

of which throw a side light on history in its ordinary accepted sense; but we must not allow our attention to be diverted by these contributions to the history of humanity, however important, from the specific meaning of history as having for its chief subject-matter man as a political being, as political, law-abiding, and as law-abiding, moral.

(1) History is not antiquarianism. Antiquarianism has something child-like about it in so far as it revels in the facts and little things of the past simply because of its interest in facts and things in and for themselves, though not necessarily always indifferent to their wider relations. There are such minds, and it is a good thing for the historian that they exist, just as it is a good thing for the biologist that there are investigators whose chief delight is in the accurate investigation of particular forms and who not only fail to rise to the science of their subject in its true sense as a rational and causal presentation of a correlated series of phenomena, but even satisfy their self-love by talking somewhat contemptuously of "theorists." This childlike attitude of mind in an adult, however, is of distinct value to science and also to history. To such minds in the historical department Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," if it were published to-day, would be a great opportunity; they would fill columns with their "learned" criticisms and exposures of errors. But Gibbon remains; while they pass into footnotes to be afterwards corrected by subsequent footnotes. We condone this seeming pettiness in consideration of its uses.

(2) History is the story of the long progress of humanity in time. Consequently the dating of events in accurate sequence and of the prominent actors round whom these events have chiefly gathered is essential. This,

however, is to be called chronology but not history.

(3) Further, since history is the long record of time, we must have record of events and of the acts of the men who specially influenced them in an accurate, *sequent* series. This we call historical annals. Annals may consist of bald, colorless statements, or they may be vivid and picturesque and contain an attempt to portray the actors. So far from such picturesque annals being less accurate presentations because of their dramatic character, they are in truth more accurate than bald annals because they are a more adequate presentation of human life; and human life is always dramatic. All depends on the objectivity and truth of mind of the writer. It is evident that annals well written are substantially narrations or stories, and are the vital basis of all history.

(4) History, however, in the strict sense (and I do not speak of the philosophy of history which is a distinct subject), contains both antiquities, chronology and annals so treated as to exhibit the causal relations of the series of events in their relation to the life of the community as a public ethical polity—a life of progress or of decay as it may be. To write history in this sense demands a combination of the highest powers, both intellectual, imaginative and ethical. By the very nature of the case such a treatment of events must be the most instructive and attractive of all studies, for what can transcend in importance the history of man to men? Humanity must always pre-eminently interest Man.

(5) The history of a nation is the history of a race; that is to say of a significant, if not specific, type of man working towards a social polity under certain conditions of physical environment. Since man lives by the earth and its products it follows that his re-