms. (7) Observation of the facts of geographical distribution. (8) Observation of the facts of geological succession. From this M. Ivanzoff passes to the discussion of Darwinism as presented in the *Origin of Species*, and the force of the argument for and against Teleology, then to the place of man in nature, the origin of man in his animal existence, and the possibility of the development of man's highest spiritual faculties by way of natural selection, in regard to which last, the author cites the corrections of St. George Mivart and Wallace. The article is not concluded.—The article which succeeds is named 'Will in Knowledge and Will in Faith,' by M. Astafieff. It is a monograph reviewing and illustrating the work of Professor Strunnikoff, designated 'Faith as Assurance according to the doctrine of Orthodoxy, meaning the Orthodoxy of the Russo-Greek Church.' The Professor, in his book with the above title which appeared as far back as 1887, holds, according to M. Astafieff, though he believes erroneously, that in faith the substance is assurance. But the learned Professor proceeds further and asserts that 'faith as assurance may be identical with knowledge.' And to this seemingly questionable conclusion he calls in the sanction of the Greek fathers;—Gregory the Great, or the Divine; John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Clement of Alexandria and Joannes Damascenus; and seeks to prove with their aid that faith, generally speaking, is identical with knowledge.—The fourth paper in the number is by Prince E. Trubetskoie, being a continuation of his series on the Philosophy of the Christian Theocracy of the Fifth Century, and is specially devoted to Augustine's doctrine as to the City of God. The Christian heresies with which Augustine contended were not directed chiefly and directly against the idea of the City of God as such. Each of them admitted in principle the idea of the Divine Kingdom, but directed their attacks against a certain form which it took. Thus, the Manicheans believed in the Kingdom of Light, but limited it by the Kingdom of Satan. The Donatists did not oppose directly the City of God, but they exchanged

the Divine element in it for the human and converted it into a Punic empire. The Pelagians also admitted in principle the Kingdom of God, but recognised its foundation as resting upon the free will of man, and saw in it only an external unity of law binding together free personalities. All these doctrines approximate internally as current elements hostile to Christianity which they sought to circumscribe, limit or lessen from its lofty place as the true city of God, the Heavenly City, to become a thing of a purely human character, cutting off or removing so much of the Christian element to present something fragmentary, incomplete, and, as it were, masked or 'mummified.' Augustine was not called upon to assault these views out and out. He had only to deal with their partial exhibitions of the truth. As against them he showed the Kingdom of God as at once a principle of world unity and the foundation of a world structure, human in its order and sociality, but bounded by no narrow particularity. It is universal and comprises all the nations. It has to do with earthly and human relations, but yet it is at the same time heavenly in ideal, a moral imperative. It determines actually the human will not by outward promises and threatenings, but entering into the innermost recesses of the human personality as Divine Grace, it binds the whole human race into one united social body. The Prince proceeds to work out this magnificent conception historically in all its bearings and details.—The last article is a defence by Count Leo Tolstoi, or rather an earnest inculcation of the ethics of Vegetarianism. It was written for another purpose, but is included here for its general human interest. It is not possible to summarize it. It ought to be read in its entirety. 'Flesh meat,' as it is named in Scotland in opposition to the English 'meat,' the only food worth speaking of,—Count Tolstoi holds to be one of the main incentives to the vilest sins. There is a picture of the slaughter-houses in Tula which could only be drawn by a man of genius, which accentuates powerfully in its moral results and bearings the Count's views. Would that there were room for it here! The Count's article will, however, appear in an English dress, and the picture along with it, and it cannot fail to have its effect.—In the special section of the Journal there are two articles, the first, a continuation by the Editor of his 'Fundamental Momenta in the development of the Modern Philosophy,' dealing with our British Philosophers John Locke and George Berkeley. The second is part of a paper prepared by N. Louze, for the late Experimental Congress in London on the Law of Perception. The rest of the journal is occupied by the usual reviews and bibliography.

ITALY.

L'ARCHIVIO STORICO ITALIANO. (Issue 2, 1892.)—'The Origin of the Consulate,' with special reference to Florence-Fiesole, from the German, with notes by R. Davidsohn.—'The Letters of Emanuel Philibert of Savoy to the Duke of Mantua.'—'Gaia di Camino,' from old documents of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, by P. Rajna.—'Petrarch's Mother,' by C. O. Coraggio.—The Notes Varieties and Bibliographical Review are very extensive.

L'ARCHIVIO STORICO PER LE PROVINCE NAPOLITANE. (Year 17, Issue 2.)—Following a new instalment of Del Giudice's 'Filangieri in the times of Frederic, Conrad, and Manfred,' we have here some notes on the chronology of the life of the astrologer, Luca Guarico, by F. Gabotti.—The other contents of this number are continuations of Nunziante's 'Ferdinand of Aragon, and the Invasion by John of Anjou;' M. Schifa's 'The Duchy of Naples;' B. Capasso's 'Plan of Naples in the Eleventh Century;' and C. de Blasi's 'Boccaccio's Residence in Naples.'—The number has a photograph of the gravestone lately discovered in Naples, representing a man seated, and holding the hand of a woman standing before him, with a small child at her side.

LA NUOVA ANTOLOGIA. (June 16.)—Colonel Barattieri publishes the second part of his interesting paper on the 'Black Mariah Race,' graphically describing their strange customs.—M. Scherillo has a study on 'Norma,' showing that Bellini's subject was taken by the Librettist Romani from the 'Norma' of Alessandro Soumet, which was played at the Odeon on the 6th April, 1831.—G. Goiran attempts to sum up the political, military, and geographical conditions of the principal European powers in a single sketch. He concludes that at present no power can follow an isolated policy, and that, were Italy to withdraw from the Triple Alliance, she would be forced into an uncertain and dangerous policy.—O. Grandi sends a novellette, 'Insidia.'—O. Marucchi writes on Wilbour's recent discovery of an ancient Egyptian inscription.—E. Mancini urges the prevention of the prevailing adulteration of food.

LA NUOVA ANTOLOGIA. (July 1st.)—Apropos of the 'Souvenirs of General Macdonald,' A. Franchetti writes about the General's relations with the Neapolitan Republic.—P. Giacosa describes ancient opinions on the malaria, and points out that Terentius rightly ascribed the disease to minute invisible insects bred in the marshes.—G. Chiarini finds an article on two English works, Bullen's *The Jew of Malta in the Writings of Chris-*

topher Marlow, and H. H. Furness's *The Merchant of Venice in the New Variora Edition*.—Signora Pigorini-Beri contributes a short story, 'The New Mass,' and P. Mantegazza describes, with repulsion, a bull-fight at Seville.—Colonel G. G. discusses the neutrality of Switzerland.—July 16.—Arturo Issel commences a series of chapters proposing to give an account of the discoveries in Liguria, preceding it by a sketch of the origin, ethnography, and anthropology of the inhabitants.—E. Penzacchi contributes a short paper on 'Academies and Art in Italy,' with regard to desirable reforms.—P. Fambri offers in this and following number some considerations on 'Military Gymnastics.—Countess Lovatelli writes an interesting article on the 'Gardens of Adonis,' describing the silver baskets in which corn, lettuce, and other plants were forced, a reminiscence of which custom still exists in Sardinia on occasion of the feast of the 24th of June. Sometime in the previous March or April, says Countess Lovatelli, a villager presents himself before a neighbour, and asks her to be his *comare* gossip (valentine?) for the rest of the year. If she accepts, she takes care, at the beginning of May, to twist a piece of cork into the shape of a vase, fill it with light earth, and sow corn in it. She places it in the sun and waters it assiduously. In less than a month the corn shoots vigorously, so that on the eve of St. John it is already a fine plant. The vase is then called the *erme* or *neneri*, and on the day of St. John the man and woman, richly dressed, and accompanied by a joyous crowd of girls and boys, proceed to a little church outside the village, and, stopping at a short distance from its door, throw the vase against it, on which of course it breaks. The merry party then sit in a circle and regale on eggs fried with herbs, and drink in turn from a large flask of wine. After which they all join hands, and sing '*compare e comare di San Giovanni*,' ('oh, the gossips of St. John!'), till at last they rise and dance till late at night. At another place the festival still more closely resembles the feast of Adonis, for here the girls who have cultivated corn in cork vases, as above described, richly decorate their balconies on the 23rd of June, place in them the vases, wrapped in rich silk and vari-coloured ribbons, and surround them with lighted candles and little flags. Formerly a picture, which might be supposed to be that of Adonis, was placed near the vase, but this custom was forbidden by the clergy as it smacked too much of Paganism. These festivals in Sardinia are now gradually dying out, lingering longest in the very old villages.—G. A. Cesareo has a story, 'The First of May,' concluded in the next number.—E. Arbib contributes a short paper on the elections in England, in which he expresses his enthusiastic admiration for a

people who make such a masterly use of their liberal institutions. The speeches of Mr. Gladstone, he says, demanding liberty and equality for Ireland, and of Mr. Balfour, showing the peril of a disintegration of the empire, cannot be read without emotion. One is persuaded that such a people as the English may go through anxious times, but possesses in itself the force to conquer, and preserve intact the precious treasure of liberty and public peace.—A. Solerti writes about Tasso's amorous lyrics, and Signor Brichetti describes the country of the Somali.

LA NUOVA ANTOLOGIA (August 1st).—A paper on 'Liberty of Instruction and Study in Universities,' by C. Cantoni, and one in honour of Shelley's first centenary, by E. Nencione, commence this number.—L. Palma, in a paper on the ideal of a United States of Europe, opines that such an ideal is totally unrealizable.—R. Bonfadini greets the better feeling between Italy and France with joy.—T. Fornione points out the present condition of literary evolution, and thinks it will result in a new and healthy modern art.—(August 16th).—A. de Sollis has chosen 'The Mind and Work of Columbus' as the theme of an essay in celebration of the great discoverer's fourth centenary.—G. Boglietti founds a long article on Mr. Jephson's 'The Platform, its Rise and Progress,' and declares that so much glory and liberty as what is now seen in England, has never been known at any other time, or in any other country.—G. Giacosa, the Italian poet, who has lately been in America, gives a sad picture of the Italians in New York, where, he says, they incur the contempt of the Americans by the too strict economy they practice, and the miserable manner of their existence, the result, not of actual poverty, but of their invincible longing to return to their native land, and to assist their relatives—motives that are anything but despicable.

LA NUOVA ANTOLOGIA (September 1st).—*Apropos* of M. Joly's *Le Socialisme Chrétien*, Signor Bonghi says that so far from it being possible to term Christianity socialistic, the war between Christianity and Socialism will be a supreme one, but he does not doubt that Christianity will conquer. The battle itself will be a great human crisis, such as has not been seen since the advent of Christ.—G. Ricci tells the story of Christina of Sweden in Italy, taking his facts from Claretta's book of that name.—A. Cottrau contributes the first part of 'Notes on the Railway Inventions of 1885.'—F. Boncionnini discusses 'The Pantheon of Agrippa,' *apropos* of recent discoveries.—A. Zardo, under the title of 'Two Venetian Tragedies,' points out the false conceptions of the Government of the Venetian Republic in the trage-

dies: 'The Conte di Carmagnola,' by Manzoni; and 'Antonio Foscari,' by Niccolini.—A. Riccio gives an account of the present eruption of Etna, with a photograph of the new eruptive cones as illustration.—C. Mazzoni contributes some odes entitled 'The Voice of Life.'—(September 16th).—F. d'Ovidio, continuing his interesting chapters on Dante, takes for his theme this time, 'Dante and Magic.'—A. Cottrau's extensive statistics of the 'Railway Conventions of 1885,' occupy a large portion of this number.—A. Riccio describes the present Eruption of Etna.—Professor Mariano contributes a long article on 'The Old Catholic Church,' in which he points out some defects of recent German books on that subject.—N. Scarano notes many resemblances between Manzoni's 'Adelchi' and 'Hamlet.'—Signora Siciliana has an historical sketch called 'Castle Volognano in Valdarno,' describing its ancient and modern aspects.

LA RASSEGNA NAZIONALE (July 1st, 16th; August 1st, 16th).—We have here 'France and the anti-Slavery Conference in Brussels,' by O. da Villa; the concluding chapters of the 'Holy Land,' by C. del Peczo; the 'Letters of Paolina Craven,' written during the Franco-German war; an article on 'Guido Guinizelli,' by G. Salvatore; a lecture by Bonghi on 'A Woman of Twenty Centuries Ago;' and continuations of former papers.—Politics and Socialism have each their exponents in U. P. D. and T. Roberti; and G. Grabinsky gives a short account of the late Cardinal Battaglini; while G. Murando writes about Father Lockhart's death, which he says is felt in Italy as a serious misfortune. There is also an account of the Monastery of San Giovannino de Cavaliere, from a note-book of the 14th to the 18th centuries, existing in the Florence archives.—The 'Letters of Madame Craven' end with a brief description of her last days, by the Duchess Ravaschieri.

LA RASSEGNA NAZIONALE (September 1st).—A. Fogazzaro, the Italian novelist, in an article entitled 'For the Beauty of an Idea,' says that in his studies he got but little help from the books of Darwin and other natural philosophers, but that he obtained the utmost satisfaction from Conte's work on 'Evolution and its Relation to Religion.'—A. V. Vecchii, in a paper called 'The Legend of Spain's ingratitude to Columbus,' disputes the imputed ingratitude, and shows that the accusations against Spain are an absolute iniquity, and could not have been adduced except by the ignorant or the malicious.—Z. notices and gives specimens of the volumes of three new Italian poetesses: Adi Negri, Angelina de Leva, and Lia.—There is a long article on 'Etna and its Eruptions,' by C. del Lingo.—Articles on the

Italian Elections and on the Budget close the number.—(September 16th).—‘Crito,’ writing on the next war, says that except France and Russia, no nation can at present menace the peace of Europe. All other nations have their own internal difficulties to contend with; Germany has her socialism; Italy her commercial depression and Africa; England her Indian Empire and the Home Rule question; the Triple or Quasi Quadruple Alliance is only determined by considerations of peace. As long as this condition of things continues, war is almost impossible. The writer then gives many military statistics, and concludes by declaring that Italy is an element of peace in Europe and would be the last to disturb the quiet of the nations.—A. M. Cornelli describes the association for assisting emigrants, instituted by Abbé Villeneuve.—A. Ricci, in a paper called ‘Old Rome,’ advocates the writing of a book on Rome and Naples, as the two characteristic cities of Italy.—Neri has a short paper on the publications of the Royal Columbian Commission.—P. Manassei gives an account of savings-banks in Umbria.—The novellette ‘Fiamm’ and ‘The Exameron’ are continued.

LA RASSEGNA DI SCIENZE SOCIALE E POLITICHE (July 1st and 15th, August 1st and 15th), contain:—‘Notes on the Symptomatic Valuation of Economic Movement and National Well-being,’ by Dr. Coletti.—‘On Torrens’s System in the Italian Colony of Eritræa,’ by L. Franchetti.—‘Scientific and Utopian Socialism,’ by F. S. Nitti.—‘The Art of Government,’ by L. Conte.—‘The Conception of Financial Economy,’ by F. Flora.—‘For the Classic Schools,’ by F. Virgili.—‘Sidgwick’s Political Elements,’ by R. Debardieri.—‘The Banking Question in Italy,’ by R. Dalla Volta.

LA RASSEGNA DI SCIENZE SOCIALE E POLITICHE (September 1st) contains:—‘The Ministers of the Constitutional Monarchies,’ by L. Palma.—‘The Dominant Political Parties,’ by G. Jona.—‘The Superior Court of Justice,’ by E. Marchionni.—‘The University in Italy,’ by A. Gotti.

G R E E C E.

ATHENA (Vol. III., part 4).—The k. Lakon reprints a number of textual emendations to the *Constitution of Athens*, which are not found in recent editions of this work.—A description is given of an altar, dating from the end of the 3rd century B.C., lately discovered at Athens, near the Thriasian gate. It is dedicated to Ἀφροδίτῃ ἡγεμόνῃ τοῦ δήμου, whom the writer of the notice identifies with Aphrodite Pandemos. He also discusses

the statements made by Pausanias about the temples dedicated to this goddess in Athens.—The k. Papabasileion contributes a note on Chalkis of Eubœia, a city of great archæological interest. The remains include many tombs, a sepulchral barrow, and an ancient aqueduct, part of which has apparently been converted into a church.—The proceedings of the Society contain a number of literary and scientific contributions.

ATHENA (Vol. IV., part 1).—All the first part of Vol. IV., except a few pages, is occupied by the k. Kontos' critical examination of Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*.—The same writer has a note on the difference between *ἰφαιλοκρατία* and *ἐπιλοκρατία*.

ATHENA (Vol. IV., part 2), contains Professor Nikolaides' inaugural address on Anatomy and the allied sciences.—In a paper on 'Isotimy and the principle of Cosmopolity,' the k. Evangelides traces their growth among the Greeks from the early philosophers to Alexander the Great, whom he regards as the captain of equality of rights and speech among men, and of cosmopolity.—An account of the rights and status of Greek women, in somewhat the same vein, forms the introduction to an interesting description of an inscribed pillar found near the horologion of Kyrrestos. It contains a correspondence between Plotina, mother of the Emperor Hadrian, the Emperor, and the Epicurean School at Athens, on the election of a president of the School. Originally the Stoic and other philosophical schools chose their own president; but these inscriptions, and the names of many of the presidents, would seem to show that the Roman Government asserted a control over them, and, as the Empress says: 'the succession passes only to Roman citizens, and the power of election reverts to the Emperor.' A passage in Ulpian (25, 9) seemed to imply that the Epicurean School had obtained exemption from this rule, and the inference is confirmed by the inscriptions now discovered. The Empress asks that the then president, Popillus Theotimus, may be allowed to elect his successor, and, if need be, a foreigner. Hadrian, in reply, grants full permission, and the Empress forthwith announces her success to the School. The privilege thus obtained was no doubt held permanently. The k. Evangelides is disposed to identify the spot where the pillar was found with the place to which the Epicureans removed, when the original garden of Epicurus was destroyed (Cicero, *Ep.*, xiii., 1).—The k. Kontos contributes a number of philological notes.—The k. Bases has a number of remarks on the *Consolations of Boethius*, based on a copy of the Greek

version, which the late J. Sakellion discovered in the National Library shortly before his death.

We have also received a supplement to the third volume, containing the reports of members of the Scientific Society on the Hellenic Government's proposals with regard to Secondary Education, together with various schemes of study, etc.

FRANCE.

REVUE DE L'HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS. No. 3, 1892.—The first article here has a somewhat sad interest. M. V. Courda-veux, Professor of Greek in the College at Lille, prepared it for this *Revue*, but died before the proof had been sent to him for revision. It is the third of a series of studies of early Christian history which he has contributed. The first was on Irenæus, the second on Tertullian, while this one is on Clement of Alexandria. Each of these men was representative of an epoch and phase of thought and life in the early Church, and as such was selected in these studies. Clement is representative of a movement of consolidation—an effort made to effect a rational reconciliation between traditionalism and gnosticism, by preserving what was best, or what was good, in each. It was more a lay movement than a clerical, properly speaking, for both Clement and Origen, its champions, were philosophers first and theologians afterwards, and entered the priestly order late in life. The entrance of Christianity into Egypt is enveloped in darkness. We do not know when, nor how, nor by whom it was first introduced. Put legend here, as elsewhere, has proved itself ready to supply the needed information. Mark has received the honour of being the apostle who first preached or taught the tenets of Christianity in Alexandria, and this as early as B.C. 44. Our author here, needless to say, rejects that statement, but thinks, owing to the proximity of, and the constant intercourse between, Palestine and Egypt, that Christianity must have sought and found a settlement there very soon. If, however, we cannot determine the exact period when it was imported there, we are fortunate in knowing the intellectual *milieu* into which it there made its way. Alexandria was not only the great commercial emporium of East and West, but the meeting-place of all their doctrines, the confluent into which flowed all their ideas. Brahmanism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, the ancient Egyptian Faiths, Greek Philosophy, etc., all met and found a place in public interest there. Fighting or fusing, these varied 'isms' could not fail to broaden the thoughts of men, and teach a tolerance of views which was helpful to intellectual progress. Clement was in the full stream

of this mental life, and its influence is seen in all his writings, in whole or in part, preserved to us. M. Courdaveux brings this out very clearly in the sketch he gives us of these writings, and our author is evidently in sympathy with the catholic spirit they breathe, and the school of thought Clement may be said to have founded, and of which Origen, his successor, was the brightest ornament.—Professor Max Müller's recent addition to the new series of 'The Sacred Books of the East,' his translation of the 'Vedic Hymns,' Part i., is the subject of a critical review by the distinguished Vedic scholar, M. A. Barth. While giving the learned professor's rendering of the hymns great praise, M. Barth nevertheless says that 'few competent readers will read the book through without a feeling of disappointment.' Perfection, of course, is difficult to attain, and M. Barth's criticisms will no doubt receive the attention they deserve.—M. Alfred Milliard continues his translation of the Buddhist priest, Gyau-nen's 'Sketch of the Buddhist Sects.'—Among the books reviewed we notice Toy's *Judaism and Christianity* and Frip's *Genests*.—A tribute of respect is paid to the late Miss A. B. Edwards of the Egyptian Exploration Society, and who was herself so distinguished and enthusiastic an Egyptologist.

REVUE DE L'HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS. No. 4, 1892.—'The Roman god Janus' is the subject of the principal article in this number. He has been a somewhat perplexing figure to the students of the old Roman religion, as he was to the Romans themselves when their ancestral faith became to them an object of antiquarian interest and study. M. J. S. Speyer here gathers up all that can be learned about this deity from the symbols, images, and sanctuaries, of which we have any information, that were connected with his worship, and from what is known of the cult paid him, and may be gathered from the myths in which he figures. In the second part of his article, our author places the principal solutions hazarded by scholars of the problem of this deity's character and offices in the Roman Pantheon in the light of these facts, and tests their adequacy. In the third part he ventures to give a solution of his own, or rather, as he modestly puts it, endeavours to penetrate a little further into the mystery that enshrouds this 'deity with the two faces, so ancient and so wise, who sees at once what is before and behind.'—M. Paul Regnaud furnishes a short paper on the question, 'Are the hymns of the Rig Veda Prayers?' According to him, as he has shown in the first volume of his edition of the Rig Veda, the *devas* are not deities, but the flames that consume the sacrifice, 'personified,' as he puts it, 'by an artifice of rhetoric.' The

hymns, in accordance with this view, are not the accompanying prayers of the worshippers, expressing the desires which they wish fulfilled by the gods, but merely descriptive of the processes of the consumption by the flames of the things offered in sacrifice. M. Regnaud endeavours to illustrate and establish this by a series of quotations from the Rig-Veda, translating them as he thinks they ought to be translated, and giving Grassmann's translation also of the passages, for comparison.—M. X. Koenig under the title of the 'Bulletin de la Religion Juive' gives a critical notice of several of the most important works which have recently appeared on the literature of the Old Testament. M. Maurice Vernes' two ponderous volumes on 'the Pretended Polytheism of the Hebrews' head the list, not because M. Koenig thinks them the most important contribution to that literature, but because of their revolutionary character. The other works reviewed are classed as (1) those which seem to the reviewer to sum up best the present state of Biblical science, and (2) those which merit attention as testifying to the revival of Biblical studies in France. Under the first order Canons Driver and Cheyne's latest works receive very favourable mention. The list of works is, however, a large one. The shorter reviews include one on Sir A. R. Wallace's 'Miracles and Modern Spiritualism'—a volume which has been translated into French, and appears as one of the series, the 'Librairie des Sciences Psychologiques.' The French Edition has been enlarged by two additional papers contributed by the author to English periodicals, since the publication in 1875 of the original volume.

REVUE CELTIQUE (July 1892).—The first place in this number is given to a further list of 'Noms gaulois barbares ou supposés tels tirés des Inscriptions,' by M. H. Henry Thédénat.—The list contains many names and is of considerable interest. It is to be followed by others.—M. H. de la Villemarqué contributes a number more of 'Anciens Noël's bretons,' and appends a note containing particulars recently brought to light by the Abbé Paul Peyron in respect to Tanguy Guéguen, according to which it appears that he was born at Leon not later than 1565, was ordained priest at the usual age, and became chaplain at the Collegiate Church of Notre-Dame du Mur, at Morlaix, at which church, and not at the Cathedral at Leon as hitherto supposed, he was organist.—M. Loth has a short note on the word *imbliv*, which he is disposed to identify with *ymyl*, a limit or margin.—M. E. Ernault continues his 'Etudes bretonnes,' discussing the negative in response and ellipses.—Under the general title of 'Celtic names of Places in France,'

M. A. Longnou deals with names ending in *otolum*, most of which he derives from names borrowed from the vegetable, mineral or animal kingdom, or from topographical terms.—Mr. Kuno Meyer prints and translates for the first time the story of Fingal Ronain, which has been preserved in the Book of Leinster, and in a paper MS. of the sixteenth century now in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. The two texts are almost identical. O'Currie gave a short summary of the tale which in one or two particulars is here shown to be inaccurate. The text and translation are accompanied with introduction and notes.—An excellent article follows from the pen of the editor, in which the ancient names of Britain and the British Isles are discussed. The scope is sufficiently indicated by the title—*L'île Préétannique, les îles Préétaniques, les Brittones ou Britanni.*—A good number is concluded with the 'Chronique' and 'Periodiques,' which as usual are full of information for students and those interested in Celtic literature.

REVUE DES RELIGIONS. No. 4, 1892.—'Les naissances miraculeuses d'après la tradition américaine,' is the title of a short paper by M. le Comte de Charency. It gives us a series of legends current among some of the aborigines of Mexican and Californian America, of the births of certain individuals by virgin mothers, or without male co-operation. These legends startled the first Catholic missionaries, and, like much else in the religious beliefs and customs of the races found in the New World, have given rise to a large amount of speculation as to how these legends and rites had originated—whether they were native or imported. Count de Charency gives a summary of these legends, or of some of them, without venturing to decide too positively as to their origin.—M. the Abbé Sauveplane contributes the first part of an original translation of the Assyro-Babylonian tablets, regarding the adventures of Gilgames, whose name was so long a puzzle to Assyriologists. It was conjecturally rendered Izdubar, Gisdubar, Gisdhubar, and latterly Namrasit. A Babylonian text deciphered by M. Theo. G. Pinches towards the end of 1890 gave the correct name, which turned out to be Gilgames. M. Sauveplane precedes his translation by a brief analysis of the poem, and some observations as to the currency and influence of Assyrian legends on Jewish, Phœnician, Greek, etc., culture and thought.—M. Depierre, who has been a missionary for a considerable period in Anam, gives an interesting account of the religious beliefs and ceremonies of the races living in Anam and the surrounding districts. The religious sentiment is very strong, he affirms, among them. 'One may say of them what St.

Paul said of the Athenians, that they are very devout. Every act of their life is governed by or proceeds from a religious feeling. Their whole life is impregnated with superstition. They regard impiety as the worst of crimes. Their thinkers and their legislators regard the virtue of religion as the necessary basis of all social order, and the only guarantee of its stability.' M. Depierre's article is not concluded here, but what he tells us of the Anamese amply confirms his assertion as to their religious character.—No. 5. 1892. In this number M. Depierre continues and concludes his account of the religious customs in Anam; the Abbé Sauveplane continues, but does not conclude, his translation of the Gilgrames' texts; and M. Castonnet des Fosses begins an article on Brahmanism, a study in religious history.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (August, September).—A name which we do not remember having seen before appears in the table of contents of the first of these four numbers. It is that of M. George Cogordan. His contribution is a long review of the correspondence and memoirs of Cardinal Maury, lately published by Mgr. Ricard. The writer's estimate of the prelate may be gathered from his closing sentence. After stating that, in accordance with the Pope's wish, no stone marks the spot where the Cardinal is buried in the Church of Santa-Maria Vallicella, he adds: 'I asked myself whether Pius VII., in refusing Maury this supreme honour, and in endeavouring to get him forgotten, has not shown a truer solicitude for his name, than the bishop who has just drawn attention to him by publishing the volumes which have furnished an opportunity for writing these pages.'—The discoveries which M. Chedanne has lately made in connection with one of the most interesting monuments of ancient Rome—the Pantheon of Agrippa, are set forth in a very remarkable paper by M. Guillaume, a member of the 'Institut.'—The immigration of destitute aliens into the United Kingdom is the subject of an interesting article by Julien Decrais. The writer speaks rather sneeringly of the agitation to which it has given rise; but he does not succeed in showing that it is otherwise than justifiable and reasonable.—The same number, that dated the 1st of August, also contains a literary study of Bayle's works, and a political article, 'Scenes de la vie politique aux Etats-Unis.'—The second number for the same months brings two articles which will interest English readers. The first of them deals with the question of constructing a tunnel under or a bridge over the Channel. The writer does not greatly favour either scheme. He believes that it would have but little influence on either the social or commercial relations between the two countries; and,

as regards the inconvenience of a sea passage, he thinks that they can be done away with when naval architects feel inclined.—The other contribution has for its subject the philosophy of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, as set forth in *Aurora Leigh*, 'the poetical gospel of contemporary idealism.' An interesting and instructive contribution in the history of the Sciences is to be found in the first of the September parts. It traces the transmission of chemical industries from antiquity to the middle-ages.—In a paper full of quaint information, M. Victor du Bled gives a sketch of the social position of actors and actresses in France, prior to the Revolution.—The experiments which have been made with a view to the production of artificial rain are related by M. de Varigny; whilst Dr. Rochard gives an account of the conference at Venice and of the measures recommended at it for the prevention of cholera. Not the least interesting part of the paper is the sketch given of the means employed during the middle-ages to prevent the spread of plagues and pestilences from one part of the country to another.—In the mid-monthly number, an article on the late elections is the most important contribution. It is by M. Augustin Filon, who, as might be expected from his former articles on English politics, is distinctly favourable to Mr. Gladstone.

REVUE DES ETUDES JUIVES (Nov. 1, 1892).—The publication of this *Revue* has of late been very irregular. This irregularity has been due unfortunately to the severe and protracted illness of its editor-in-chief, Professor Isidore Loeb, which ended fatally on June 2nd. M. Loeb has had the conduct of the magazine in his hands from the first, and it has been owing largely to his zeal, enthusiasm, and management that it has succeeded in securing the honourable place it occupies among the high class Continental journals devoted to historical and religious problems. This number opens with a brief notice of the editor's death, but we are promised a fuller biography and a critical estimate of his work in the next issue. There is given us here too a verbatim report of the funeral oration delivered at his grave by M. Theodore Reinach, and M. Joseph Halévy pays a tribute of respect to his deceased friend and co-religionist in the form of a Hebrew ode of eight stanzas. The first article is from the late editor's pen, and we are informed that M. Loeb had prepared several papers on biblical and historical subjects for the pages of this *Revue*, and that they are to appear in its pages in due course. One of these papers is a further instalment of the interesting series on 'The Literature of the Poor in the Bible,'

and deals, we are told, with the poetical pieces found embodied in the so-called historical books, many of which pieces are there traced to the same source as, according to M. Loeb, gave us most of the Psalter and the Second Isaiah. His article in this number is headed 'The Jew of Folk Lore in the Chronicle of the Schebet Jehuda.' This work was written, or compiled, by a Spanish Rabbi, Juda ibn Verga, in the middle of the 15th century. It is chiefly legendary, M. Loeb thinks, though the names introduced are frequently those of historical personages. A summary of its contents is given us, and some of the legends in it are translated. M. J. Halévy furnishes the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth of his series of 'Recherches Bibliques.' Here he examines Ezekiel xvi. and then xviii. The text of the first of these chapters is confessedly faulty, and the ingenuity of scholars has been much exercised in endeavouring to amend or restore it. M. Halévy offers many admirable suggestions in this direction, and then gives a new translation of the whole chapter, with a critical explanation of the corrected text. One of the interesting points he brings out in his interpretation of the passages is the acquaintance which the prophet had with the early history of Jerusalem, and with the Genesis narratives as we now possess them. M. Halévy has not much sympathy with the results come to by the so-called historical school of criticism, and is always anxious to score a point against those who assert the late composition of the Pentateuch. He does so here. 'The Prophet,' he writes, 'uses the name of Jerusalem, not for the city itself, but for the Davidic dynasty, whose residence it became. After the death of Saul, David founded it in the town of Hebron, where he had to maintain a sanguinary struggle for three years, before he was able to transfer it to Jerusalem. It is to this humble origin of the Jerusalemite royalty that the prophet alludes in his description of the birth of the girl, abandoned by her parents, here. The prophet gives her an Amorite for a father and a Hittite for a mother, and these were precisely the nationalities that divided the possession of Hebron and its neighbourhood. In fact, according to Genesis, Abraham, living at Hebron, had the Amorites for allies, and purchased from a Hittite or Hethian, in the presence of the children of Heth, the cave and adjoining ground, which he wished to secure for a sepulchre for Sarah his wife.' M. Halévy examines Ch. xviii. in much the same minute and critical fashion, though the text there is comparatively accurate; and here again he finds and sets out evidences from it which betray the prophet's acquaintance with the narratives contained in the historical books of Scripture.—M. Maurice Vernes gives the first part of a critical study of the 'Song of Deborah.'

M. Vernes is poles asunder from M. Halévy as regards the date of the composition of the historical and other books of the Bible, and the object of this study is to establish the late date of this Song—to show, in fact, that it was written after the narratives contained in the Book of Judges were cast in their present form, and that it has been inserted where it now stands because of its bearing on the battle there described. His analysis of the song is carried here as far as verse 12. The contents of this number include also an interesting study by M. J. Lehmann on Herod's trial, as recorded in Josephus', 'Jewish Antiquities,' Book xiv., Ch. xvii., (not, as by an oversight in the text here, Ch. ix.); also M. Estein's, 'Les Chamites de la table ethnographique selon le Pseudo-Jonathan;' M. Lambert's 'Remarques sur la formation du pluriel en hébreu;' M. Haufmann's 'Une falsification dans la lettre envoyée par Maimonide aux Juifs du Yemen,' etc.

REVUE MENSUELLE DU MONDE LATIN (July, August).—In an article which runs through both these numbers, M. Léonce de Brotonne relates the history of the Concordat of 1817.—M. le Comte Baguenault de Puchesse in a paper of similar nature but of far more actual interest, discusses the attitude of Pope Leo XIII. towards political parties in France. He passes a favourable judgment on it, maintaining that it is only condemned by extremists of either party.—A readable sketch by M. Jean Rolland has for its subject 'French Noblemen of Last Century.'—The number for August opens with a short but, in its way, very important document, a letter in which Cardinal Rampolla, Secretary of State to his Holiness, thanks M. le Comte Baguenault de Puchesse, in the name of the Pope, for his article, referred to above.—In 'La Question du Vers Français,' M. le Prince Alexandre Bibesco condemns the attempts which certain poets of the new school have made to modify the old rules of French Prosody.

SWITZERLAND.

BIBLIOTHÈQUE UNIVERSELLE ET REVUE SUISSE—(July, August, September).—Last quarter M. Aug. Glardon gave a first instalment of an elaborate study entitled 'A travers la littérature Anglaise contemporaine.' It is continued in the three numbers now before us. The novels which he first deals with are those of Mrs. Humphrey Ward, Mrs. Deland, Edna Lyall, and Maria Corelli. He looks upon them as the representatives of four distinct philosophical systems—Christian socialism, mythical pantheism, evangelical Christianity properly so-called, and 'electric' Christianity. They have, he says,

this common feature, that they take the experimental method as the basis of their philosophical structure, rejecting, without examination, all dogmatic authority, and that they make divine love, received into the heart through faith, the great motive principle of religious life. In literature, he continues, they are idealists, but by their means, the rationalism and the mysticism of Germany, skilfully combined, have passed from theory into practice, and are gradually penetrating the social life of England. From these novelists, the author passes on to those whose works he considers as emanating from the proceedings of the society for psychical research, such as 'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde,' 'Peter Ibbetson,' and the 'Shadow of a Dream.' As 'humorists,' Mr. Barrie, Mr. Jerome, and Mr. Stockton are then dealt with, and favourably compared, as regards their good taste and sense of propriety, with those of the Continent. The interesting study is not yet concluded.—In addition to this important contribution there is a long and careful review of a work entitled 'Le congrès des trois Amériques'; and also a very erudite and instructive essay on the legislator Lycurgus. These are in the July part, which contains further, a second instalment of M. Levier's account of a botanical excursion, 'Au Cœur du Caucase.' Not taking into consideration the lighter literature, which is represented by three excellent stories, the only new matter in the August part is the beginning of a very elaborate review of a work on the Russian language, and the expansion of the Slavonic languages.—The action of the mind on the body is discussed in a paper headed 'De l'hygiène morale,' which appears in the third number for the quarter.—'La Circulation à Londres,' based on a German work dealing with the same subject, gives some interesting statistics with regard to the traffic of the English capital.—As usual, the 'Chroniques' are full of interesting gossip.

SPAIN.

LA ESPAÑA MODERNA, *Revista Ibero-Americana* (July, 1892).—The Columbian literature continues to dominate this Magazine. The third and concluding portion of 'Martin Alonso Pinzón,' the companion and pilot of Columbus, deplors the statement of Las Casas, and seeks to restore Pinzón's prestige. 'His influence was most powerful in the enterprise; his services in a high degree important. Without the aid of the brothers Pinzón, in all likelihood the journey could not have been undertaken, or only under such conditions as to be without result. . . . If Christopher Columbus was the head, Martin Alonzo Pinzón was the arm. . . . The intelligent

activity of Pinzón, his proverbial energy, his skill, the influence he enjoyed, the prestige of his name in the district, especially among seamen, were in great part the cause of the disappearance of the difficulties that met the voyage in the beginning.' The Centenary includes the result of the Conference of the Athenæum at Madrid, a discussion of the birthplace of Columbus (the Genoese), the declaration of the failure of the poets competing for the offered prize to reach the required excellence, this with 66 competitors! It seems a French writer, Gaffarel, in a learned work has raised the Spanish ire, by declaring that a Frenchman accompanying Pinzón discovered at one time Brazil and the Cape of Good Hope, preceding Columbus and Vascoda Gama.—'Agridulces,' by D. Antonio Valbuena, is a collection of literary and political articles by an able opponent of the Spanish Academy. The Spanish is described as particularly good, and the thoughts as particularly Spanish. The bulk of the number, as usual of late, consists of translations of French and Russian writers.

LA ESPAÑA MODERNA, *Revista Ibero-Americana* (August).—Again Columbus. His statue is to be erected in Honduras and in Mexico, on 12th October. Italy opened its Italo-American Exhibition on 10th July in Genoa, the most striking novelty being a huge 'egg' of Columbus—25 metres high and 18 in diameter, painted inside with scenes from the life of Columbus. Two Spanish vessels of war are called after the Pinzóns, which family is not forgotten in the jubilation. Castelar summarises the struggle over the English elections with much knowledge, but with a very strong Gladstonian bias. He holds that if the Irish deserve justice, they do not deserve admiration or sympathy in their crusade for right and liberty. All the orator's admiration is for Gladstone, the 'sublime radical lion.' 'God will continue to illuminate the great soul which burns, like the sun in its down-going, with incredible splendour over the boundaries of death.' But he holds that the only practicable proposition is that of Labouchere, to postpone Home Rule to electoral rearrangement. Comparing Germany with its Bismarck, and England with Gladstone, to the disadvantage of the former, he adds in ecstasy, 'Only God is great, and only liberty is immortal.'—'Italy in the 15th Century,' by Orti and Brull, is highly spoken of as presenting in a picturesque manner Italian life during the Renaissance, its politics, its costumes, its arts.—One of the few Spaniards who is not a pessimist, is said to be the author of 'Dulce y Sabrosa,' D. Jacinto Octavio Picón. The subject of his novelettes is always refined; the loves of common people captivate the reader, thanks to

his story-telling art, to the purity and distinction of his style, and to the correctness and clearness of his language.—‘Diary of a Witness of the War in Africa,’ by Alarcón, is highly commended; but the Spanish writers noted are always mainly critical.—A translation by M. A. Caro of Longfellow’s ‘Ode to Tennyson,’ comes in strangely amongst a very non-English body of literature. But Germany, in Heine’s Memoirs; and Scandinavia, in an appreciative criticism of Ibsen, are suitably acknowledged. ‘The secret of the poetic temperament (Ibsen’s) is to keep his head in the sky and his feet in the soil; like the date palm, which seeks with its roots for water in the depths of the subsoil, and shakes its noble crown among the loftiest.’

LA ESPAÑA MODERNA, *Revista Ibero-Americana* (September).—The ‘Renaissance’ of Spain seems as yet to be mainly critical. It has not preened its wings for any confident flight into the empyrean. A Magazine of the Spanish world given up to translations of French and Russian tales, and other foreign transcripts, does not speak much for the national spirit. Yet when it does show, it has a character of its own that is worthy of more attention than it receives.—‘The Salon of the Empress Josephine,’ gives some curious information. When the Empress journeyed to Aquisgran in 1804, ‘the only good roads in France were those along which the Emperor passed, and as war had never reached the department of Roër, it is impossible to picture the deplorable state of the journey from Liege to Aquisgran.’ Orders were given by the Director of Public Works to repair it *sufficiently to save the lives of the Empress and her suite!*—Leaving aside the Columbian summary, still continued, the International Chronicle of Castelar has a pessimistic tone over the slowness of human progress. He is in despair at Germany repeating the story of Jews eating children; as if this has not been said in all ages by the conquering sect of those who are conquered. ‘It appears impossible, to the religion whose dogmas and laws more than any other contributed in remote centuries to the dethronement of human sacrifices, to impute to it to-day its continuation in the midst of universal culture.’ He describes European civilization as more than ever *hypnotised* by Africa, speaks plainly of it driving France out of her mind, and, while appreciating England’s colonising destiny, scoffs at Germany’s colonising infatuation. The text throughout of Castelar is that ‘the Gladstonian Ministry in England is one of pacific progress; the Gladstonian Ministry out of England is one of universal peace.’—Dr. Thebussem’s ‘Racion de Articulos,’ a

collection of papers, is acknowledged to show amazing learning, but also to show spite against all things Spanish. He is pleased that Gibraltar is in the hands of the English, because there the inns are inns, the food food, and the beds beds. He is taken to task for this, seeing that the sight of the fortress in English hands makes every Spaniard red-hot for vengeance! This does not flavour of the 'universal brotherhood' which Castelar so fondly expounds! If it is more prosperous and comfortable, what matters whose hands it is in?

HOLLAND.

DE GIDS—August—Contains a short but remarkable story by H. Heiermanns, Jr., 'A Jew's trick.' The story begins with the boyhood and youth of a Jew, showing how he gradually cast himself loose from his national traditions. He becomes a physician and marries a Christian girl who equally has emancipated herself from her inherited faith. For a time all goes well, but when a baby is born the wife feels her isolation and renews intercourse with her family. In danger of death, she by their solicitation, forces from her husband a promise to baptize the child, and in order to save her life he yields. Before the time fixed for the ceremony she is again well, and he now tries to convince her of the unfairness of keeping him to his promise, showing how the act would make an irreparable breach between them, and must rob him of self-respect. But she insists, calling his attempt to resile 'A Jew's Trick,' and so he has to give in at the sacrifice of all he holds noblest and best.—'The Zwijndrecht Brotherhood' is a sketch of religious communism in Holland in the first half of the century, by the well-known Quack. In that period, a wave of socialism passed all over Europe in a full tide, although noiselessly, and was perceptible in Holland in the various communities of a religious type called New Lights, and combining a sort of pantheism and communism on the model of the earliest Church, for they clung strictly to the Bible as their authority. Their adherents were mostly very humble people, the most remarkable being Stoffel Muller and his associate Maria Leer. The story of their patient efforts to set up an ideal brotherhood, of their persecutions and trials, for they were always more or less in conflict with the civil authorities, whom they did not acknowledge, of their industry and piety and often pathetic sacrifices, and lastly of the dissensions and scandals that ensued, and their final break-up and dispersal mostly to the Mormons in America, is narrated with much clearness and brightness, and forms a most interesting and instructive chapter in the history of

social movements.—‘Arnold Geulincx as Essayist,’ by J. G. N. Land is a very remarkable account of a 17th century writer, a native of Antwerp, but who spent his best days in Leiden. He wrote with remarkable literary skill and taste, and the subject matter of many of his essays is still interesting, such themes for example as ‘Which is to be preferred, the Dutch or the Latin language?’ ‘Is it worth while to learn many languages?’ ‘Is riches or poverty best for a scholar?’ ‘Should the works of old or of quite recent writers be used in School teaching?’ and rather subtle debates are started, such as ‘Whether among friends jokes are best with a sharp edge or harmless? and What is the best time for a banquet, in the day or at night?’—Shelley’s anniversary is commemorated by Byvarck in a sketch of his Life and Works continued in the September number.—September opens with the first part of a paper on the alluring subject of Summer Holidays by Dr. Pierson, who throws into it all his freshness and originality, employing a wealth of literary illustration both ancient and modern. His discussion of descriptions of travel is especially good.—‘An Austrian Diplomat’ is a review of the German life of Ludwig Fürst Stahrenberg, Ambassador to the Hague, London and Turin.—‘Seneca as Tragedian’ is the first part of a dissertation by Polak, suggested by a lately published book, Worp’s ‘Influence of Seneca’s Tragedies on our Stage.’ This influence was a reality though only at second hand, for in the 17th century Hooft moulded his plays on Seneca’s, and in 1600 a translation of the ‘Troades’ was issued by Duym, and even Vondel, who wrote contemptuously of Seneca, owes him not a little. Seneca’s tragedies, though unfit for the stage, have merits of their own.—‘A festival at Buitenzorg’ (Botanical Gardens, Java). Oudemann reviews some interesting publications issued in connection with the gardens, namely, a History; and a Treatise on the use and importance of botanical gardens in the tropics, both by Dr. Treub. Many highly interesting details are given both in regard to plants and management, and the immense practical benefit of such a garden to the colony is abundantly demonstrated. For instance, when it became necessary to extend the cultivation of the cacao and gutta percha trees, it was not necessary to send to America or their native haunts, an abundant supply of plants was got from seed gathered in the Botanical garden, from plants that had been proved the best varieties. Efforts are being made to arrange these gardens more and more as a scientific institution. Oct.—This number is almost entirely devoted to English literature. *David Grieve* is noticed more favourably than in most English reviews. Though frankly a novel with a purpose, it is true to

nature, and has unity which was wanting in *Robert Elsmere*, but the hero's dismal later life is little fitted to commend Mrs. Ward's teaching.—'The Mahdi and his Kingdom' is a long paper based on Major Wingate's work, Gordon's Journals, etc., and contains an excellent summary of our present knowledge concerning that unique theocratic realm.—'The Moon in Distress,' an interesting mythological study by Prof. Speijer, takes a review of the diverse customs practised in primitive times during an eclipse, the main idea being that the moon, a friend to man, was being attacked by some Chinese Dragon, German Wolf or Indian Jaguar, none of them too far off to be scared by a hubbub of cries and beaten drums. The ideas of the Romans, essentially though not explicitly the same, are particularly gone into, and it is shown how very slowly the old customs died out.—The poetess Helène Swarth contributes some graceful little fairy tales.

THEOLOGISCH TIJDSCHRIFT (July).—Dr. Dyserinck gives a new translation of the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Prefixed to this is a communication from the lamented Dr. Kuenen, written shortly before his death, in which he gives his views on this book of the Old Testament. He believes it to have been written in Palestine about 586 B.C., by a poet who remained there; but he agrees with Stade that Cap. iii. is a more recent composition, of higher religious value, but as literature less fresh and actual than the other chapters. The translation is accompanied by critical notes, and thus furnishes virtually a new edition of the Threni; Dr. Dyserinck hopes, however, to write further on this work, particularly on its connection with the origin of the Psalms.—There follows a paper by Dr. A. Bruins, on the 'Parousia in the Epistles of Paul.' As Paul regarded Christ as a heavenly and spiritual, rather than an earthly being, and believed him to be fully present in spirit in the Church, Dr. Bruins considers that he could not consistently believe in the second coming of Christ to the world; in John certainly the former belief supersedes the latter one, and with Paul it must surely be the same. Limiting himself in the meantime to the first Corinthian Epistle, this writer finds a description of the second coming of Christ in Cap. xv., and the trial of the work of various builders at the last judgment in Cap. iii., while in Cap. xi. Christians are said to keep the Lord's death in memory at the Supper, 'till he come.' In all these passages Paul appears to share the belief of the Synoptics in the Parousia of Christ. To a Dutch scholar, however, who has determined that Paul could not hold that belief, this occasions little difficulty. He has only to take up each

passage in turn and prove that the words about the second coming are interpolated. He will rarely lack the support of some previous Dutch scholar for such an assertion, for there is little in the Epistles that has not been made an interpolation for one reason or another; and where no previous authority can be cited, the writer cannot hesitate to break new ground on a text himself. Dr. Bruins thus makes out to his satisfaction that all the references to the Parousia in 1 Cor. are by a later hand. The assumptions on which he builds, that Paul must have been consistent with himself in this matter, and that the belief in the second coming was inconsistent even to Paul's mind with that of the spiritual indwelling of Christ in the Church, seem to us to be wholly unwarranted by what we know of the Apostle's habits of mind. In such circumstances the method of emendation so much practised in Holland cannot lead to any result of value.—There follows a very good paper, apparently the first of a series, on 'The Sources for our Knowledge of Frisian Heathenism,' by Dr. L. Knappert. The subject taken up in this paper is the life of Saint Liudger, described by Alfrid. The lives of the early Christian missionaries are confessedly among the best sources for the knowledge of the Germanic religion, which was once practised in these islands as well as in Frisia and Norway. Much of what is here gleaned from the time of Liudger, who preached in Friesland in the eighth century, agrees with former knowledge of the Germanic religion; the Frisians are made out to have worshipped idols, which the Norse cannot be shown to have done; the gods are mostly the same. A new feature in Dr. Knappert's account is that the god Fosete is Woden in his capacity as judge, (Fosete = Voorzitter = Preses, Woden) therefore as head or President of the heavenly court, and that the island of Heligoland was the principal seat of the worship of this god.—Dr. W. C. van Manen writes on the German book on 'Acts,' by Spitta, and rejoices in the attempt there made to identify different documents of which the writer of Acts made use; though disagreeing with many of Spitta's conclusions and disapproving of his conservative theological position.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

Christian Ethics. By NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D., (International Theological Library). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1892.

This is the second volume of the new series of works now being issued by Messrs T. & T. Clark, under the general title of 'The International Theological Library,' for the editorship of which Professor Salmond of Aberdeen and Professor Briggs of New York are responsible. An excellent beginning was made some months ago by the publication of Canon Driver's remarkable volume, bearing the title of *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, a work of which it may be said that it is without its equal in this country, and compares very favourably indeed with any that have been produced on the Continent. Mr. Smyth's work is of a different kind, and deals with a different subject, but it is nearly as welcome an addition to our theological literature. The position it occupies indeed is almost unique. Books on Christian Ethics by English-speaking writers are rare. We have of course Dr. Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theories*, but beyond a few dealing with parts of the subject, it is difficult to recall any. The only one that occurs to us at present is a singularly dry, uninteresting, and unscientific volume bearing the same title as Dr. Smyth's by Dr. Wardlaw. In its day it was a book of some importance, but since then the stores of Continental Theological literature have been opened up to English students, and Dr. Smyth writes under very different conditions. Whether Dr. Wardlaw was acquainted with the German Theology of his day we do not know. So far as our recollection goes we should say he was not. Dr. Smyth is, and has evidently taken the treatises of German Theologians for his model. At the same time he has written independently, and furnished a very solid, painstaking, and learned contribution to the science of which he treats. To the fact that he has we are anxious to call attention, because if in what follows of what must necessarily be a brief notice, we have occasion to differ from him, we shall do so, not because we wish to detract from the merit of his work, but because we desire to point out what seems to us to be defects in a work which is otherwise highly meritorious. And first of all let us note that the work is written in a style which has several excellent features. It is clear, direct, and here and there eloquent. Perhaps there is too great a tendency to the use of technical terms, and here and there a disposition to attempt the epigrammatic. Such statements as 'The moralist is the man with an ideal,' while true, do not contain the whole truth. The subject, to use the language of logic, contains a good deal more than the predicate. But to turn to the contents of the volume. After several very weighty introductory paragraphs after the German manner, in which the subject is defined, and its relation to various kindred subjects pointed out, the work is divided into two parts. The first treats of the Christian Ideal, and the second of Christian Duties. Christian Ethics is defined as 'the science of living according to Christianity.'—a definition which is got by utilising a remarkably good phrase of Ignatius—'Let us live according to Christianity.' But it may be questioned whether the definition is altogether correct. Living is usually defined as an art; Ethics is a science; so is Christian Ethics. If we might venture upon a definition, it seems to us that a more accurate one would be, 'The science of Christian life or of Christian conduct.' Again, the

object of Christian Ethics is said to be 'to bring all the materials of life under this supreme, formative principle, "According to Christianity."' That we should say is the supreme object of the Christian religion, and one to which Christian Ethics will certainly contribute; but as a science its object is more restricted. Science is always knowledge, classified it may be, but always knowledge, and the object of a science is always the obtaining and ordering of it. The object of Christian Ethics as a science therefore is not to bring all the materials of life under the supreme and formative principle which Dr. Smyth briefly designates by the phrase, 'According to Christ,' but to ascertain what the formative element in Christian conduct is, and to unfold its principles, the laws of its development, and its applications to the problems of conduct and life. These may appear to be matters of but slight importance, but in reality they are vital to any scientific treatment of the subject. Christian Ethics is none the worse for being treated after the most rigorously scientific fashion. In this country, however, it may be said that the study of it is almost in its infancy. Dr. Smyth has chosen to deal with it in a less scientific way than it is capable of being dealt with, and as a consequence he has here and there had to deal more or less elaborately, with topics which though connected with his subject, lie outside the domain of Ethics proper. It is somewhat tantalising after reading his volume to find on almost the last page this statement, 'This dynamical, as distinguished from the statical view of nature and personality, is also the profoundly ethical conception.' That is exactly what we contend for. The dynamical conception of Ethics and of Christianity is the profoundest. It is the one to which S. Paul and the other writers of the New Testament continually revert, and furnishes the starting point from which the science of Christian Ethics can alone be adequately treated. Dr. Smyth, however, though he has adopted a different method, has thrown no small amount of light upon his subject, and has written a book which by reason of the admirable tone and spirit by which it is pervaded, and the richness of its thought and learning, will amply repay the most attentive perusal. It is pregnant with suggestions, and full of instruction and incentive for higher living.

The Gospel of St. John. By MARCUS DODS, D.D. Vol. II.
London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1892.

In a previous volume Dr. Dods brought down his exposition of the Fourth Gospel to the end of the eleventh chapter; in this he completes it. Here, as in the other volume, no attempt is made to deal with the controverted question of the authorship or date of the Gospel. The treatment of any such question does not seem to have fallen within the lines of his purpose. And after all there is no reason why it should: 'introduction' and exegesis are different; and the aim here seems to have been exegesis pure and simple. It is not difficult, however, to see what Dr. Dod's ideas respecting the date and authorship of the Gospel are. He accepts the Beloved Disciple as the genuine author of the work and the speeches as addresses actually delivered by Jesus in the form in which they are recorded. On this basis his exposition is written. Nor is the reader troubled with grammatical or critical notes. Here and there, when the Authorised Version is not exactly clear, we have a paraphrase or a better rendering suggested, but that is all. The course of the exegesis is never interrupted, but flows on calmly and quietly and without almost the faintest sign of controversy. The plan is excellent, and Dr. Dods may be congratulated on the completion of his work. His expositions are simple, orthodox, and often strikingly beautiful. The absence of any show of learning is conspicuous, but one

feels that the author knows his text, and has a full faith in his gospel and a profound knowledge of its contents. One may not agree with every word he utters, nevertheless, there is abundance of spiritual teaching in his discourses plainly and often felicitously expressed. To read them is to be enriched.

Side Lights upon Bible History. By MRS. SYDNEY BUXTON. With Illustrations. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

The Bible history here illustrated is that of the Jews down to the Return from Exile. Of late years it has acquired fresh interest by reason of the many and important discoveries which have been made in connection with it. With these discoveries Mrs. Sydney Buxton is well acquainted, and has made excellent use of them. Her volume is not a history of the Jews, but an attempt to throw light upon their history by means of the facts lately ascertained respecting the nations who at one time or another influenced their destiny. Consequently, we hear much of the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Hittites, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians. The way in which the fresh knowledge respecting these peoples is used to throw light upon the text of the Old Testament is exceedingly happy, and the result is a volume in which every page is fresh and attractive, notwithstanding the many similar volumes which have lately been published. Perhaps the principal charm of the book is in its style. A good deal may also be attributed to the tact with which the quotations have been made and introduced. Any-way, of its kind we have not seen a book in all respects equal to it.

Essays on some Controverted Questions. By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, F.R.S. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

The essays in this volume have all appeared before, either in the *Fortnightly* or in the *Nineteenth Century Review*, but chiefly in the latter. Their publication in their present form makes them handier for reference, and will probably send them into the hands of a wider, and it may be of a more thoughtful, class of readers. By their inclusion in one volume also, especially when read in the light thrown upon them by the 'Prologue,' the reader will be better able to understand their mutual relation and the way in which they bear upon the important question which more or less underlies the discussions in them all. That question is as to the extent which the Supernatural is to occupy men's thoughts. That there may be a Supernatural Mr. Huxley frankly admits, and brings forward some very simple but striking arguments in support of the admission. His quarrel is with the practice of assuming that evidence that a thing may be is equivalent to proof that it is, and with certain ideas now current, or supposed to be current, respecting the Supernatural. His criticism of these is wholly destructive. Whether it is effective is not for us to say. At the same time one might perhaps venture to say that many people may be disposed to think that of this sort of criticism they have had recently a very liberal allowance. It has its function no doubt, but so far as the progress of truth and the genuine interests of mankind are concerned a bit of really constructive criticism built upon a substantial foundation is of more worth. As Mr. Huxley has pointed out in his Prologue to the *Essays* the controversy between Supernaturalism and Naturalism is fairly venerable. Whether the time has come for it to cease is difficult to say. There can be little doubt, however, that positive faiths, as compared with those which are purely negative, are much the more powerful agents in human progress.

Mr. Huxley is aware of this and claims for the 'present incarnation of the spirit of the Renaissance,' of which he himself may be taken as one of the best representatives, that it 'differs from its predecessor of the eighteenth century in that it builds up as well as pulls down.' We are afraid that many will fail to see this. They may even meet it with a negative and say that Agnosticism takes away the very foundation on which any real and quickening faith can be built. Reference has been made to the Prologue more than once. It is the one paper in the volume that is new. As an introduction to the Essays nothing can be better, though while it may and certainly will please those who follow Mr. Huxley, it will not those who belong to either of the theological schools to which he is opposed. Neither Catholics nor Protestants will accept his history of themselves as correct. Certainly very few orthodox Protestants will. They will be disposed to charge him with using against them the same arguments as have been used against them by Catholic writers.

The Principles of Ethics. By HERBERT SPENCER. Vol. I.
London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. 1892.

The first part of this volume, which forms the ninth of Mr. Spencer's great system of Synthetic Philosophy, was published as far back as the year 1879. It was published then because its distinguished author feared that ill-health might wholly prevent him from dealing with the subject of Ethics, and thus compel him to leave the final part of his work untouched. 'Hints, repeated of late years with increasing frequency and distinctness,' he then said, 'have shown me that health may permanently fail, even if life does not end, before I reach the last part of the task I have marked out for myself.' And 'this last part of the task it is,' he went on to say, 'to which I regard all the preceding parts as subsidiary.' Happily the fears then expressed have not been realized; a return of health has enabled the author to carry on his work, and it is to be hoped that before long he will have the pleasure of seeing the whole of the great task he has marked out for himself completed. The first part still bears its old title 'The Data of Ethics,' and remains unchanged, with the exception that the 'Replies to Criticisms,' contributed to *Mind* in January, 1881, and appended to the later editions of *The Data of Ethics*, is here omitted. Of this part, it will be sufficient to say that the points emphasised in it are that the conduct Ethics deals with is a part of conduct at large, that for its subject-matter Ethics has the most highly-evolved conduct as displayed by the most highly-evolved being, man, and is a specification of those traits which his conduct assumes on reaching its limit of evolution, and that while thus conceived as comprehending in its scope the laws of right-living at large, Ethics has a wider field than is commonly assigned to it, including therein, over and above the conduct usually approved or reprobated as right or wrong, all conduct which furthers or hinders, in either direct or indirect ways, the welfare of self or others. The second part deals with the Inductions of Ethics, and the third with the Ethics of Individual Life. The second part is especially interesting and instructive, because of the vast mass of curious information which is brought together in it, illustrative of the habits and moral ideals of a great variety of peoples in different stages of civilization. The contrasts it presents are extremely remarkable. They open up an entirely new field for the moral philosopher, and show how little has hitherto been done and how much still remains to be done, in the science of Ethics. Mr. Spencer's inductions from them, so far as they go, are almost irresistible; but it can scarcely be maintained that he has said the last word about them. He himself, we should say,

would be the last to maintain that he has. They simply open up new problems. Herein, indeed, lies to us, though not agreeing with all that it contains, the chief attraction of this section of the volume. Like the rest of Mr. Spencer's writings, it starts problems and questionings innumerable, and while solving some, leaves others, apparently more difficult of solution, not solved, but more distinct, and at the same time adds to them a weight, a significance, and an imperativeness which, to all appearance, they had not before. For instance, there is the doctrine of the origin and nature of the moral sense. On this Mr. Spencer formerly agreed with the intuitive moralists; now he casts their doctrine aside, and is of opinion that he has set forth sufficient evidence to dissipate the belief in a moral sense as commonly entertained. Here, we suspect, many sincere evolutionists, while accepting some of his inductions, will part company with him. The evidence he has brought forward, so at least it seems to us, only accentuates the problem, does not solve it. But if the second part of the volume is the most interesting and suggestive, the third is not a whit behind either of the other divisions in practical significance or practical importance. Here, as already said, Mr. Spencer deals with the Ethics of Individual Life. The headings of his chapters are alone sufficient to show what weighty matters he treats. Among them are Rest, Activity, Stimulation, Culture, Amusements, Marriage, Parenthood. That these topics are treated from a broad and philosophical point of view, need not be said. Prudential admonitions, of course, occur in the course of the chapters, and very weighty admonitions they are; but what will surprise most is that Mr. Spencer has no difficulty in finding ethical sanctions for them, and proves conclusively that evolutionary ethics gives no countenance to any form of conduct lower than those at present enjoined, but contrariwise is absolutely intolerant of much which many who profess to have the highest guidance think harmless or justifiable. The masterly treatment of this part of the subject is, we may be sure, but an earnest of what may be expected in the parts which are yet to come. These, as we learn from the preface, are to treat of Negative Beneficence and Positive Beneficence, and until these appear, to speak of Evolutionary Ethics as a whole, would obviously be out of place. Meantime, without by any means committing ourselves to the acceptance of its teaching in its entirety, we can commend this volume as in some respects the most important of the series to which it belongs, and as deserving of the most attentive study both by those who accept the doctrine of evolution as set forth by Mr. Spencer, and by those who do not. It is a book of universal interest.

The Dialogues of Plato translated into English with Analyses and Introductions. By B. JOWETT, M.A., Master of Baliol College, etc., etc. Five Volumes. Third Edition. Revised and Corrected throughout. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1892.

In this, the third edition, Dr. Jowett's well known and deservedly popular edition of Plato's *Dialogues* has undergone many changes and received a number of additions. Most of the changes are minute but such as add to the effectiveness of the translation. In many cases they amount to no more than the recasting of a clause or the substitution of one word for another. But just as an artist heightens the beauty of his painting by small and frequently almost imperceptible touches, so by the minute changes which Dr. Jowett has here and there introduced the excellence of his rendering of these masterpieces of Greek prose has been increased. Among the more notable additions in the volumes, those in the preface

to the second and third editions may be noted. Substantially it is the same preface as appeared in the second edition, but here it has been considerably enlarged and improved. Many fresh and important remarks on translating Plato have been introduced, and several paragraphs in reference to Dr. Jackson's new explanation of the Platonic 'ideas,' based on the well-known and difficult passage in Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (Bk. I., c. 6), according to which the doctrine of ideas took, at different periods in his life, two essentially different forms in the mind of Plato:—an earlier one which is to be found chiefly in the *Republic* and the *Phaedo*, and a later, which appears in the *Theætetus*, *Philebus*, *Sophist*, *Politicus*, *Parmenides*, and *Timæus*. This theory, while acknowledging the learning and ability with which it has been urged, Dr. Jowett rejects, maintaining, among other things, that in Plato's own writings there is no hint whatever that he was conscious of having made any change in the doctrine. Other changes that deserve to be noticed are a marginal analysis of the *Dialogues*, which is here supplied for the first time, and the running titles, both of which are distinct improvements. The chief additions, besides those already mentioned, are translations of the *Eryxias* and *Second Alcibiades*, and a number of essays. The subjects dealt with in the latter are *Language*, *The Decline of Greek Literature*, *The Ideas of Plato and Modern Philosophy*, *The Myths of Plato*, *The Relation of the Republic, Statesmen and Laws*, *the Legend of Atlantis*, *Psychology*, and a comparison of the *Laws of Plato with Spartan and Athenian Laws and Institutions*. Among the more important of these may be mentioned the first three, and particularly the first, in which some very difficult problems are suggested for the consideration of philologists. The essay on the relation of the *Republic* to the *Statesman* and the *Laws*, though brief, is a welcome addition to the very admirable introduction to the first named of the three *Dialogues*. As might be expected, the essay on the *Myths* forms something of a contrast to Dr. Westcott's essay on the same subject, though the two are not without points of agreement. From a variety of points of view the most important of the essays is the last. It is impossible here to discuss it, but it may be commended to the reader as in every respect a very admirable piece of workmanship, and deserving of the most attentive perusal in connection with recent discovery of Aristotle's work on the *Constitution of Athens*. The index, which formerly occupied 61 pages, has been extended till it now fills no fewer than 175. A very excellent index it is. To the student it cannot fail to be of the greatest use. As it now stands, the work is by far the best attempt to acquaint the English reader with the writings of Plato that has ever been made. Its merits as a translation are acknowledged. It deserves to stand equally high as a piece of English literature. One thing deserves to be noticed as somewhat unusual. Dr. Jowett is anxious that those who read his translation should read it in its latest and most improved form; he has therefore made arrangements that those who are in possession of the earlier editions may, in exchange for a perfect and undamaged copy, receive a copy of the new edition by payment of one half of the published price.

Kant's Kritik of Judgment. Translated with Introduction and Notes, by J. H. BERNARD, D.D., etc. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892

It is somewhat surprising that though Kant's other two great books have been long translated, and one of them more than once, into English, his *Kritik of Judgment*, which he himself regarded as forming the keystone to his critical edifice, has had to wait until now to be made accessible to

the English reader. The explanation is perhaps to be found in one of the two facts, or it may be in both, that philosophers have all along regarded the *Kritik of Pure Reason* as the most important of the series or that those who have attempted the translation of one of the treatises have had no heart to attempt another. But, be that as it may, no small credit is due to Dr. Bernard for the courage with which he has grappled with a very difficult task and for the skill with which he has performed it. To translate Kant is not easy, as most who have attempted him will readily own. He was never a careful writer, and apart from the technicalities and refined distinctions—those ‘symmetrical architectonic amusements’ as Schopenhauer called them—which are characteristics of all his writings, the *Kritik of Judgment* had the special advantage of being written in his later years when he was least careful as to the form in which he expressed his ideas. Dr. Bernard has done perhaps all, and certainly almost all, that can be done to make the work intelligible to English readers. His pages are not always so lucid or easy reading as one could desire, but that is no fault of his. If it is a fault, and we cannot say that it is not, it is Kant’s. So far as we have examined it the translation is faithful, and whatever help to the understanding of the author’s meaning can be afforded by a glossary of terms and an explanatory Introduction, whose clearness of style is in strange contrast to the obscurity of Kant’s, is here provided. The work is a much needed addition to our philosophical literature, and will be heartily welcomed by all English speaking students of philosophy, among whom the Critical Philosophy seems to be developing renewed interest.

A Short History of the English People. By J. R. GREEN, M.A.
Illustrated Edition. Edited by Mrs. J. R. GREEN, and Miss
KATE NORGATE. Vol. I. London and New York. Mac-
millan & Co. 1892.

The issue of this illustrated edition of Mr. J. R. Green’s *Short History of the English People* is an attempt to fulfill one of his cherished ideas. ‘It was a favourite wish of my husband’s,’ says Mrs. Green, ‘to see English History interpreted and illustrated by pictures, which should tell us how men and things appeared to the lookers-on of their own day, and how contemporary observers aimed at representing them.’ The idea is excellent, and no pains have been spared by the two accomplished editors of the work to carry it out. The result so far is a very charming and indeed sumptuous volume. The *Short History* easily lends itself to illustration, and such has been the care and labour which the editors have devoted to their task, that there are few points in the life of the English people during the period covered by the volume which they have not succeeded in illustrating either with contemporary pictures or pictures of contemporary things. That they have searched far and wide need not be said. The illustrations, while profuse in number, are admirably chosen and well executed. Some of them are reproductions in colour from some of the most famous MSS., such as the Book of Kells and the Lindisfarne Gospel-book. Nor are the illustrations simply inserted in convenient places, short descriptions are given of them, pointing out the source whence they are taken and other noteworthy particulars. Some corrections have also been inserted in the text. Altogether, it is difficult to conceive anything better calculated to awaken an interest in the study of history or to convey to the reader more luminous and intelligent ideas respecting the past life of a great people than this new edition of Mr. Green’s great work.

Craigmillar and its Environs, with Notices of the Topography, Natural History, and Antiquities of the District. By TOM SPEEDY. Illustrated. Selkirk: George Lewis & Son. 1892.

Mr. Speedy has written a very pleasant and informing book which deserves to take a good place among the many local histories which are now happily issuing from the press. Neither he nor his publisher seems to have spared any pains to make the volume in every way worthy of its subject. It is handsomely printed, and embellished with numerous and excellent engravings, and is altogether just such a book as one has pleasure in handling. Craigmillar and its environs deserved to be written about. The castle itself is one of the finest specimens of its kind. It consists of a central keep which has formed the nucleus around which, from time to time, other buildings at later periods have been built. According to the latest authorities the original keep probably dates back to the latter part of the fourteenth century. The chief additions, with the enclosing walls, strengthened with round towers at the angles, and of great extent, were probably added a century later. By whom the castle was originally built is unknown. The earliest mention of the place goes back to the year 1137, when David I. gave to the Holy Trinity Church of Dunfermline, in perpetual gift, some houses in Craigmillar, with several acres of arable land. In the fourteenth century it was in the possession of John de Capella from whom it passed into the hands of the Prestons of Gorton. The Prestons were then, and subsequently an important family. Sir William de Preston was one of the Scottish barons summoned by Edward I. to Norham Castle in 1291. In the reign of James II. William Preston, while on the Continent, obtained possession of the arm-bone of St. Giles, which he bequeathed to the church of St. Giles in Edinburgh. It was in his memory, and in return for his gift, that the Preston Aisle in that church was built by the Town Council. On August 15, 1565, Sir Simon Preston was, on the representation of Queen Mary, made Lord Provost of Edinburgh. Afterwards, however, he broke away from his allegiance, and it was in his house that the Queen was lodged the night before she was carried to Lochleven. A little more than a century later, John Preston, a member of the same family, is said by Fountainhall to have been excluded by the Duke of Lauderdale from the Commission 'as one inclined to burn too many witches.' But to return to the castle. It was the scene of the death or murder of the Earl of Mar in 1477. When on his raiding expedition, in 1544, the Earl of Hereford sacked and burned the place. After its restoration it was visited more than once by Queen Mary. It was by the merest chance, as Mr. Speedy reminds us, that its walls escaped being stained with the blood of Darnley. A proposal was actually made to Mary that her husband should be conveyed thither when he fell ill, instead of to Kirk-of-field. After his death she withdrew to Craigmillar, and was there joined by Bothwell. Mr. Speedy has many other historical incidents to record respecting the castle, both in connection with the ill-fated Queen, and other Scottish sovereigns and princes. Among the buildings in the environs of Craigmillar which come in for notice are the old Tower of Liberton, Moredun House, Kingston Grange, Edmonstone House, Niddrie House, Peffer Mill House, and Inch House, once the residence of the Winrams, and where a sword, which is said to have belonged to Oliver Cromwell is preserved. Mr. Speedy, however, deals not only with the historical buildings of Craigmillar and its environs, but also with the botany, fauna, and avifauna of the district, as well as with its geological features, and has some very interesting information to record. The chapter on the

avifauna, and not less that on the fauna, is remarkably full, and contains many curious facts. Altogether the volume is exceedingly attractive, and to our own mind has not a single uninteresting page.

Twenty-five years of St. Andrews. By the Author of 'The Recreations of a Country Parson. Vol. II. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1892.

This volume has reached us just as our last sheets are passing through the press. Our notice of it therefore must be short. Happily it does not need to be anything else. *Twenty-five years of St. Andrews* is one of those books which no amount of criticism can injure and no amount of praise can advance. Besides, it is entirely personal, and here with personal matters we have nothing to do. All we have to deal with is the book as literature. Dr. Boyd's style is well known. Somewhere or other he has an essay on the 'Art of Putting Things;' in that art he is himself a master. His style is all his own, and a very charming and delightful style it is. No doubt it has its weaknesses, but that is what might be expected. No more than any one else is he an exception to Burke's famous dictum, 'Every man has his point of weakness,' and 'the style,' as some one has said, 'is the man.' Taking the book at its worst, it is a collection of anecdotes, but then they are all worth telling, and all are charmingly told. The author has written many books, but none he has yet written is so much in his own peculiar way or as completely autobiographical as this, notwithstanding his protests, usually emphatic, to the contrary. Talking of others he talks of himself. Egotism, however, is not the word to apply to the volumes. And then, again, if every now and then one hears the faintest rustle of silk, there is very much in the volumes which is manly and strong, not only in what is said and done by those of whom Dr. Boyd writes, but in what he records of himself. There is just one thing which makes us hesitate in reading his pages. In one place he says, 'People of that rank' (princely), 'it is impossible to deny, have the faculty of making themselves extraordinarily agreeable. They may not mean what they say. But they say it sweetly.' Dr. Boyd has this faculty in an extraordinary degree. Everything he says is said sweetly. But when we come across the recurring epithets, 'eminent,' 'outstanding,' 'awful,' 'good,' 'saintly,' etc., one is apt to wonder how much is due to mannerism and how much is really meant. But setting all such things aside, the book in its own way is charming. The present volume is not behind the former in attractiveness or variety. If anything it strikes us as the more preferable. Its meaning is more on the surface; the author pays fewer dubious compliments; more is said and less is implied. Some of its passages are full of pathos and tenderness, and here and there we come across bright and manly sayings. Some of its stories are exquisite, and one might fill page after page with selections from them. That, however, is not our province. We can only commend the volume to the reader. It brings down the reminiscences to the year 1890, when the author received the highest honour the Church of Scotland can confer upon any of its ministers. It is to be hoped that he will continue to enjoy the honour of an ex-Moderator for many years, and that these years will be as full of work and friendships and happy reminiscences as those recorded.

Thomas Carlyle. By JOHN NICHOL, LL.D., M.A., Oxon. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

This latest addition to the 'English Men of Letters' series is by no means its least important volume. On the contrary, it will take its place

as one of the best and most deservedly popular. Dealing with the writer who of all others has had the greatest influence upon the thought of the English-speaking world during the last fifty years, and who is generally recognised as the main literary figure of these latter days, it is altogether worthy of its subject. Mr. Nichol is no Carlyle worshipper, but a keen and discriminating critic. While thoroughly admiring his genius, he is conscious of his defects, and does not hesitate to point them out with the utmost candour. The storm of angry complaints, to use no stronger term, which have been levelled at Mr. Froude, do not in the least deter him. He applies the knife remorselessly, and when Carlyle was weak or wrong, he says so. He is equally just to Mrs. Carlyle. Sentimentalism and hero-worship seem to be as far from him as possible. This cold judicial tone is maintained throughout, and is one of the most striking features of the volume. After all that has been written about Carlyle, it was scarcely to be expected that the Emeritus Professor of English Literature would have much that is new to say about his life. The value of his monograph does not lie in this direction, but in its admirable style, its masterly condensation, and its brilliant portraiture. Mr. Nichol is a master in the English language, and has written with a crispness and felicity of expression seldom equalled. If anything the style is too condensed; the amount of matter, biographical, descriptive and critical, which he has managed to press into his 248 pages is really wonderful, and it is not too much to say that the reader may obtain from them all that is worth knowing or remembering about Carlyle and his wife, and much in the way of criticism which he cannot find elsewhere. Mr. Nichol's fairness is conspicuous in the way he speaks of the relations between Carlyle and his wife, as for instance in the following passages: "The 'rift in the lute,' Carlyle's incapacity for domestic life, was already showing itself. Within the course of an orthodox honeymoon he had begun to shut himself up in interior solitude, seldom saw his wife from breakfast till 4 P.M., when they dined together and read *Don Quixote* in Spanish. The husband was half-forgotten in the author beginning to prophesy: he wrote alone, walked alone, thought alone, and for the most part talked alone, i.e., in monologue that did not wait or care for answer. There was respect, there was affection, but there was little companionship.' . . . 'What such a man wanted was a housekeeper and a nurse, not a wife, and when we consider that he had chosen for the latter companionship a woman almost as ambitious as himself, whose conversation was only less brilliant than his own, of delicate health and dainty ways, loyal to death, but, according to Mr. Froude, in some respects "as hard as flint," with "dangerous sparks of fire," whose quick temper found vent in sarcasm that blistered and words like swords, who could declare during the time of the engagement, to which in spite of warnings manifold she clung, "I will not marry to live on less than my natural and artificial wants;" who, ridiculing his accent to his face and to his friends, could write, "apply your talents to gild over the inequality of our births;" and who found herself obliged to live sixteen miles from the nearest neighbour, to milk a cow, scour floors, and mend shoes—when we consider all this, we are constrained to admit that the 17th October, 1826, was a *dies nefastus*, nor wonder that thirty years later Mrs. Carlyle wrote, "I married for ambition: Carlyle has exceeded all my wildest hopes ever imagined of him, and I am miserable;" and to a young friend, "My dear, whatever you do, never marry a man of genius." Speaking of Carlyle as an author, Mr. Nichol says, 'His works were written seldom with perfect fairness, never with the dry light required for a clear presentation of the truth: they have all "an infusion from the will and the affections;" but they were all written with

a whole sincerity and with fervour : they rise from his hot heart, and rushed through the air "like rockets driv' by their own burning." The following is one of several similar passages : 'Read Scott's *Memoirs* in the morning, the *Reminiscences* at night, and dispute if you like about the greater genius, but never about the healthier, better, and larger man.' As to Carlyle's style, Mr. Nichol writes : 'It is not that of Addison, of Berkeley, or of Helps ; its peculiarities are due to the eccentricity of an always eccentric being ; but it is neither affected nor deliberately imitated. It has been plausibly asserted that his earlier manner of writing, as in *Schiller*, under the influence of Jeffrey, was not his natural voice. "They forget," he said referring to his critics, "that the style is the skin of the writer, not a coat, and the public is an old woman." Erratic, metaphorical, elliptical to excess, and therefore a dangerous model, "the mature, oaken, Carlylese style," with its freaks, "nodosities and angularities," is as set and engrained in his nature as the *Birthmark* in Hawthorne's romance.' There are many other passages equally worth quotation ; but we must stop. The work has been long looked for, and now that it is here, we doubt whether in the performance of his task Mr. Nichol has not exceeded the highest anticipations entertained regarding it.

A Pilgrimage to the Land of Burns, and Poems. By HEW AINSLIE. With Memoir by THOMAS C. LATTO. Paisley and London : Alex. Gardner. 1892.

Hew Ainslie was for a few years clerk in the Register House, Edinburgh, where he had for his associates Alexander Campbell, editor of the now forgotten *Albyn's Anthology* ; Robert Jamieson, editor of ballads, and translator of certain Scandinavian poems and sagas ; and Thomas Pringle, joint-originator of what afterwards became, and still is, *Blackwood's Magazine*. He was born in Ayrshire, at Dailly, in 1792, and after an attempt at studying for the legal profession, removed to Edinburgh, from whence he emigrated to the United States in 1822, where except during a visit he paid to Scotland, he remained, farming, and writing verses and other matters, until his death in 1878, at the patriarchal age of eighty-six. Mr. Latto has done his best to give an attractive and picturesque narrative of his life, and, though here and there he has fallen into a blunder, may be said to have succeeded. His account of Ainslie's visit to Burns' widow is interesting, and will be a new item for those who worship at the feet of the Ayrshire bard. The principal contents of the volume, however, are Ainslie's 'Pilgrimage to the Land of Burns,' and a large and indeed complete collection of his poems. The first is a narrative of a journey made by Ainslie and two companions from Edinburgh to Ayrshire and back, and undertaken with the intention, fully carried out, of visiting the places connected with the memory of Burns. For the most part it is written in prose, but is pretty freely interspersed with songs and poems. As a specimen of the old-fashioned way of humorous writing it is excellent. The party were in good spirits, and though nothing of any great importance occurred, the pilgrimage seems to have been very eventful to them. They succeeded in picking up a good deal of information about Burns, besides doing a good deal of hero-worship. Ainslie cannot be called a great poet. A few of his songs will probably live, but Mr. Latto's estimate of him is a little emotional and exaggerated.

The Principal Speeches of the Statesmen and Orators of the French Revolution, 1789-1795. Edited with Introductions,

Notes, and Indices. By H. MORSE STEPHENS. 2 vols. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1892.

The publication of this collection of speeches was suggested, it seems, by the action of the Faculty of Modern History at Oxford, in prescribing a certain number of the principal speeches delivered by the Statesmen and Orators of France during the French Revolution for examination, as part of the original documents to be studied by candidates, offering that period in Modern History as a special subject. Mr. Morse Stephens is to be congratulated on the manner in which he has carried out the suggestion. The selecting and editing of the speeches could not have fallen into better hands. His *History of the French Revolution* was a guarantee that the work would be well done, and when we turn to its examination our expectations are more than fulfilled. Students of French literature as well as of French history will find much to interest and inform them, not only in the notes and introductions Mr. Stephens has written for the speeches, but also in the speeches themselves. With the exception of Danton's all of them were carefully written out beforehand and read, and contain among them the best specimens of French political oratory, a thing unknown in France before the Revolution, and altogether different from the political oratory to which we are accustomed in this country. Besides the biographical introductions which he has written for each of the orators whose speeches are here represented, Mr. Stephens has prefaced his volumes with an introduction dealing with the history of political oratory in France, in which he shows what influence pulpit, legal and academic oratory had in forming it. The absence of political oratory previous to the outbreak of the Revolution was due, he points out, to the policy inaugurated by Richelieu of preventing all public discussion of political matters, and to the fact that after 1613 no free Assembly met in which public affairs could be debated. The politicians of the Revolution, with the exception of Mirabeau, Danton, Barnave and Maury, were not debaters. Even Mirabeau was in the habit of reading his speeches, and, what in the present seems still stranger, had most of his speeches written for him, he as a rule, furnishing the ideas, but not always. Mr. Stephens has edited the speeches chiefly from an historical point of view and for historical purposes. Their literary character, however, has not been altogether neglected, and in the 'Introductions' some very useful remarks in this connection will be found. The remark that Saurin is 'not at all known' in this country is a little too sweeping. A number of his discourses have been translated into English and used to be not uncommon.

A Companion to the Iliad for English Readers. By WALTER LEAF, Litt. D. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

Here is a book which for English students of the Iliad is full of rare information and surpassing interest. It is an experiment it is true, but it is an experiment made by one whose knowledge of his subject is scarcely surpassed and which can hardly fail to succeed. It is intended as a companion to the well-known and deservedly popular translation of the Iliad of which Dr. Leaf is one of the joint authors, and assumes the form of a running commentary upon it. It has another and a higher aim than that of simply throwing light upon the translation, and that is of awakening a living interest in the Iliad and the classics as an essential part of the history of the human mind. With these aims in view, Dr. Leaf, as need hardly be said, has made use of all the available means afforded by philology and the re-

cent archaeological discoveries, and the result is that his commentary is brought down to the latest date. The Introduction is of special interest and will open up to those not already acquainted with the progress of Greek scholarship, a new and important field in ancient history. The question of the composition of the Iliad also comes in for treatment, and the theory now held by most scholars is carefully developed. It is referred to also again and again in the introductions to the several books as well as in the notes. That it is only a theory Dr. Leaf is always careful to point out, but at the same time gives very substantial arguments for its acceptance. Next to the scholarship and fulness of information with which the *Companion* is written, perhaps its most conspicuous characteristic is its moderation. Every trace of dogmatism is absent from it. Some of the notes are of considerable length, as, for instance, the one on the shield, which expands into something like a brief treatise on the origin of Greek art. Here and there too we have alterations of the translation which, excellent as the translation is, are always for the better. Altogether the English student of the Iliad may be congratulated on having at last placed within his reach the highest results of Homeric studies, and in such a way that they are perfectly intelligible to him.

Scottish Poetry of the Sixteenth Century. (Abbotsford Series of Scottish Poets). Edited by GEORGE EYRE-TODD. Glasgow: W. Hodges & Co. 1892.

In this third volume of his series of selections for the Scottish poets, Mr. Eyre-Todd has given a number of poems from Sir David Lyndsay, Bellenden, James V., Sir Richard Maitland, Alexander Scott, and Alexander Montgomerie. The poems have been carefully chosen, and may be taken as representative. For the first time the poems of James V., or those attributed to him, are brought together. To each of the sections into which the volume is divided, the editor has prefixed an introduction, dealing for the most part with the biography of the poet whose writings are illustrated in the section, and in the margins of the pages the difficult words occurring in the text are frequently explained. The introductions have evidently been written with care. They contain a good deal of information, and many critical remarks, which are, on the whole, fair. As a rule the glossary, if such the explanations of the words given on the margin may be called, is correct, but the editor's attempts at definitions are not always so successful as they might be. Even the word 'gaberlunzieman' seems to puzzle him. The reader will get a much better definition of the word or description of the class to which the individual referred to belonged from the two last stanzas of the ballad than he will from Mr. Eyre-Todd's apparently learned note. The fact is a gaberlunzieman was not a hawker, as Mr. Eyre-Todd says, but a beggar. 'Perysit,' (p. 35), again, is simply 'perished,' 'undone,' and 'sweir swyngeoris' is not particularly well rendered by 'lazy sluggard.' 'Syne' does not mean 'presently,' nor is 'over outland and mountains' a good rendering of 'over firth and fell.' Philology is not a strong point with the editor, and some of his shots are far from happy. A more careful use of the dictionary would make the series still more valuable.

Hill-A-Hoy-O. By a 'COUNTRY COUSIN.' Paisley and London: Alex. Gardner. 1892.

Poems. By JAMES MATHER. Same Publisher. 1892.

The Professor and other Poems. By the Author of *Moods, Times, and Days, etc.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1892.

Warbeck. A Historical Play in Two Parts. By JOHN WILLIAM AIZLEWOOD, LL.B. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1892.

Here are four volumes all claiming to contain poetry, but with very varied contents. One is a drama, an historical play, in two parts; another is, to use the author's own phrase, a 'song-spate'; a third might almost stand for a poet's guide-book; while the fourth is more staid and philosophical. But to take them as they stand above: the musings and utterances of a Country Cousin are sometimes rather difficult to understand. Here and there they seem a little disjointed; very often they are jerky. The author, indeed, seems to be something of an imitator of Browning. Browningites may approve this; ordinary mortals will not. All the same a 'Country Cousin' can write vigorous verses, and often hits off a picture with a few sharp strokes, and in a way that is quite surprising. The art of fusing his thoughts into perfectly intelligible forms as well as of manipulating words strikes us as his chief defects. The book is full of promise.—Mr. Mather's poems are pleasant, but with a tendency to monotony. For the most part they are descriptive of natural scenery, with here and there an historical incident interwoven. Homer nods, and we need not be surprised if Mr. Mather does. He has read about the ice-age, but does not seem, in the following verse, to have grasped the situation—

“ Then Cairnsmore lay in ice and snow,
 ’Twas winter evermore,
 Although the west, warm wind did blow,
 With summer at the door.”

An ice age with a west warm wind blowing would be rather an anomaly. The following, on the 'Old Yew Tree of Fortingall' is somewhat odd—

“ And that new world was once a child,
 Thy finger tickled 'neath the chin
 With sportive glee, the while it smiled,
 Or danced and leaped like any linn.”

The new world referred to is Christendom, but the idea of a tree 'tickling it 'neath the chin' is a little ludicrous.—The anonymous author of *The Professor* writes well. His pieces are full of thought and very suggestive. Most of them are studies of certain aspects of human life and character, and are evidently the work of a studious and cultivated mind. They exhibit very considerable skill in versification and a good deal of imaginative power.—Mr. Aizlewood's play is based for the most part on Ford's Perkin Warbeck. The first part ends with the death of Stanley, and the second with that of the impostor. There is considerable movement in the action and the speeches are never unduly prolonged. Warbeck, Clifford, Stanley, and the Duchess, are well drawn, as also the King. For the most part the play is written in verse, but it might almost as well have been written in prose. It is very seldom that the diction rises above prose of the plainest kind.

Imperial Federation: The Problem of National Unity. By GEORGE R. PARKIN, M.A. With Map. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

The question of Imperial Federation is gradually forcing itself on public

attention and will soon call for a settlement. Such at least is the opinion of Mr. Parkin, and of many besides him, and there can be little doubt that they have grounds most relative for their faith. Twenty-five years ago, it was regarded as a perfectly natural thing that the Colonies should sooner or later lay claim to political independence and throw off all allegiance to the mother-country. All this is now changed. According to all accounts there is everywhere a strong tendency of opinion in the opposite direction, and an aspiration common to all the Colonies as well as prevalent in the United Kingdom after a closer union than at present exists. This extraordinary reversal of opinion is regarded by Mr. Parkin as the natural outcome of the vast changes which within the past two or three decades have come over the national life, and 'The extension of commercial and industrial relations,' he says, 'the growth of common interests, the increased facility for communication, above all, the retention of the Colonies, under their new systems of free government, of a strong national sentiment, and the absence of the anticipated desire to break the national connection, have thrown new light upon it.' It is in this new light that Mr. Parkin now considers the question. His volume, in brief, is a very temperate and well argued plea for federation. His large acquaintance with Colonial opinion enables him to speak with authority upon the question, and there are few points in connection with it, upon which he has not a good deal that is very pertinent to say. In the course of his argument he handles the statements put forward by Mr. Goldwin Smith and Mr. Carnegie, and with his larger knowledge and more statesmanlike views has no difficulty in disposing of them. The volume can be strongly commended for perusal and study by all who wish to arrive at wise and liberal views on one of the most important political questions of the day.

The Scottish Poor Laws : Their History, Policy, and Operation.

By ROBERT PEEL LAMOND, Member of the Faculty of Procurators in Glasgow. New Edition. With Appendices. Glasgow : W. Hodge & Co. 1892.

Mr. Lamond has here revised and greatly enlarged the work which he published anonymously so far back as 1870. As it stands, it is a work of considerable research and legal ability. Though bearing a legal title, it is not exactly a work which is meant exclusively for lawyers, but appeals to, and is intended to be read by, all who take an interest in the social condition of the poor in Scotland. Of course there is a good deal of law in it, but lay readers will have no difficulty with it as it is written without technicalities, and in such wise as to be intelligible to any one of average education. Mr. Lamond has two propositions to maintain : first, that Burke's statement that it is not in the power of Government to provide for us in our necessities is not true, and secondly, that the administration of the Poor Law in Scotland does not, as has been frequently asserted, tend to demoralise and pauperise society. The chief value of his book, however, is not in the skill with which he maintains his theses, but in the lucid explanation he gives of the poor law system, the facts and arguments he brings forward in defence of its administration, and the suggestions he makes for its improvement. That the working of the system is susceptible of improvement there can be no doubt. Whether Mr. Lamond's suggestions will be adopted is another question. One of them is that instead of to the present elective Board, the administration of relief should be left to two or three Inspectors, under the supervision of a central Board, and responsible to the Crown. The arguments he brings forward in favour of this plan are cogent, but it is doubtful whether the ratepayers or Parliament would con-

sent to any such change. It touches a principle which has almost become a fetish. Another point on which Mr. Lamond has a suggestion is the vexed and costly question of 'settlement.' Here, we should say, both the ratepayer and Parliament will be in agreement with him as to the necessity of a change. Any change which would save the time of the inspectors, the time of the Law Courts, the tempers of conflicting Boards, and the rates, to say nothing of the feelings and wits of the applicant for relief, all parties, we should think, would gladly accept. There is of course the inevitable chapter on old age pensions. Mr. Lamond is strongly against Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, and urges the utilisation of existing agencies, as for instance, the Parochial Boards, Friendly Societies, and Trades' Unions. The book is rich in suggestions of a very practical kind, and ought to be read by the charitable and philanthropic as well as by the professed social reformer.

A Treatise on Byzantine Music. By the Very Reverend S. G. HATHERLY, Mus. Bac. Oxon., Propresbyter of the Patriarchal Œcumenical Throne of Constantinople. Paisley and London: Alex. Gardner. 1892.

This is a book which requires careful study, but to all who are interested in the subject of which it treats, it will amply repay the attention given to it. Mr. Hatherly, as a priest of the Greek Church, has had the opportunity of making himself well acquainted with his subject; and the thoroughness with which he has gone into it is evident on every page. We have had no such full explanation of the peculiarities of the Byzantine Music until now. To those who have hitherto believed in only two modes, the Major and the Minor, it will be of the nature of a new revelation. Mr. Hatherly begins at the beginning and shews how the scale is built up. He shews how, by the various arrangements and conjunctions of the tetrachord, a vast number of modes are formed, some of them indeed of no use and unworkable. After these are set aside there still remain one hundred and twenty-six that are workable. For a description of these we must refer the student to the book itself. It will open up quite a new field even to many who are well acquainted with modern musical science. To ordinary musicians, perhaps, the most interesting part of the book will be the numerous specimens of Eastern music contained in Part V. These consist both of sacred and secular pieces from Russian, Greek and Turkish sources. The Sailor's Love Song of Leucadia, No. CXLVI.; the Turkish Schiardy for the pianoforte, No. CLXII.; and A Desponding Complainer's Song of Smyrna, No. CLXXXII.; and several others will shew the peculiarly quaint and often weird character of the Byzantine Music. We very heartily commend the book, which is beautifully got up, to the musical student.

The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ (Macmillan), by Canon Bernard, is a study and an exposition of the five chapters of the Gospel according to St. John, xiii. to xviii. inclusive. In these chapters the author finds, as others have found, the essential part of our Lord's teaching, a gospel within the Gospel, the gospel to the believing disciples in contrast to the gospel to the unbelieving world. The point where the two separate in the gospel narrative is first clearly pointed out, and then the incidents related in the chapters, our Lord's great discourse and His prayer as the High Priest are treated. Questions relating to the authorship of the Gospel and kindred topics are designedly left aside. Canon Bernard assumes the genuineness and authenticity of the passage, and discourses upon it with tact and simplicity. A spirit of genuine reverence and piety pervades the

entire volume, and it is impossible to read it without being spiritually enriched.

Of Messrs. Macmillan & Co's. cheap and excellent reprint of Archdeacon Farrar's extremely popular works, there have been issued during the quarter, *Mercy and Judgment* and *Sermons and Addresses delivered in America*. The first is the author's well known Eschatological work, written with reference to the late Dr. Pusey's indictment of its author's views respecting the punishment of the wicked. Need it be said that the volume is wonderfully learned and remarkably eloquent? It may be taken as a handbook on the subject, as viewed from its author's standpoint. Dr. Farrar ranges over the whole field of theology, and brings together a vast array of opinions, both ancient and modern. The second volume, as its title indicates, contains, with one or two exceptions, the sermons and addresses which the author delivered in America during his visit to that Continent in 1885. The introduction is from the pen of Dr. Brooks, Bishop of Massachusetts.

Another volume of sermons we have received from the same publisher is *Christmas Day and other Sermons*, by the late Professor Maurice. It is uniform with the recent cheap re-issue of the author's *Lincoln's Inn Sermons*, and apparently the first volume of a series intended to contain his remaining theological writings. These sermons belong to an earlier date than those contained in the six volumes recently published, and all deal with topics of supreme importance. They are valuable besides as showing the earlier phases of their author's thoughts, while their republication is a sign of the hold which he still has upon the religious mind of to-day.

The Rev. Buchanan Blake's *How to Read Isaiah* (Clark) has reached its second edition. The work is an attempt to put the reader in the way of understanding the prophecies contained in the first thirty-nine chapters of the great evangelical prophet. Mr. Blake seems to have availed himself of the recent results of Biblical criticism and Biblical research, and there can be no doubt that his work will serve a useful purpose by bringing out distinctly the order in which the prophecies may in all probability be assumed to have been spoken, and the events or circumstances to which they relate.

Life and Conduct (Black), by Dr. Cameron Lees, is a little manual intended primarily for the use of the members of the Church of Scotland Guild. It is packed full of excellent advice, conveyed with great literary skill, and deserves to be universally read.

Under the editorship of Mr. Herbert B. Adams, the series known as the 'John Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science,' (Baltimore) continues to supply us with many carefully prepared monographs on points of interest in connection with the history and political institutions of America. In the tenth series, the one now running, we have *The Bishop Hill Colony: a Religious Communist Settlement in Henry County, Illinois*, by M. A. Mikkelsen; *Church and State in New England*, by Paul E. Lauer; *Church and State in Maryland*, by George Petrie; *The Religious Development in the Province of North Carolina*, by Stephen B. Weeks; *Maryland's Attitude in the Struggle for Canada*, by J. W. Black; and *Quakers in Pennsylvania*, by A. C. Applegarth, Ph.D. The titles are sufficient to show the importance of the subjects dealt with, and the contents are always informing.

The most recent issues of the excellent series, entitled *Les Artistes Célèbres*, (Paris: Librairie de l'Art; London: Allison & Co.), to which we

have so often referred to, are *Charlet*, by F. Lhomme, *Les van de Velde*, by Emile Michel, and *J. B. Greuze*, by Ch. Normand. As usual the volumes are abundantly illustrated, especially the last, while the names of the authors are a guarantee for the accuracy of the text, and judicious character of the critical estimates they contain.

Quintin Doonrise (Alex. Gardner), by J. M'Gavin Sloan, is 'a study in human nature.' The specimen of humanity studied, or the hero of the volume, if he may be so called, is Quintin Doonrise, a west of Scotland laird, terribly afraid of what other people will say of him, weak in will, and of questionable character. Mary Lamb, the heroine, is different, but her character and the position in which she is placed, do not sort well with each other. Having the character assigned to her, we should say that the incident on which her fate is made to turn is improbable, if not impossible. Quintin Doonrise moves one with contempt, and the extraordinary thing is that such a milk-and-water individual has the nerve to commit suicide. Mary Lamb is a little bookish, and apparently with more passion than sense. The best characters are the subordinate. The plot is simple. But no man of sense or character or of education, such as we may suppose a west-country laird of the past thirty years to have been, would ever have been mixed up in it. Mr. Sloan writes well. His next venture may be more successful.

Tib (Oliphant Anderson), by George Douglas, is a short story of humble Scottish life, in which the characters are portrayed with considerable skill, and the plot, notwithstanding one or two improbabilities, is well sustained and worked out. The two sisters, Tib and Clova, and the 'orra man,' stand out very distinctly, as also does Brandeth, a prig of a dominie, who deserves a whipping rather than to be received back by Clova, whom he has deceived and jilted.

The *Critical Review* (T. & T. Clark), which is devoted to the criticisms of theological and philosophical literature, contains in its October number, as in its predecessors, a series of brief and scholarly reviews of recent works. The editor has gathered around him an excellent staff of contributors, and to theological and philosophical students, but more especially to the former, the *Review* is proving itself extremely useful. Its notices are always of the latest date, and, what is of special service, its numbers always contain a list of the most recent foreign publications in the various departments of literature with which it is concerned.