

there is no God, judgment or future state, seems a somewhat inconsistent and Hibernian conception.

Meanwhile the great opponent of the Positivists, Mr. Mallock, has again appeared before the public with "a Romance of the Nineteenth Century." The book whatever else it may be is not a Romance in the ordinary acceptation of the term, but a series of Platonic dialogues with a thin thread of narrative and description running through it. It is undoubtedly interesting and very significant of the times in which we live, though it can hardly be recommended for general reading. It has been severely handled by *all* the Reviewers, but this was naturally to be expected, as its author's former volume won great popularity in the teeth of similar opposition. Mr. Mallock however has the good fortune which is often denied to better writers than himself—he has the ear of the great reading public.

A centennial celebration of the publication of Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" was held during July at Saratoga Springs, under presidency of the head of Amherst College. Such popular commemorations of poets and other literary characters are common enough, but the celebration of a work of metaphysical philosophy is a curious phenomenon. Kant was the great restorer of philosophy and led the reaction against the scepticism of Hume. His book dealing with Pure or Theoretic Reason was followed by Critiques of Practical Reason and of Judgment. But though Kant's Pure Reason was an epoch making work, he will probably be best known by his formulated standard of moral action, the so-called Categorical Imperative, "Act as if the maxim of your action ought to become the universal law of nature," i.e., that action is bad that cannot be desired to be turned into an universal law.

M. Taine has paid so much attention to England and the English, that his name is as familiar among English speaking people as one of their own writers. A new volume has appeared carrying on his History of the French Revolution, under the second title of "The Jacobin Conquest." His general view of this period is that the Jacobin, by knowing his own mind and having no scruples, succeeded in making himself supreme. The respectable people were timid, unintelligent and vastly too careful of their skins and their comfort to offer such a resistance as might have saved the country from the horrors of the Reign of Terror.

The character of Napoleon Bonaparte has a charm about it which attracts historians and essayists now and again to attempt its solution. Prof. Seeley has lately made it the occasion for an article in *Macmillan*. The chief results which he establishes are that Bonaparte was produced not by the Revolution but by the war, and was the child of the *levée en masse*; the Imperial system and the French ascendancy in Europe grew from the same causes. Bonaparte's practical qualities were shown in the fact that he established a real government; his ideal was an adaptation of Oriental romance. In his view of his personal character he takes a stand strongly contrasted with that of Carlyle. Bonaparte is not an instance of a nature originally noble which was corrupted by power or carried away by passion. He rather proves that "there really is