

## LYNDHURST AND BROUGHAM.

ly offended and irritated the King. In 1834, his conduct was extraordinary. He was manifestly intoxicated with success. He made a sort of 'progress' through Scotland, and spoke of the King as though he had been commissioned to represent the sovereign in the northern kingdom. After receiving the freedom of the city of Inverness he said: 'To find that he (the King) lives in the hearts of his loyal subjects inhabiting this ancient and important capital of the Highlands, as it has afforded me pure and unmixed satisfaction, will, I am confident, be so received by His Majesty when I tell him (as I will do by this night's post) of such a gratifying manifestation.' No wonder that the King was deeply offended, and that colleagues and friends began to doubt the sanity of the Lord Chancellor. In November the Ministry was dismissed, and Brougham, instead of delivering the Great Seal into the hands of the King, sent it to His Majesty in a bag. At this time Brougham was fifty-six years old, and he expected soon to return to office; but though he lived for thirty-four years, his fond hopes were not gratified. Lord Melbourne tricked him by putting the Great Seal into commission, and then appointing Lord Cottenham to the Chancellorship. Lord Brougham was badly used by his political friends. Lord Melbourne said, 'Although he (Brougham) will be dangerous as an enemy, he would be certain destruction as a friend. We may have small chance of going on without him, but to go on with him is impossible.' Yet we hold that the attempt should have been made, and it is not impossible that during a second tenure of office Lord Brougham would have been less self-opinionated, and would have been more careful not to transgress official etiquette.

What then shall we say of Lord Brougham? Shall we recite the threadbare adage that, 'A Jack-of-all-trades is master of none'? Doubtless if Brougham had applied himself exclusively to the study of the law, he would have been a profoundly read lawyer, but it by no means follows that he would have won for himself the cognomen of the English Justinian. If he had kept to science, he might have produced some valuable treatises, but it is not to be inferred that he would have gained distinction as a discoverer. It seems to us that Brougham was not endowed with that quality of mind which we may describe as penetrating. His mental vision was powerful to survey vast realms of thought, knowledge, and speculation, but he had not the faculty of deep research. He was superficial, but not in the ordinary sense of that term. He did more than skim the surface. He could and did follow the lead of other minds, but he could not open up new and unexplored regions. Lord Campbell tells a story of Brougham getting £1,000 from Jeffrey, to be repaid in articles for the *Edinburgh*, and that in a few weeks he had written enough copy for an entire number of the *Review*. Whether the story is true or false, it

illustrates the speciality of Brougham's powers. He could write, and write well, on any subject. He was a critic, but not a creator. If then he has left few works to bear witness to his industry and ability, we must not forget that he took an active part in many important movements. He did less than might have been expected as a law reformer, yet, as Lord Campbell remarks, 'without his exertions the *optimism* of our legal procedure might long have continued to be preached up, and *Fines* and *Recoveries* might still have been regarded with veneration.' He did much, very much, towards the spread of education. He was indeed the hardest worker of his age; and it is far easier to set forth what he did not do, than to sum up his accomplishments.

Lord Campbell does not vituperate Brougham as he does Lyndhurst. Brougham was a Whig, and therefore Campbell did not hate him politically. Then, in later life Campbell received many kindnesses from Brougham. The ex-Chancellor used his utmost efforts to get Campbell appointed Lord Chief Justice, and he succeeded. Campbell was received cordially at Brougham Hall and at Cannes. Yet Lord Campbell never misses an opportunity of being spiteful. It is with evident relish he tells us that Brougham's 'Speeches' would not sell, and went to the trunk-maker's, and that the 'Political Philosophy' fell still-born from the press, and ruined the Useful Knowledge Society. We are told of 'Brougham's strange practice of recklessly making statements in the presence of those who he knew might, if so inclined, have flatly contradicted him.' Lord Campbell cannot be charged with that species of recklessness, since he took care that his statements were not published until the attacked persons were dead. At page 539 we read: 'It is my duty, as a true and impartial biographer, to relate that he was made very unhappy by the successful publication of my *Lives of the Chancellors*. . . He wrote himself, or induced others to write in periodicals over which he had influence, stinging articles against the book and its author.' At page 549 we read: 'Cottenham grew worse, and a paragraph appeared in the newspapers stating that I was likely to be the new Chancellor. This brought out a series of scurrilous articles in the *Morning Herald* (Brougham's organ) vilifying me.' Probably the reader has had enough of Campbell's spite, and therefore we will quote no more of it, but will conclude our somewhat lengthened notice by extracting two capital jokes. Lord Campbell refers to a visit to Brougham Hall, accompanied by his wife and daughter, and says they were most kindly and hospitably received, and adds:—

'Indeed, I still feel not only regret, but something savouring of remorse, when I am obliged, as a faithful biographer, to record anything which may seem not altogether to the credit of one with whom I have spent so many pleasant hours.'