

on the barren chance (in the first instance mentioned) of conquering another city, or (in the second) of intriguing for the purple, the attainment of which experience had taught, in nine cases out of ten, meant death within a few months. It was not that the conquest of the city or the ascent of the throne added to his luxury, which would have probably been impossible—this was not his object, but that having already his fill of all sensuous pleasures he looked for something more, and this something more he found, in accordance with the manners of his age, in the notion of glory, the glory of founding a dynasty, or of being saluted absolute master of the world. We see a similar thing nowadays in the tradesmen in possession of all that wealth can purchase, and in absence of all intellectual resources, who, also in accordance with the manners of his age, finds his “something more” in commercial “success,” which he continues to pursue for its own sake.

The introspective moralists, Christian, Positivist, or what not, are therefore right when they insist on the satisfaction of material wants not being regarded as the final end of human life. They are only wrong in not seeing that until obtained they must necessarily seem such to the vast majority of men. The signal failure in history of the doctrine of repression, whether it take the form of the “holiness of the Christian, or the more plausible “ascetic” discipline” of the Positivist, after a reign of two thousand years ought, one would think, to give these good people pause as to whether repression is, after