

but not in any other respect. With regard to the Iliad, he considers it divisible into two parts, the Achillean or Thessalian, and the Odyssean or Ionian. The latter portion, which he regards as the work of Homer, the author of the Odyssey, consists of ten books, viz.: Those from the second to the seventh inclusive, the ninth and tenth, and the twenty-third and twenty-fourth. The other books, except some Odyssean episodes, he regards as Achillean. The theory is worked out with considerable ability, and is decidedly to be preferred to the rhapsodist or Pisistratid notions. "The Beginning of the Co-operative Trouble," by G. J. Holyoake, the founder of English secularism, is in fact a short sketch of the life and aims of Robert Owen, well written, and of course thoroughly sympathetic. Prof. Max Müller has written of Sun-myths, and the paper on "Wind-myths," by Mr. Keary, is an examination of a cognate subject, based upon the Eddas chiefly. It forms a slight but interesting contribution to comparative mythology.

Mr. Pope Hennessy, who dropped out of Parliamentary life some years ago, makes a strenuous effort to persuade people, that "The Tories and the Catholics" ought to be the closest of allies. His historical facts are for the most part fairly stated, but they are posed occasionally in a peculiar manner. Much is made of the opposition of the Liberals, including Fox, Barré, and Thomas Townshend to Lord North's Canadian Bill of 1774—the statute which virtually established the Roman Catholic religion as a State Church in Lower Canada. The paper is worth reading, but it is not satisfactory by any means. Mr. Matthew Arnold has reached No. 6 of his "Review of Objections to 'Literature and Dogma.'" His immediate subject is the Fourth Gospel. He utterly repudiates the theory of Baur and the Tübingen school, which supposes this Gospel to be the work and for the most part the invention of a learned Greek, tainted with Gnosticism, and written at the end of the second century. The so-called "art of our Greek Gnostic," says Mr. Arnold, "is after all, not art of the highest character, because it does not manage to conceal itself. It allows the Tübingen critics to find it, and by finding it out to pull the whole of the Fourth Gospel to pieces, and to ruin utterly its historical character." He then proceeds to argue that the fancied divergence in fact and doctrine from the synoptics has no real foundation. His own view of the Gospel is very high, although his theory of its composition is hardly orthodox. He believes, as a cardinal principle, that Jesus was always "above his reporters," and that they never perfectly comprehended his teaching. At the same time, he thinks the discourses in St. John are suitable *logia* of the Saviour received directly from St. John, and pieced into the narrative, not always with discrimination and understanding, by a

Greek of considerable literary pretensions. The Duke of Argyll's paper on "Animal instinct, in its relation to the Mind of Man," is not a deep paper, yet, in many respects an interesting one. The opening pages give some curious instances of the working of instinct in which imitation could have had no part.

The name of M. Emile de Laveleye, is too well known to English readers to require any introduction. In the current *Fortnightly*, he appears as the author of an elaborate paper on "The European Situation." The key-note to the whole is to be found in a few words: "The vanquished think of recovering what they have lost. The victors cause jealousies. They know this; they fear it; and naturally they wish to anticipate possible alliances or to make themselves strong enough to be able to see them without apprehension. Hence follow strong temptations, and even apparent necessities, to resort to arms as a means of arriving at a more secure position." M. de Laveleye does not believe that Germany is dazzled by any dream of universal conquest, but he gives many reasons why she will be likely to anticipate attack. To some extent, we think he exaggerates the importance of Ultramontanism. He regards it as the moving cause of the Franco-German war, although, as has been well-remarked, Ultramontanism did not start a Hohenzollern as candidate for the Spanish throne; it did not drive Napoleon to a war undertaken to gain the confidence of the army, and to get rid of governmental complications. Sometimes he appears to think that the Falk Laws were not merely defensible, but inevitable, at others he thinks them impolitic. "I am then disposed to think," he says, "that the Prussian Government, in attempting by means of repressive laws to master the hostility of the priests, made a blunder, for I do not see how it is to come victorious out of the struggle." The conquest of Alsace, according to the writer, "is an inexorable cause of war between Germany and France. It is a duel to the death;" and elsewhere—"France does not at this moment wish for war."

It is contrary to the truth to accuse her of seeking to trouble Europe. But it is useless to deny that the day when she shall believe herself strong enough to recover Alsace, she will try." Turning to the probable attitude of the several powers in that contingency, he regards it as inevitable that Russia and Austria, with the Particularists of South Germany, would join hands with France, and that Italy would probably be neutral. M. de Laveleye ridicules the reproaches cast upon England because of her abstention from continental broils. Singularly enough, however, he imagines that England would unite with Germany, because she hates Ultramontanism, forgetting, as an English journal remarks, that she would never stir a finger to aid a power too strong already, that she could secure the independence of Italy,