

though he puts in a plea for them, has little sympathy with the preaching of the early Calvinists, whose style was as bare as their temples; devoid of imagery, ornament, and every artistic element,—“sombre, hard, oft bitter.” The portraits of the great preachers of the Church are artistically drawn.

Mr. Mill's paper on “Lord Baltimore and Maryland Toleration,” is an attempt to belittle the character of the generous nobleman who gave his name to the commercial capital of Maryland. The views of Bancroft and most other authorities are nibbled at in a very unsatisfactory way. Liberty of conscience found a home in that State, at all events, under the auspices of a Roman Catholic nobleman, at a time when Massachusetts was persecuting Roger Williams and all who would not conform with the “elect.” Mr. Russell's “Capital Punishment in England” is, in fact, a history of the infliction of the extreme penalty from the Conquest until now. The portions relating to the Heresy Laws and the bloody penal code which was in force a hundred years ago, as well as the statement of the crimes committed during war and peace times respectively, are of great interest. The last shows that, in those days at any rate, war brutalized a man, and too often educated soldiers for murder and highway robbery when they returned home. Dr. Riggs's paper on “The Churchmanship of John Wesley” is evidently a reply to Mr. Llewellyn Davies, who argued the subject from a Churchman's point of view; the discussion is of long standing and not of vital importance. Mr. Macdonell's brief sketch of “The American Bench” is good so far as it goes; but it is rather too brief to be impressive. Chief Justice Marshall deservedly occupies the first place, with his successors, Taney and Chase, far in the background. A lawyer would like to have heard a little more of Story, Kent, Redfield, and Curtis. With Mr. Grant-Duff and his dogmatic utterances, most people have lost patience. With all his knowledge of Eastern affairs, he has no policy to suggest, except that we must be anti-anti-Turk and anti-anti-anti-Slave, patting both races on the back, uttering equivocal phrases, and doing no good to either.

The *Fortnightly* also has something to say on the Eastern question, its opening article being Mr. Rutson's on “Turkey in Europe.” It extends to over thirty pages, and therefore any attempt to give an abstract of it is out of the question, more especially as its treatment of the subject is historical. The tone of the paper may be gathered, however, in a few sentences. England has been the mainstay of the Christian populations, hitherto, against “the neglect, cruelty, and incompetence of Turkish ministers, and if she did her duty, she should be their protector now.” “All these opportunities have been missed; and the Christians left, and the initiation abandoned to Austria-

Hungary and Russia—powers biassed by the special interest each has in a particular mode of ‘manipulating’ the Christians, without influence with the Porte, and without the means England has of giving wise counsels as to the special difficulties of the Turkish Empire.” Mr. Hutchinson puts in a defence of vivisection with the singular title coming from one of his opinions—“On cruelty to animals.” The article is temperate in tone, but it will convince nobody not already convinced or desirous of satisfying his scientific conscience on the subject. Miss Octavia Hill's “Word on Good Citizenship” contains some valuable advice on beneficence. She determinedly opposes charity, in the vulgar sense of the term, and indicates many methods of benefiting one's fellow-creatures without degrading and pauperizing them.

The *Fortnightly* is unusually dull this month as a whole, and there is but one other paper which need be noticed here. Mr. Morley completes his essay on Robespierre, and it is not too much to say that the character he gives that actor in the terrible drama of the last century bears upon it a verisimilitude we shall hardly find elsewhere. It is not merely that the panorama which passes before us is artistically sketched and coloured; when the author of this paper draws, he is too graphic to be dull, too calm and judicial to be swayed by passion on one side or the other, too keen-sighted to make mistakes in the historical perspective. Anything more determinedly clear and searching than the analysis of Robespierre's character—his weakness, his inherent shallowness, his empty phrase-mongering, his essentially despicable spirit—will be looked for in vain. He was not the hero that the Extreme Left would make him, nor the demon of most modern historians. No thirst for blood possessed him; all he desired was domination. The law of Prairial was the most atrocious law, perhaps, ever enacted, and it was Robespierre's. But it was aimed not at the crazy old woman and poor seamstress who suffered, but at the more bloodthirsty opponents of himself. The real “Terror” is something awful to contemplate; but though the law was Robespierre's, the terrible execution of it must not be laid to his charge. He merely desired the destruction of his enemies, and he found that, notwithstanding the dreadful list to be guillotined, the men he desired to decapitate escaped. If he only could secure “an official Supreme Being and a regulated Terror!” The first was his, but he could not regulate what was too powerful for management. It is, therefore, altogether a mistake to load the memory of this weak, vain, unstable hero with all the sins of 1793-4, after his death in the latter year. The description of the Revolution of Ninth Thermidor is admirable in every respect; indeed the whole essay is most excellent, as well for its impartial tone, as for its literary power.