

changing, fortunately, and we trust that few men of intelligence are now to be found who would dispute our definition of culture as a certain provisional completeness of the human

mind in the sum and development of its faculties, or who would deny that, to constitute such completeness, a liberal scientific training is wholly indispensable.—*Popular Science Monthly.*

EDITORIAL.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO CARLYLE.

A CONTRIBUTOR to our pages makes some reference to Carlyle's political doctrines, which are seemingly hard to understand, or if understood aright, are difficult to reconcile with Carlyle's sincerity, his manifest desire to do right, and the earnestness with which he denounces all wrong-doing and wrong-thinking. Carlyle was, above all things, a man of convictions; and though unquestionably his influence is ever on the side of righteousness, it is, we confess, not easy to endorse his view of government by an Aristocracy of Intellect with due regard for justice and the largest freedom of the individual. To this extent we are in sympathy with our correspondent, and, with some qualifications, we share his views. But Prophets and Seers are not always to be judged by ordinary canons of criticism. As a writer has pointed out, allowance has to be made for "a certain intolerance of their immediate surroundings, a certain visionariness of speculation, a retrograde and reactionary impulse, a generous weariness as of those born out of due time." But, while we put forward this plea for the great censor of the age, whose voice has been "a cry in the wilderness," we are far from joining in the condemnation of his Hero-Worship; still less do we fail to sympathize with his deification of force, in the sense in which Carlyle

really meant to commend that symbol of power. Even as he is ordinarily interpreted, there is much in Carlyle's political opinions that calls for commendation, and no little virtue in his Hero-Worship. There come times when a Cromwell is necessary, and his work is beneficent. In these days of vacillation and compromise, one cannot help having a lurking sympathy for autocratic governments, for vigorous administration in the individual or in the state, and for the kingly intellect that reduces chaos to order, and sits heavily on anarchy and idleness. With popular suffrage and the gospel that "Jack's as good as his master," we have got rid of reverence and much that was formerly noble in life and living; and with democracy has come demagogism, disbelief and dynamitism. We do not say that the forces that have been let loose in the last quarter of a century will not in time slough off their undue license, and be brought back to conservatism and decency. Good, we believe, will ultimately prevail; and we have hope that the better part of the community will always leaven the worse. Danger is always the more menacing during a time of transition. New enthusiasms are apt to take on a certain sort of fanaticism; and, at present, we have the doctrine preached of the elevation of the many by the levelling of the few. It was in the few that Carlyle had hope, and to the few he looked for all that was beneficent