

The death of a great man is sure to be followed by republications of his works. Besides various lives of the Earl of Beaconsfield, two volumes of collections have been published, viz., a rather poorly made selection from his Wit and Wisdom, and a more judicious one from his Speeches. The following which is one of the best characterizations that we have seen of Disraeli, as an orator, comes from an *Athenæum* review of the latter work. "It is admitted that he had many of the qualities of a great public speaker; that he had an admirable voice and an excellent method; that his sequences were logical and natural, his arguments vigorous and persuasive; that he was a master of style, and that in the course of a single speech he could be eloquent and vivacious, ornate and familiar, passionate and cynical, deliberately rhetorical and magnificently fantastic in turn; that he was master of all oratorical modes—of irony and argument, of stately declamation and brilliant and unexpected antithesis, of caricature and statement and rejoinder alike; that he could explain, denounce, retort, retract, advance, defy, dispute with equal readiness and equal skill; that he was unrivalled in attack and unsurpassed in defence; and that in personal debate, and on occasions when he felt himself justified in putting forth all his powers and in striking in with the full weight of his peculiar and unique personality, he was the most dangerous antagonist of his time. And withal it is admitted that he was lacking in a certain quality of temperament, the attribute that great orators possess in common with great actors; the power, that is to say, of imposing oneself upon an audience, not by argument nor by eloquence; not by the perfect utterance of beautiful and commanding speech nor by the enunciation of eternal principles or sympathetic or moving appeals; but by, so to speak, an effect of personal magnetism—by the expression, through voice and gesture and presence, of an irresistible individuality. This deficiency it was that made him so much less effective as a speaker on the hustings than in the House, so much less brilliant in utterances *urbi et orbi* than in argument and debate, so much less conspicuous as a popular leader than as a parliamentary gladiator. He could slaughter an opponent, or butcher a measure, or crumple up a theory with unrivalled adroitness and despatch; but he could not dominate a crowd to the extent of persuading it to feel with his heart, think with his brain, and accept his utterances as the expression, not only of their common reason, but of their collective sentiment as well."

In a volume of Studies on English History by Messrs. J. Gairdner and Spedding, the former traces the history of the development of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. In the sense in which Mr. Gairdner expounds the doctrine as asserting "that the descent of the crown cannot lawfully be set aside, and that the heir to the throne has an indefeasible right to the succession," he shows that the theory was not recognized in the sixteenth century; for the numerous acts which regulated and altered the succession under the Tudors were so many denials of the principle. In a wider sense the doctrine is one of the primitive beliefs of mankind, attested by the unction (*pace* Prof. Stubbs), which was one of its ceremonies at coronation from early Jewish times. In the middle ages, however, the only sovereigns below the imperial rank who were entitled to unction were the kings of England, France, Jerusalem and Sicily. In this wider sense again it is constantly brought forward in Shakespeare's plays and was the subject of Dante's celebrated tract, "De Monarchia." To return to Mr. Gairdner, the succession of James I was universally accepted, on the ground of his "divine right" to succeed, and the preference of the Scotch line over all the claimants mentioned in Father Parsons's 'Conference on the Succession to the Crown of England' at once illustrated and established the principle. It was clear that James did not succeed by law, for the law of England was against him; nor by election, for he was recognized before he entered England. By what right, then, did he succeed, if not by the "divine right" of hereditary succession? Mr. Gairdner proceeds to show how the doc-