

have no desire to see the establishment of a Third Empire. Still we cannot forget that Mr. Beesly himself tells us that France prefers "a personal to a parliamentary government," and that preference must be fatal to any government which is republican in fact as well as in name. We do not believe, moreover, that the peasantry have grown so enlightened in four years as to deliberately prefer the republic. If Napoleon IV. should land on the shores of France when he comes of age, we believe that the moneyed classes, the *bourgeoisie* and the peasantry would receive him with open arms. If they approve of the establishment of the republic just now it is only as a disagreeable but on the whole a necessary interregnum.

"Free Land," by Mr. H. R. Brand, M.P., deals with a question which is gradually coming to the front in England. The writer shows from premises supplied by the Lords' Committee that the present law of settlement is an insuperable obstacle to any attempt at land improvement. The remedy proposed by that committee of "giving power to the limited owner to act for some purposes as if he were the owner in fee" to this extent, that he may "spread the repayment of charges on the estate over a period equal to ten years more than his own expectation of life," Mr. Brand regards as inadequate. He suggests in lieu of it that land should be settled only upon a life in being and not upon unborn children of a living person.

"Mr. Mill's Three Essays on Religion" are reviewed by the editor with his usual vigour of thought and lucidity of expression. As however we have only a portion of the review in the current number we can hardly give Mr. Morley's views upon the book as a whole. The essay on "Nature" occupies his attention almost exclusively, the other two essays on the "Utility of Religion" and "Theism" being reserved for a future occasion. Mr. Mill's general propositions are stated in form, and, if we may venture to abridge the statement, they may be shortly expressed as follows:—That God cannot be all-powerful and at the same time purely benevolent, but is possibly, and, perhaps probably, limited in His powers; and that a belief in "certain supernatural potentialities" (including revelation and miracles) are proper objects of rational hope, though not capable of demonstration—a hope which may be a legitimate aid and an effective support to duty. Mr. Mill further allows that Christ, though not God, may have been what he supposed himself to be, "a man charged with a special, express and unique commission from God to lead mankind to truth and virtue;" also that it may be satisfying and useful to hope for a life beyond the grave. Now, as Mr. Morley clearly shows, these admissions open the door to the entire

Christian system. Mr. Mill abuses that system without stint, and yet ends by welcoming it by another door. If the "rational hope" which he approves, though incapable of demonstration, be salutary and praiseworthy in its indulgence, on what does it rest? If it has a foundation in the spiritual or emotional nature of man, what becomes of Mr. Mill's philosophy? If it be merely an amiable delusion why not call it by its right name, absurd though it would be to speak of a rational delusion? The problem of the origin of evil is solved in the Essay on Nature after a fashion. There are four ways in which that terrible enigma may be dealt with. The Deity may be endowed with omnipotence and beneficence, as Christians believe, though not exactly as their belief is stated by Le Maistre. Both attributes and conscious intelligence may be denied and the universe regarded as "thoroughly miserable"—as something "which had better not have been." That is the pessimism of Hartmann and Schopenhauer. Thirdly, omnipotence may be conceded with maleficence for beneficence. This is devil-worship. Or lastly, omnipotence may be denied and beneficence admitted in a qualified sense. This is Manichæism and also the belief of Mr. Mill. The first view does not untie the knot certainly, but the last three cut it in a way satisfactory to those who hold it. Mr. Morley is surprised that Mill should have left the door open to the orthodox by leaving hope to be transformed successively into belief, faith, assurance, and finally into knowledge. The inconsistency is evident, but it is in perfect keeping with the gradual development of Mr. Mill's views in other departments, and seems to indicate that the "mystic" portions of the book were the most recent expressions of his progress towards a spiritual creed. In the evolution theory Mr. Morley sees another enemy, and that the danger is that "the Nature of science" is merely stepping to the throne of "the Nature of theology," because both are sketched upon the Optimist plan. Mr. Pater's "Fragment on *Measure for Measure*" is a short but thoughtful view of Shakspeare's comedy from artistic and ethical stand-points. Mr. Stanton's review of Prof. Cairnes' latest work on Political Economy, is in the main eulogistic, although he differs with the author on the economic effects of trades-unions. The modifications made by the Professor in Mill's theory of wages and on other important points are approved by the writer without qualification.

The *Contemporary* has no *pièce de resistance* this month. The first paper is an instalment of Prof. Tyndall's experiments in the value of various methods of fog-signalling. These experiments were conducted at and off South Foreland, near Dover. The instruments used were two huge trumpets