

science, and genius in that quiet midland village lay grouped round Dr. Darwin and his Lunar Society with James Watt and Matthew Boulton, then at work on their steam-engine, and Murdoch, the inventor of gas-lighting; and Wedgwood, the father of the potteries; and Hutton the book-seller, and Baskerville the printer; and Thomas Day, and Lovell Edgeworth, a group to whom often came Franklin, and Smooton, and Black, and in their centre their great philosopher and guide and moving spirit, the noble Joseph Priestley. Little as we think of it now, that group, where the indomitable Boulton kept open house, was a place of pilgrimage to the ardent minds of Europe; it was one of the intellectual cradles of modern civilization. And it is interesting to remember that our great Charles Darwin is on both sides the grandson of men who were leading members of that Lunar Society, itself a provincial Royal Society. What forces lay within it? What a giant was Watt, fit to stand beside Gutenberg and Columbus, as one of the few single discoveries have changed the course of human civilization! And, if we chose one man as a type of the intellectual energy of the century, we could hardly find a better than Joseph Priestley, though his was not the greatest mind of the century. His versatility, eagerness, activity, and humanity; the immense range of his curiosity, in all things physical, moral, or social; his place in science, in theology, in philosophy, and in politics; his peculiar relation to the Revolution; and the pathetic story of his unmerited sufferings, may make him the hero of the eighteenth century.

The strength of the century lay neither in politics nor in art; it lay in breadth of understanding. In political genius, in poetry, in art, the eighteenth was inferior to the seventeenth

century, and even to the sixteenth; in moral, in social, and in material development it was far inferior to the nineteenth. But in philosophy, in science, in mental versatility, it has hardly any equal in the ages. Here, especially, it is impossible to limit the view to one country. Politics, industry, and art are local. Science and research know nothing of country, have no limitations of tongue, race, or government. In philosophy then the century numbers: Leibnitz, Vico, Berkeley, Montesquieu, Diderot, D'Alembert, Condorcet, Kant, Turgot, Hume, Adam Smith. In science it counts Buffon, Linnaeus, Lavoisier, Laplace, Lamarck, Lagrange, Halley, Herschel, Franklin, Priestley, Black, Cavendish, Volta, Galvani, Bichat, and Hunter. To interpret its ideas, it had such masters of speech as Voltaire, Rousseau, Swift, Johnson, Gibbon, Lessing, Goethe, and Burke. It organized into sciences (crystallizing the data till then held in solution) physics, chemistry, botany, zoology, comparative anatomy, electricity, psychology, and the elements of social science, both in history and in statics. It threw up these three dominant movements: (1) the idea of law in mind and in society, that is, the first postulate of mental and social science; (2) that genius for synthesis of which the work of Buffon, of Linnaeus, and the Encyclopedia itself, were all phases; (3) that idea of social reconstruction, of which the new régime of '89, the American Republic, and our reformed Parliament are all products. The seventeenth century can show, perhaps, a list of greater separate names, if we add those in poetry, politics, and art. But for mass, result, multiplicity, and organic power, it may be doubted if any century in modern history has more to show than the eighteenth.—*Nineteenth Century.*

(To be continued.)