

democracy a new phase and type, and the curiously interesting personality of Theramenes; one of the statesmen who were responsible for the capitulation of Athens to Sparta, and the establishment of aristocratic government, but who very speedily quarreled with that government and was put to death by it.

Theramenes did not die, so far as most historians are concerned, in the odour of sanctity. He left behind him, not merely with the Athenian people, but with most of their historians, the disrepute implied in his nickname, "the turn-coat." He bears in their eyes the character of the mere trickster, false to all parties, and by all detested; the enemy of democracy first, and then the enemy of oligarchy.

But as whitewashing is an ingenious and diverting fashion and as in Theramenes' case the great name of Aristotle can be quoted in defence of a coat of whitewash—for Aristotle has recorded his very great respect for Theramenes, it may be pardonable to attempt a little whitewashing, or at least to tint him with a somewhat lighter colour. Naturally, therefore, the occasion has produced the man. There has lately appeared a critic who believes he sees two points in Theramenes' soul unseized by the Germans yet, which view he prints. In default of this book itself (which has not yet reached this country), it is permissible to guess at its contents. To speak seriously, that Theramenes was guilty of treachery and of collusion with Sparta, there can be little doubt, and so far his sentence of condemnation calls for no revision. But this was, after all, a common offence in his days, when party spirit ran so high, and when also a glowing admiration of the Spartan system affected so strongly most of the best and highest minds in Athens. The point, therefore, rather is, was his treachery purely selfish and personal, or was it to his mind palliated by unselfish devotion to political ideals, ideals which he sincerely believed to be necessary, and which could not otherwise be realized?

Now Theramenes died when bravely and eloquently resisting the policy of the extreme party of reaction—the extreme right, as they would be called in French party nomenclature—viz., Critias and the ultra-aristocrats. Why did he quarrel with these friends—especially after alienating the opposite party, the democratic, and leaving himself no allies? Aristophanes, who expresses current opinion, calls him an ingenious casuist, fond of drawing subtle distinctions which no one else could comprehend, and which he only advanced for his own interests; in short, to use a much abused but conveniently brief epithet—a Jesuit. Now this fondness for subtle distinctions need not be doubted, but to suppose him selfish and insincere in drawing them, is very inconsistent with the closing scene of his life. Theramenes faced death recklessly and died defiant rather than forego his ideal of moderation; of a government neatly balanced between the extremes of democracy and oligarchy; to describe him as an Athenian Jesuit—as a dishonest schemer after the style of Lord Bolingbroke, because his thoughts ran in channels too subtle for the mass of his fellow-countrymen—is political bludgoning, not political judgment. There were a generation ago, there probably are here and there, amiable conservatives, chiefly elderly ladies, who sincerely believe Mr. Gladstone to be a Jesuit and an emissary of the Vatican, because his mind also is fertile in subtle distinctions.

The natural inference from Theramenes' devotion even to death in defence of a strictly moderate government is very different from this; the natural inference is that Theramenes, also, like Pericles, was an idealist, but of a different school of thought; of a philosophic rather than a philanthropic school; an idealist whose fervour was scientific, rather than moral; whose ideal was moderation and compromise, rather than Reform and Utopia; who was, in fact, the very incarnation of Greek spirit of reason. Theramenes may thus be regarded as holding in Athenian politics the place which in English politics has been held by the school of "Academic Liberals" as they are called; statesmen, that is, who are liberal in their practical benevolence and desire to ameliorate the condition of the masses, but conservative in their distrust of democracy and of an extended franchise; statesmen who prefer to do work rather for than through the people.

The history of this small body—for of necessity its many-sided sympathies and carefully balanced judgment has made it a very small body—has not been without honour either in England or in France. Its "animated modera-

tion" spoke through the lips of Vergniaud and the Gironde in the French Revolution and through the lips of the scholar statesman, Sir George Lewis, in the England of our fathers; it speaks in the England of to-day, or at least spoke yesterday, by the mouths of Lord Sherbrooke and Mr. Goschen. Nay, more, in so far as this party stands between the older parties, attempting to reconcile them and to combine what is best in each, and in so far as its distinctive "note" is high attainments, and a scholarly mind, it may be said to have kinsmen on this side of the Atlantic—in the so-called "mug-wumps" across the line.

The independent statesman, said the witty Lord Melbourne, is the statesman not to be depended upon, and this is what both parties in Athens said of Theramenes, the Athenian independent. But the utmost that is ever said in sober earnestness against honest independence is that those who practice it are too impractical and impracticable for a world so coarse and ill-jointed in its machinery as the present; a world in which the coach of state, the roads being what they are, cannot be expected to run smoothly, but must be content to run, if it is to run at all, with continual lurchings from one side of the road to the other, and not unfrequent upsets first into the one ditch and then into the other; on which account the strength of the springs becomes of far more importance than their delicate adjustment and scientific balance. In short, the worst that can seriously be said of academic statesmen like Theramenes—granting their personal sincerity—is what Goldsmith said so wittily of a modern Theramenes, who had all the classical Theramenes' virtues, without his equivocal record, and the doubts and blots which sully his fame. Of Burke, Goldsmith wrote:

"Who too deep for his hearers, still went on refining,
And thought of convincing when they thought of dining,
The equal to all things, for all things unfit,
Too nice for a statesman, too proud for a wit,
For a patriot too cool, for a drudge disobedient,
And too fond of the right to pursue the expedient,
In short, 'twas his fate, unemployed or in place, sir,
To eat mutton cold, and cut blocks with a razor."

(To be Continued.)

* * *

Lullaby.

Soft and low sing the Dream-God's song,
Hush, my wearie sweet dearie, hush
As Sleep's smooth river we drift along,
Hush, my wearie sweet dearie!
A perfumed breeze from the rose-banked shore
Justs cools our heads, while the idle oar
Floats on the water, and all before
Is restful for you my dearie.

Now, see the shadows the sunset casts,
Hush, my wearie sweet dearie, hush!
As its last gleam gildeth our tap'ring masts,
Hush, my wearie sweet dearie;
On to the ivory gates we glide,
Where the God of Dreams doth our barque abide,
There we shall rest where no storms betide,
Peacefully rest, my dearie.

S. JOHN DUNCAN-CLARK.

* * *

Silver and Gold.

I NEED not say very much in answer to Mr. Harkness paper of 5th inst.

I certainly thought that he held the decline in the value of silver partially responsible for the fall in prices. But for this that part of my article on silver which dealt with this point would not have been written. (THE WEEK, 3rd April. "It is not necessary . . . very little support to this theory.") Apart from that, I do not think my argument is affected.

I need not add anything to what I said as to the quotation from Mill. As given, it certainly entirely misrepresented, not the particular sections from which it was culled, but Mill's views on the question, taken as a whole. I would ask anyone who takes any interest in the question to refer first to what Mr. Harkness said on 24th April, and then to Mill's "Political Economy," Book III., Chapters 8, 9, 11, 12.