

violence of the military party he probably exerts a steady influence on the mind of the Czar, and he meets in Lord Granville a negotiator much of the same temperament as himself. A huge sacrifice has already been offered to Moloch in the expenditure on preparations, the diversion of industry to barren waste and the disturbance of commerce. Let us hope that the fell deity will yet forego a sacrifice of blood.

PASSIONATE love and fanatical hatred of Mr. Gladstone are forces each in its way almost unique in the history of English politics, and the influence of both is mischievous. There are some people who so worship the Premier as to be totally blind to the failure of his Irish policy and to the consequences of his irresolution in the Soudan, while they devoutly accept his Franchise Bill without stopping for a moment to consider whether he has exercised proper forecast or not. There are others who so fiercely detest him as to forget not only the respect due to his high qualities and great achievements, but their own duties as citizens, and to care little what mischief they do their country so long as they can damage him at the same time. Among the fanatical haters are the members of the Chelsea set, three in number while Carlyle lived, but reduced by his death to two: Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Froude, between whom, as they are always themselves apprising us, is now shared all that survives of veracity, integrity, wisdom and, above all, of manhood, in Great Britain. There never was a time when a loyal Englishman would have been more careful not to traduce his country or its Government than the present, and there are rather special reasons for self-restraint in the case of one who speaks to the people of the United States. But Mr. Froude, who is now in the States, not only pours into the bosom of an American reporter his antipathy to the British Prime Minister, but does his best to turn American opinion against the cause which the British Prime Minister is upholding. The territorial greediness of England he represents as being the root of the trouble. It is rather curious that this arraignment should come from one who went as Lord Carnarvon's envoy to propagate imperialism in South Africa. Has not Russia been annexing territory as well as England, and territory at least as much beyond what she needs for present occupation, or for any useful purpose? Charges of general acquisitiveness, and recriminations connected with them, are totally irrelevant to the present issue. England neither wants to take anything herself nor cares to withhold anything from Russia on the mere ground of opposition to territorial extension. But Russia wants to force open the gates of British India; and more than this, the military party in Turkestan and at St. Petersburg are bent upon picking a quarrel and bringing on war.

### THE RISE OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

THAT the periodical is to-day the chief medium of the intellectual life of the many is a statement few will feel inclined to gainsay. Its potency in the moulding of opinion is pre-eminent, and its influence in the advancement of culture ubiquitous. The daily press is undoubtedly powerful, and to belittle its agency were the part neither of knowledge nor intelligence; but the function of the Press, apart from the presentation of news, is commentative rather than didactic, and its sphere circumscribed as well by necessary haste and brevity in the preparation of matter as by the circumstances of perusal. The tendency, which of late has become prominent amongst newspapers, to trench upon the domain of the magazine, seems to be one not to be approved. When the daily journal has reached a much higher degree of excellence in its news and editorial columns, enlargement of scope and discursiveness may be advisable, but at present concentration of energy and resources is what is called for.

The following figures are culled from Mr. H. R. Tedder's article on "Periodicals" in the recently-issued volume of the eighth edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," which, pretending only to give the statics of this interesting subject, yet enables us to discern not a little of the dynamics, illustrated in the struggle for existence and specialization of function.

The first periodical in the English language, Mr. Tedder says, was the *Mercurius Librarius*, its scope being indicated by the sub-title, a "Faithful Account of all Books and Pamphlets"—pamphlets, as we all know, occupying a very much more important position in those days than now. This appeared in 1681 and had but a brief existence. It was followed (1699-1712) by the *History of the Works of the Learned*, a publication of greater merit and influence, but consisting for the greater part of descriptions of foreign books. The first periodical of contents entirely original was the *Memoirs of Literature*, doomed to early death, and running but for four years. Indeed we cannot fail to note that nearly all of the progenitors of the periodical belonged to the ephemeridæ; and even to-day

the temerarious journal that attempts colonization must start equipped not only with large material support but with an enormous reserve of natural robustness, else will the public indifference and mistrust, born of experience, together with the famine and the ague of hostile environment, eat them up.

It was not until 1749 that we find the title of "Review" employed in the *Monthly Review*, a periodical, too, which was more nearly the prototype of the contemporary magazine in character and subject-matter, comprehending, as it did, science, literature and criticism. The lead of the *Monthly* was shortly followed by numerous other efforts in the same direction, and we soon find the *Critical Review*, to which Johnson, Smollett and Robertson contributed; the *Literary Magazine* (1756-58); the *London Review* (1775-80), and the *British Critic* (1793-1843). As, however, these and others like them showed a marked disposition (which now is indicated in diathesis at least) to subserve special interests and support bias, in short, to become merely the "organ" of the publishers controlling them, two abortive but laudable efforts were made to stop the demoralization—the one by Adam Smith, Blair and others; the other in 1773 by the issue for three years of the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*, under the conduct of Gilbert Stuart and William Smellie. These were the precursors of the famous Quarterlies, which, while they have attained a hitherto unknown degree of scholarship and literary ability, are yet chiefly run in the interest of some party of Church or State, or in advocacy of some particular scientific or philosophical tenet. It is obvious, too, that this very bias is, if not carried too far, a very excellent principle, inasmuch as it encourages controversial writing and the ablest presentation of both sides of a question, though possibly the arguments presented (which seems to be an inherent peculiarity of arguments in general) succeed only in making the already convinced doubly sure, or in proselytizing those whose minds are not confirmed either way. He would be purblind indeed who saw but the immediate ills of strong partisanship, disregarding its instrumentality in the eradication of error. Bigotry and prejudice, even, are not without their uses, serving, if for nothing else, as flint-stones upon which to strike light with the steel of progress. For these reasons, if there were no others, the journal with a "policy" and the periodical with a prescribed trend of propagandism or advocacy is not to be decried. Put this aside. The *Edinburgh*, a natural outgrowth of the time, was started in 1802 under the editorial management of Sydney Smith, with Jeffrey, Scott, Horner and Brougham as coadjutors, and seven years later, at the instigation of Scott, John Murray established the *Quarterly Review*. The *Westminster* was not established till 1824. In 1884 there were one hundred and twenty-nine Quarterlies. No account of the progress of periodical publications, however brief, can afford to omit mention of those originated by Steele's *Tatler* in 1709. The impetus given by this and the *Spectator* and *Guardian* to this popular, yet refined and delightful literature, resulted, according to rough estimate, in the birth of one hundred and six such papers up to the period of the *Rambler* (1750-1752). Everyone knows that we are indebted to this style of production for some of the most admired of English classics, and a host of great names, which there is neither occasion nor space to reproduce here, is appended, as contributors to such journals as the *Adventurer* (1752-54); *World* (1753-56); *Connoisseur* (1754-56); *Idler* (1758-60); *Lounger* (1785-87).

It is interesting to note the recent origin of England's four great monthlies of serious character, viz.: the *Fortnightly* (1865), the *Contemporary* (1866), the *Nineteenth Century* (1877), and the *National* (1883). The popular literary magazines are too numerous for mention. Mr. Tedder gives, on the authority of *May's British and Irish Press Guide*, 1,041 as the whole number of periodicals for 1884, "including every description of periodical with the exception of annuals and newspapers"—these for the United Kingdom—while in British North America the number is 652.

Passing to the United States we observe a high death-rate, but a still greater fertility, resulting (according to G. P. Rowell and Company's *American Newspaper Record* for 1883) in a total of 1,827, excluding weeklies and those publications of more frequent issue. Beginning with Franklin's *General Magazine*, which lived for six months in 1741, the record is for many years one of failure, and the list of interest solely to the antiquarian. It is not until 1803, in the establishment of the *Monthly Anthology*, that we discover anything of permanent interest. This was the immediate ancestor of the *North American Review*. At first conducted by the North American Club, the ownership of this Review passed into the hands of Alexander Everett in 1829. At one time threatened with a rivalry by the *Princeton Review* and *International*, the former dominated by theological influence, and the latter in its last gasp at least managed with conspicuous inability, the *North American* now occupies this field quite alone, not without dignity and influence. It is difficult to detect a trend in its management, so impartial does it appear, giving free discussion