

confirm and extend the strong influence Russia had always exercised in Poland. Frederic II. of Prussia, from a desire for peace, after the Seven Years' War, allied himself with Catherine; Maria Theresa looked with no particular affection upon either of them. The Partition in fact arose from no particular lust of territory on the part of any of the powers; it was a gross crime against Poland, but not a deliberate scheme until it became a necessity to avoid a general war. This danger arose from the conquest of Turkish provinces by Russia after a war commenced by the Sultan; Austria refused to permit Russia to annex these provinces, and Frederic, longing for peace, but as much opposed to the partition of Poland as Maria Theresa when she called it "a sinful negotiation," entered into the scheme to avoid a European war. Thus his statement in "Memoirs since 1763," long doubted by historians, has proved to be true beyond question. This, of course, is no adequate excuse for the nefarious transaction. Prof. Cairnes contributes a vigorous attack on Froude's "English in Ireland." Mr. Lecky had already dealt that unvarnished historian some severe blows, principally regarding questions of fact. Prof. Cairnes deals chiefly with principles. We are sure every unprejudiced reader who has read the so-called "History" will agree with Mr. Cairnes when he says "that a more essentially unfair, ungenerous and mischievous book it has rarely been my fortune to read." The principles are odious, the facts distorted or selected, according to the Froudian system, to suit a theory; and history becomes a romance and a delusion. "Imaginary Geometry and the Truth of Axioms" is a chapter from the forthcoming volume of Mr. G. H. Lewes' *Problems of Life and Mind*. It is a defence of Euclid's Axioms against the attacks of Helmholtz and others. Mr. Algernon Swinburne has a characteristic lyric entitled "The Year of the Rose." It is certainly vigorous in conception, and musical also in rhythm and rhyme, although it has some peculiarities in the latter respects.

Mr. E. A. Freeman's paper on "Federalism and Home Rule" is written with the historian's usual clearness and distinctness of his historical vision. It is a calm and judicial view of the question, such we should be entitled to expect from the writer. He believes Mr. Butt's scheme to be impracticable and explains why he thinks so. His principal proposition is that the plea of Federalism raised on behalf of Home Rule is fallacious. This is done by examining the Federal principle historically. The deduction is thus made that Federation has never been "a proposal to put a laxer tie instead of a closer one, but to put a closer tie instead of a laxer one or no tie at all." This is, of course, the reverse of the process intended by the Home Rulers. The perti-

nent question is then put, If Mr. Butt intends that there should be local Parliaments also for England and Scotland. He protests that Irish members at Westminster will not vote on purely local questions regarding England and Scotland? But who is to judge what are local and what are Imperial questions? And are the Irish members to walk out of the House when the former are discussed, or to be turned out by the Sergeant-at-Arms? Mr. Freeman considers "that total separation would be a less evil than such a scheme of Federation, or whatever it is to be called, which is now proposed."

M. Henri Rochefort contributes a French article—something of a novelty in English magazines. It is a review of "Recollections of the Revolution of 4th September, (1870)," by M. Jules Simon, Minister of Public Instruction under Trochu and Thiers. Rochefort recommends a new volume entitled—"Oublis"—what M. Simon has forgotten, and then proceeds into one of those slashing and reckless displays of attack and defence to which the readers of *La Marseillaise* and *La Lanterne* used to be regaled with. There is no denying the writer a sort of glittering ability—but the jewels are paste instead of diamonds. He hits off a character in a sentence:—McMahon is "the type of ignorance and imbecility;" Dufour is "the plague of all governments he has assisted;" Thiers is M. Simon's "Pythoness;" and Gen. Trochu is "that political and military comedian by the name of Trochu." His heroes are Gambetta, Raspail, Felix Pyat and Delescluse. For a man who is physically a coward, and who ran away at the first sound of danger, it was certainly rather impudent to speak of Delescluse as one who died bravely on his barricade.

In contrast with this wild Parisian rhetoric, is the calm, lucid, and well-reasoned paper of Mr. John Morley. It is the concluding chapter of an essay "On Compromise," to which we have already referred. Its main text, as we stated on a former occasion, is this:—"That men should refuse to sacrifice their opinions or ways of living (in the self-regarding sphere) out of regard to the *status quo*, or the prejudices of others; and this, as a matter of course, excludes the right of forcing or wishing any one else to make such a sacrifice for us." The present chapter considers the final question—what are "the limitations which are set by the conditions of society to the duty of trying to realize our principles in action." The essay will, in all probability, be published in a separate form, and we may then have an opportunity of reviewing it at greater length and under more favourable circumstances. The *Fortnightly* concludes with the initial chapters of a story by George Meredith, entitled "Beauchamp's Career," which promises well.