Pages Missing

VOL. II No. 2

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1894

PUBLISHED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY
THE NEWS PUBLISHING HOUSE
KINGSTON, CANADA

SINGLE COPIES, 30c. PER ANNUM, $1.00

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY,

PUBLISHED JULY, OCTOBER, JANUARY AND APRIL,

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF ALUMNI AND FRIENDS OF QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON, CANADA.

All business communications should be addressed to the Sec.-Treas.,

T. J. THOMPSON,
BOX A,
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY,
KINGSTON, CANADA

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. II. OCTOBER, 1894. NO. 2.

All articles intended for publication, books for review, exchanges,—and all correspondence relating thereto—should be addressed to the editors, Box A, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.

EARLY HISTORY OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN KINGSTON AND VICINITY.

IT was in 1783 that Kingston was first settled by those who speak the English tongue. That was twenty years after Canada was confirmed by treaty to Great Britain, and nearly ten years before Upper Canada became a separate colony. It is said that the first child of British parentage was born here in 1783. The name of the child was Clark and there are descendants of his existing here still.

It seems strange at first sight that for more than thirty years after the beginning of British settlement here, the traces of Presbyterians, so far as public records go, are so meagre. That there were Presbyterians among the U. E. Loyalists who settled in Kingston and the district, there is no doubt, but for a generation there was no organization as a Church. Very early the Anglicans entered the field, their way being made smooth by Government patronage. The first rector, Dr. Stuart, was not dependent on his hearers for support, and this has often been the case with his successors. Strangely enough, he as well as the first prelate in Upper Canada, were brought up in the Presbyterian faith. The father of Dr. Stuart was a sturdy Irish Presbyterian, and as is well known, Bishop Strachan was of similar origin. Before the end of last century the Methodists were here in two distinct bodies, British and American. More than twenty years of the present century passed away, as we shall see, ere a Presby-

terian congregation was organized and a minister settled over it.

It is not generally known that the Rev. John Bethune who afterwards was twenty-eight years minister of Williamstown, in Glengarry, was here in the winter of 1783-4. The regiment of which he was chaplain, the 84th Highland Emigrant, was quartered on Carleton Island, and some of the men were in Fort Frontenac. The minutes of St. George's Vestry testify that Mr. Bethune visited the Fort at the time and officiated at a marriage there, thus performing the first recorded act of the Protestant ministry in Kingston. The Presbyterians may thus trace their genealogy to the very beginning of British life here. Mr. Bethune was no ordinary man. In the early part of the Revolutionary War he had been chaplain to the troops in the Carolinas, had been taken prisoner, and lost all that he had. Then when the 84th was enrolled in Nova Scotia he became chaplain of it until its disbandment in 1784. Next he is heard of as residing near Oswegatchy. In 1786 he founded St. Gabriel Church in Montreal, the oldest congregation of our faith in that city. Next year he moved to Williamstown where he spent the rest of his life, a period of twenty eight years. Here among the Highland settlers Mr. Bethune built up and consolidated Presbyterianism so that in few parts of Canada is it comparatively stronger. His influence was felt for good in a wide region. He died in 1815.

The next minister that was settled in Eastern Canada, but west of where Mr. Bethune lived and laboured, was the Rev. John Ludwig Broeffle of the Reformed Dutch Church of the United States. There is a fine testimony on record as to the faithfulness of this minister in circumstances that were very trying. Like others in pioneer days he had to endure great labour to bring consolations of the Gospel to those that were in scattered settlements over a wide region, and in addition he was very poorly supported. It is said that his means never exceeded one hundred dollars per annum. He died in 1815, the year in which Mr. Bethune died.

It was in 1798 that the Dutch Classes of Albany commissioned the Rev. Robert M'Dowall and sent him into the infant colony. When he had laboured on this side of the St. Lawrence for a time he was pressed to make Elizabethtown, now Brockville,

his headquarters, but in 1800 he agreed to make Fredericksburg, Ernestown and Adolphustown his special charge, while for many years he exercised a general oversight from Brockville to Toronto. To us in Kingston Mr. M'Dowall, during the first generation of British life, is far more than any other in tracing out the foundations of Presbyterianism and in rearing the first few courses of the building that was slowly but solidly erected. During many years of the early period of his ministry in Canada he was the only one of the Presbyterian Church in the neighbourhood. His ability and zeal are so well known that he needs no eulogist. Earnestly and anxiously he watched by the cradle of our faith here, giving such service as he could, seeing that his diocese was so extensive. The record that he kept of Marriages and Baptisms is in the College here and is a mine of information to the descendants of the first settlers on the Bay of Quinte. There is a Kingston list of baptisms, such names as Graham, Forsyth, and Horning being among them. It is to be feared that some of his successors have not been so accurate and methodical in keeping their records. It may go without saying that his toils were enormous as he went from place to place, generally on foot, sometimes it may be in a canoe. The lake shore furnished a well beaten track, and fortunately there were no rivers of any great dimensions to swim across. There was opposition to encounter, but he was not easily daunted. One of the old inhabitants up the Bay tells that on one occasion when leaving Kingston, a gang of young bloods planned to give the Presbyterian preacher a scare that would prevent the dissenter, as they called him, from further disturbing the peace of the ecclesiastical aristocracy here. They followed him out of the village some distance apparently for the purpose of giving him a physical shaking up. He did not wait for the attack of his would-be assailants however, but turning suddenly upon them he gave them such a payment in their own coin that he got no more annoyance from that quarter; and as he could not be bullied into silence, neither could he be bribed to abandon the Church of his convictions. He saw others doing that, he, however, was made of sterner stuff.

For the first quarter of a century of the life of Upper Canada as a separate colony, the Reformed Dutch Church of the States

was almost the only one that cared for the spiritual interests of our people here. The brethren that directed the missionary energies of that Church deserve to be held in grateful remembrance by the Presbyterian Church in Canada of the present day. It was a timely as well as precious service that was rendered until the Churches of the mother land awakened to some sense of what they ought to do. Many Missionaries were sent over for a time, but most of them returned after a season. It remained for Mr. M'Dowall to cast in his lot permanently here and to give a ministry of over forty years to the region of which Fredericksburg was the centre.

In 1811 the Rev. Wm. Smart came and settled in Brockville, and in 1817 the Rev. Wm. Bell came to Perth. Both of these were Scotch, but both had lived in London for a time and had become acquainted there. Indeed the former had got his professional training in London. Both came out under the auspices of the Secession Church of Scotland. They proved themselves to be the right kind of men for the work that was to be done here, and they left their mark behind them in Eastern Canada. Mr. Bell was the father of the Rev. George Bell, LL.D., of Kingston.

The year after Mr. Bell's arrival the Presbytery of the Canadas was formed. Of this Presbytery Messrs Smart, Bell and others that were settled between here and Montreal were members.

In 1820 the Rev. Robert Boyd came from Ireland, and settled in Prescott where and in the surrounding region he laboured for the rest of his life. He had a long, laborious and useful ministry. He was known at a later date as the Rev. Dr. Boyd.

With these notices of the origin and progress of our Church in the region around, we go on to trace the steps, so far as known, that were taken in Kingston itself. And first of all what may be said of the people that were here a century ago? Where did they come from? of what race were they? for the answer to such questions suggests somewhat as to Church connection. The Army and Navy were represented here from the very first. Obviously there would be changes from time to time, and it was inevitable that soldiers and sailors of the Presbyterian faith would be stationed here. It may have been that regiments or parts of regiments that are distinctively Scotch in character were

sent here. It is a matter of fact that some of that complexion were in Kingston, years before the first St. Andrew's Church was built. Then there were the U. E. Loyalists that were among the first colonists, if they were not exclusively the first, in the village and neighborhood. Some of these were British and some Dutch in origin, and it is certain that there were Presbyterians among them. In the early Masonic records that run back, without a break into the last century, there were men high in office, of such names as M'Kay and M'Leod, and these are most suggestive. As we have seen, from the very beginning of this century onward, Mr. McDowall was at hand to keep the fire of our faith burning, or at the very least to prevent it from being quenched until more favourable days would dawn. Lastly, when the stream of immigration set in, there came Scotch and North of Ireland people, the latter known in recent times as Scotch-Irish, and in these were found material for the enlargement of the Presbyterian Church. We know how passionate the attachment of the Scotch and Scotch-Irish was and is to the faith and simple practices which they believe to be Scriptural, founded on or agreeable to the word of God, and also that they were and are ever ready to make sacrifices to obtain for their children, a good common school education. In some cases they waited for years, sometimes patiently and sometimes not very patiently, for ministers to come across the ocean and break the bread of life to them. In the earlier years of their settlement here, with what pathos they sang the lines:—

"My soul is poured out in me,
When this I think upon,
Because that with the multitude,
I heretofore had gone.
With them unto God's house I went,
With voice of joy and praise,
Yea, with the multitude that kept
The solemn holy days."

Then when better times came, when the services they loved and enjoyed became frequent, their voices broke forth into gladsome strains in such lines as:—

"I joyed when to the house of God,
Go up they said to me."

or

"We'll go into his tabernacles,
And at his footstool bow."

Among the scholars of the school that Mr. Strachan taught at the very beginning of the century were two Hamiltons, uncles of Clarke Hamilton, collector of the port. It was in 1810 that Lieutenant-Col. MacPherson came here with his regiment and he remained here for the rest of his life, having retired from service some years after. He became one of the first elders in St. Andrew's Church. His daughter-in-law and grand-daughters reside now on Princess Street and still keep up the succession in that congregation. In 1816 John Mowat, the father of Sir Oliver and Professor Mowat, came to Kingston and while he lived, well nigh half a century, was a tower of strength to the Presbyterian cause here. In the *Kingston Gazette* of March 10th in the same year the following announcement may be read in the advertising columns :—The Rev. W. Smart will deliver a discourse in the English Church to-morrow, at two o'clock, on the following subject : "The Gospel of Christ adapted to the nature and circumstances of Man." One is tempted to ask whether the Presbyterian ancestry of Archdeacon Stuart had anything to do with the granting of the use of the Church on that Sabbath afternoon, to Mr. Smart and the adherents of the Presbyterian faith in Kingston.

The next year, 1817, is a red letter day in the annals of our Church in Kingston. The present strength and future prospects of the Presbyterians have become so encouraging that a site for a Church is now obtained. That was a step forward of a most important kind. As I pen this article, a copy of the original Crown Land Grant lies before me. In it is described the property conveyed for church purposes. It is bounded on one side by Store street (now Princess), on another by Grove street (now Queen), and on a third by a street running north but not yet named (now Clergy). The names of the grantees are as follows: Smith Bartlett, merchant ; Solomon Johns, merchant ; Archibald Richmond, merchant ; Allan McPherson, merchant ; Samuel Shaw, merchant ; Alexander Pringle, Esquire ; John McLean, Esquire ; Daniel Washburn, Esquire ; Benjamin Olcott, yeoman.

In the designations given to these men are seen the social distinctions of three quarters of a century ago. Comment on that

is needless, however. There is another line of cleavage which has graver consequences as the years go on. As I read these names for the first time it seemed to me that four of these, the first two and the last two, were of United States origin, in other words of the U. E. Loyalist stock; while the remaining five were Scotchmen by birth. Further investigation leaves me in no doubt whatever as to the correctness of that first impression. From the time that St. Andrew's had a settled pastor the names of the "Yankees" do not appear in it, but some are found in connection with another cause in Kingston, of which more hereafter. I infer that all four went into that cause. The five Scotchmen we will meet again, they are to the "fore" and no mistake in the conduct of congregational affairs. From conversations which I had with the older people I learn that all of the grantees were well known men in those days. The children of Allan McPherson are in the city still. A son was long Emigration Commissioner here. John McLean was better known at a later date as Sheriff McLean. Marshall T. Bidwell served his time with a lawyer named Washburn, possibly the same as one of the grantees. Benjamin Olcott was known as a hotel keeper on Princess street.

It was in that year that the Presbytery of Edinburgh were requested to be Patrons of the congregation which was in process of formation, and an application was made to have a minister appointed at once. The venerable brethren of "Auld Reekie" took time to consider before a minister was sent. Things are done more slowly in the old land than in a new country.

In Gourlay's Statistical Account of Canada as bearing on the same date we learn somewhat of the extent of Kingston and some other particulars. "There were then in the town, apart from the township, 450 houses and 2250 souls. There were four churches or meeting houses, one Episcopalian, one Roman Catholic, and two Methodist. There were four professional preachers, one Episcopalian, one Presbyterian, and two Methodists. This did not include the chaplains of the army and navy." We believe Mr. Gourlay was in error when he set down that there was a Presbyterian minister here in 1817; there was none resident until 1822.

In the fall of the same year Mr. Bell, lately settled at Perth, made a visit to Kingston. We would like to quote a most life-

like description which in his published letters he gives of his journey hither, especially that part from Gananoque, but space forbids us. We let him speak for himself when he arrives here, which he did on a Friday night. "On the following day which was Saturday I waited on a few friends of religion, but was sorry to find that they were very far from being united in their sentiments. . . . . On the Sabbath I preached twice in the Lancasterian School House to a numerous and attentive congregation. On Monday, at the request of some of the friends of religion, I visited them at their own houses, and found some very agreeable company. At that time there were in Kingston an Episcopalian Church, a Roman Catholic Chapel, and a Methodist meeting house. The Presbyterian Churches were not then built, though one of them had been proposed."

Mrs. MacPherson, to whom I have already referred in an incidental way, came here with the Macdonald family in 1821, and she tells me that at that time the Presbyterians had a monthly service in a somewhat indifferent building on Ontario Street, the minister who officiated coming from Cornwall for that purpose. His name was Leith. It is on record that a Mr. Leith, no doubt the same man, taught school for some years in Cornwall early in the twenties. It is of rare interest to meet with one of the age of my informant so bright and vivacious, and to remember that she has been connected with St. Andrew's Church during the whole of its history, extending over seventy years.

In 1821 the Presbytery of Edinburgh acted in accordance with the authority conferred on it some years back. John Barclay is selected for the position and he is ordained to the work of the ministry and commissioned to the exercise of his office in Kingston. He was the son of the parish minister of Kettle. This is not the first time that Kettle and Kingston came into relation. John Strachan who came here to teach more than 20 years before had taught in Kettle, and he brought with him a testimonial from Mr. Barclay's father. The new minister reached here early in the summer of 1822 and entered on his duties. There is evidence to shew that he was well qualified for the duties it fell to him to discharge. He was prudent, zealous, talented and cultured; short as his ministry was he left a permanent impression here. His untimely removal was a great blow to the

congregation. It was no small tribute to his memory that the people when they applied to their patrons in Edinburgh to send a successor stipulated that the man to be sent be like the minister they had lost. One of the first that Mr. Barclay baptised was David Gibson now a resident on Princess Street.

When Mr. Barclay had been here a few months he took steps to have elders chosen to help him in the spiritual oversight of the congregation. Their names were as follows :—

John McLean, Esq., Col. MacPherson, Anthony Marshall, Esq., Mr. Hugh McDonald, Mr. Samuel Shaw, Mr. John Mowat.

With some of these we are already familiar, we have met them in the course of our narrative. A word or two will be in place as to the others. Anthony Marshall seems to have been an army surgeon when he came to Kingston, and he filled his place in his profession and in church work most efficiently. While the church was in process of erection, he was Secretary-Treasurer of the building Committee. I am told that he removed to Belleville afterwards, and that he died there. Hugh McDonald was the father of Sir John who so lately passed away after having risen to the first place in Canada. The future premier was then about beginning his school work, being six or seven years of age. Hugh McDonald did not live continuously here, he spent some years on a farm up the bay. John Mowat on the other hand gave lengthened and uninterrupted service to the congregation. For nearly forty years he was in office, serving long on the temporal committee as well as in the session. We would not be far astray if we said that during much of that time he was the most influential man in the congregation.

Mr. Barclay was succeeded by Mr. Machar whose life work and character are known to the whole people, and his reputation is known to all. There were many events of great importance in his day, both in Church and State, but our space does not allow us to even mention them. We must hasten on.

Mr. Bell, in another part of his letters, tells of another congregation that was formed soon after Mr. Barclay's arrival. "The second congregation of Presbyterians in Kingston, consists chiefly of persons from the United States." The building where these worshipped, stood on the corner of Wellington and Johnston Streets, now the site of the First Congregational Church,

Smith Bartlett, one of the original grantees of the St. Andrew's Church property, was one of the first Trustees of the "Yankee" Church, whose official title was the Union Presbyterian Church. So far as I can find the Rev. Horatio Foote was the first minister, he appears to have been here in 1824, 1825, and 1826. Later on the Rev. John Smith, a Scotchman, was pastor, and the last in charge was a Rev. M. Baker who was alive until a very late date. The congregation was broken up because of the troubles of 1837-8. The Bidwell family was one of the most influential in the congregation. The banishment of Marshall T. Bidwell from Canada by Governor Head, nobody will now attempt to justify, it was an act that brought speedy retribution on the perpetrator of it. Some years later the property passed by purchase into the hands of the Congregationalists, and when a stone building came to be erected the old one was moved off. The old one is now St. Patrick's Hall.

I had intended to say something more of the five Scotchmen who were of the original grantees of St. Andrew's Church property, and of the famous constitution they drew up. The article is already too long and so I must forbear.

The Presbyterian Church in Canada, is the second in numbers in the Dominion, and may I venture to say that it is all of that in influence in the best sense. In referring to it we may adapt the words of the Hebrew Bard:—"Thou broughtest a vine; . . . . Thou . . . . planted'st it. Thou prepared'st room before it, and it took deep root, and filled the land. The mountains were covered with the shadow of it, and the boughs thereof were like the cedars of God. She sent out her branches into the sea, and her shoots into the river."

SAMUEL HOUSTON.

SOME OF CARLYLE'S HINTS TO THEOLOGY.

TO appreciate Carlyle's work we must have a knowledge of the ideas which were swaying the minds of men in his day, but for our purpose we must be content with a mere suggestion on one or two points of interest.

Carlyle began his work in an age when the selfishness of men was regarded as one of the highest evidences of divine providence, Bentham, Ricardo, Mill, were the names to conjure with, and it was held that if men were let alone, society would run itself. In distinctively theological lines the prevailing view was, that the most which can be said as to the relation of the natural and spiritual is, that there is an analogy between them. Miracle and prophecy regarded as *violations* of nature were considered the main proofs for the existence of a Supreme Intelligence. To express it in one word we may say that God was regarded as an object among other objects. So that when the French astronomer denied the existence of God with the remark —"I have swept the heavens with my telescope and have found no God"—he was only voicing one of the strongest tendencies of the time. Deism, atheism, crude radicalism were in the air; in Ruskin's words "the most startling fault of this age is its faithlessness." It is true that better thoughts than these were moving in the hearts of men, but they had not become dominant, scarcely noticeable indeed, in 1834.

In this vortex or rather co-mingling of vortices Carlyle was the first Englishman to discern and herald the order which was struggling through the disorder. This is but a hint at Carlyle's environment, but it will have to suffice here. It may be added that notwithstanding the changes of the past sixty years Carlyle's criticism of society is still vital, and the light which he brought to the problems of his day may still be a torch to us.

What brought light to him? 1. His conviction that the universe is a *unity*. This may seem a commonplace to us, but Carlyle shows clearly that when this idea dawned upon him it was

indeed a light from heaven, for it enabled him to see that the whole universe, and therefore the progress of man, is systematic and therefore intelligible. Teufelsdrockh is alone with nature among the mountains, the valleys, streams and lakes are shining in the mellow light of the setting sun—"A hundred and a hun-'dred savage peaks, in the last light of day; all glowing of gold 'and amethyst, like giant spirits of the wilderness there in their 'silence, in their solitude, even as on the night when Noah's de-'luge first dried! Beautiful, nay solemn, was the sudden aspect 'to our wanderer. He gazed over these stupenduous masses with 'wonder, almost with longing desire; never till this hour had he 'known nature, that she was one, that she was his mother and di-'vine. And as the ruddy glow was fading into clearness in the 'sky, and the sun had now departed, a murmur of Eternity and 'Immensity, of Death and of Life, stole through his soul; and he 'felt as if Death and Life were one, as if the earth were not dead, 'as if the Spirit of the earth had its throne in that splendour and 'his own spirit were therewith holding communion* . . . . Or 'what is nature? Ha! why do I not name thee *God?* Art thou 'not the Living Garment of God? O Heaven, is it in very deed, 'He then that ever speaks through thee that lives and loves in 'thee, that lives and loves in me? Fore-shadows, call them 'rather fore-splendours of that Truth and Beginning of Truths, 'fell mysteriously over my soul. Sweeter than dayspring to the 'shipwrecked in Nova Zembla: Oh like the mother's voice to her 'little child that strays bewildered, weeping, in unknown 'tumults; like soft streamings of celestial music to my too exas-'perate heart, came that Evangel. The universe is not dead and 'demoniacal, a charnel-house with spectres: but Godlike and my 'Father."†

Nature for Carlyle is not a dead machine, but a living organism, a symbol and manifestation of God. Much less is humanity a machine moved by the weights of pleasure and pain, but both nature and man imply the divine which is *in* them, and which is finding expression through them, *i. e.*, both nature and man are animated by one principle and have meaning simply as revelations of that principle. No doubt this idea is suggested in the New

*Bk. II. Chap. VI. (All the references in this article are to "Sartor Resartus.")

†Bk. II. Chap. IX.

Testament*, but the church failed to grasp its significance, and it remained practically a dead letter till the Reformation touched it with life by asserting that every man is a priest of the Most High, but it soon became onesided again to such an extent that we find Rousseau asserting that the ideal man is the "Noble Savage." Against this then was of course a reaction but Carlyle was the first in England to give explicitly both sides of the truth in something like true proportion. To him the savage is noble because he has the capacity to become Godlike. He asserts on the one hand that we are "not to count anything human alien," that all true history is sacred history, and that every noble life is an evangel. But on the other hand he declares that it is only in the highest biography that we find the genuine Gospel.

Thus Carlyle helps us not only to believe in the unity of the universe and especially in the unity of man—in the identity of human spirit in all times and places—but he helps us to *see* it, and to see that we, under the conditions might have been such people as history tells of. In this attempt to make the past into a living present, and to enable us to comprehend the inner meaning of that past as it could not be comprehended by those who lived in it. Carlyle did a very great work and helps us to see the organic unity of the universe in actual process of development.

But further, Carlyle declares that the universe is a *spiritual unity*. No doubt it may be said that the idea of the unity of the universe *presupposes* that it is spiritual, but just because it is *presupposed*, it has to be made explicit, and this is the work to which Carlyle devoted all his powers. To bring the spiritual nature of the universe into bold relief is the thought that is always present with him "Nothing that he sees but has more than 'a common meaning, but has two meanings: thus, if in the high-'est Imperial Sceptre and Charlemagne-Mantle, as well as in the 'poorest Ox-goad and Gipsy-Blanket, he finds Prose, Decay, 'Contemptibility; there is in each sort Poetry also, and a rev-'erend worth. For Matter, were it never so despicable, is Spirit, 'the manifestation of Spirit: were it never so honorable, can it 'be more?"†

The idea—for that the universe is a unity and that it is spiritual

*Matt. v: 44,45; xiii: 31,32; Rom. viii: 28. †Bk. I, Chap. X.

are but phrases of one idea—is the great thought which Carlyle wrought out for his time; but that we may have some hint as to its faithfulness let us look briefly at some of it applications.

(1.) Notice how it leads him to transcend the popular interpretation of Holy Scripture. "Temptations in the wilderness" exclaims Teufelsdrockh "Have we not all to be tried with such? '. . . For the God-given mandate *Work thou in well-doing*, lies 'mysteriously written in Promethean Prophetic Characters in 'our hearts, and leaves us no rest, night or day till it be deciphered and obeyed . . . . And as the clay-given mandate, *Eat thou 'and be filled*, at the same time persuasively proclaims itself through 'every nerve—must there not be a confusion, a contest before 'the better Influence can become the upper?

'To me nothing seems more natural than that the Son of man when such God given mandate first prophetically stirs within 'him, and the clay must now be vanquished or vanquish,—should 'be carried of the spirit into grim solitudes . . . . Name it as 'we choose: with or without visible Devil, whether in natural 'Desert of rocks and sands, or in the populous moral Desert of 'selfishness and baseness,—to such temptation are we all called. 'Unhappy if we are not. Unhappy if we are but halfmen, in 'whom that divine handwriting has never blazed forth, all-sub-'duing, in true sun-splendour."*

This is how Caryle deals with Holy Scripture and he does it often; what does he mean by it? He means a great deal more than a happy adaptation of Scriptural language. He wishes to teach us that "no prohecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation", but that it has a universal significance and application. This is Caryle's way of bringing before us the very important idea that the Divine Spirit in man is a fuller and therefore a more accurate revelation of God than any external facts can be—that an experience of the divine life in his own soul reveals more of God to man than any written account can. Indeed Carlyle would say you cannot understand the written account until you have had the experience. It follows from this that prophecy—*i. e.* a forthtelling of the eternal principles of morality which govern men and notions—is a fuller revelation of God than any mere record of events can give. A half-unconscious belief in this view has al-

*Bk. II. Chap. IX.

ways remained with the church and has led it to prefer the prophetical parts of Scripture to the strictly historical parts; but Carlyle makes the conviction stand out clearly before us that the prophet deals with the Infinite while the historian as such, *i. e.* the mere chronicles of events, deals with the finite.

This idea enables Carlyle to sweep away at one stroke the whole foundation on which men like Voltaire build their objections to Christianity. It enables him to say the external facts to which you object may be inadequate now, external facts by which the divine is bodied forth in one century may become inadequate in the next century, as a manifestation of God, but that is no valid reason for denying the existence of God; any more than the existence of rude Indian houses in Ontario would prove that there never were any Indians there. All that Voltaire and his followers can do is to show the inadequacy of the old, they have a "torch for burning, no hammer for building." Thus we can say, the sympathy, the self-sacrifice, the love which Jesus taught is now here. If you have felt it in your own heart you cannot but admit that it is divine. Give what account you may of its origin and history, its existence for you is indisputable, and "this is Belief, all else is Opinion."

(2) This idea of the spiritual nature of the universe Carlyle also applies to the question of Inspiration. "Neither shall ye tear 'out one another's eyes, struggling over Plenary Inspiration, and 'such like: try rather to get a little even Partial Inspiration, 'each of you for himself. One Bible I know, of whose Plenary 'Inspiration doubt is not so much as possible; nay with my own 'eyes I saw the God's-hand writing it."* That is; if God has spoken to your soul, then for you everything which speaks of God carries its inspiration in it. The divine voice in your own soul is the first requisite and the clearest,—all else is but illustration, "picture-writing to assist the weaker faculty."

(3) The same idea gives Carlyle a new point of view from which to discuss the question of miracles. He saw that there is a truth in the statement that, no Theist can deny the possibility of miracles; but he carries it farther and asserts that every Theist must admit the omnipresence of the miraculous. To Hume, and all who argue with him that no testimony can establish the

*Bk. II, Ch. IX.

actuality of a miracle, Carlyle says, "Custom doth make dotards 'of us all . . innumerable are the illusions and legerdemain tricks 'of Custom, but of all these perhaps the cleverest is her knack of 'persuading us that the miraculous, by simple repetition ceases 'to be miraculous . . . Am I to view the stupendous with stupid 'indifference because I have seen it twice, or two hundred, or two 'million times ? There is no reason in nature or in art why I 'should. . . . . Were it not miraculous, could I stretch forth my 'hand and clutch the sun ? Yet thou seest me daily stretch 'forth my hand, and clutch many a thing, and swing it hither 'and thither. Art thou a grown baby then, to fancy that miracle 'lies in miles of distance, or in pounds avordupois of weight ; and 'not to see that the true inexplicable God-revealing miracle lies 'in this, that I can stretch forth my hand at all ?"*

From this it is quite evident that since God reveals himself in the *whole* world, though one object or event may reveal Him more fully than another, yet there can be no absolute division between different objects or events, and no absolute breach in the continuity of the process by which He reveals Himself in everything. When the materialist and the Positivist said "There is no spiritual force, in the universe, known to man", the orthodox apologist replied "Yes there is; and we have the evidence of miracles for its existence." At this Carlyle shakes his head and says, in substance, "My friend apologist, you mean well, but you are leaning on a broken reed. If God is not in the *whole* world He is nowhere." That is Carlyle maintains not that there are miracles now and then, but that the whole course of nature is miraculous —that the universe is not a mechanical arrangement like a clock, into which the clock-maker may occasionally put his finger, and move the hands back or forward as suits his will; but that the universe is a living organism which implies a spiritual principle as its origin and its end and without which it would have no meaning.

(4) One other point in Carlyle's application of this spiritual view of the universe may be noted—his belief in the *divinity of man*. "Well said St. Chrysostom with his lips of gold 'the true Shekinah is man': Where else is the God's-presence manifested

*Bk. III. Chap. VIII.

not to our eyes only, but to our hearts, as in our fellow-man ?"* If Carlyle does not very often refer to this thought, he carries it with him continually, it is seen in the name *Dio-genes* which he gives to the hero of his first great work "Sartor Resartus." It is this conviction that there is something divine in every man which gives Carlyle his inextinguishable hope for the future. "The Golden Age, which a blind tradition has hitherto placed in the Past, is *Before* us." He believes that the 'Kingdom of Heaven' will surely come, though he often thinks it is a long way off, the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven is usually for him "that *far-off* divine event."

Here we may very easily see one of Carlyle's limitations,—and perhaps his most serious one—he does not give sufficient weight to the truth that the Kingdom of Heaven is already among us. His faith, great as it is is not always strong enough to lift him entirely above

"The weariness, the fever and the fret
Here where men sit and hear each other groan."

His faith did not always overcome the world in which he lived with its follies and sorrows and sins. He was not always able to allow sufficient weight to his own principle that if God is at all, He is in all.

But if it be true as Carlyle holds that the spiritual life is its own evidence then it also contains in itself 'the promise and the potency' of its own triumph. A thought akin to this leads Paul to declare that "all things work together for good." And though Carlyle could not always remain at that high altitude yet his faith is one of the grandest things in him. "Beautiful it is to understand and know that a thought did never yet die, that as 'thou, the originator thereof, hast gathered it and created it from 'the whole past, so thou wilt transmit it to the whole Future." And this is just his way of expressing the optimism of Emerson

"One accent of the Holy Ghost
The heedless world hath never lost."

JOHN SHARP.

*Bk. I. Chap. X.

DANTE AND MEDIEVAL THOUGHT.

III.—THE POLITICS OF DANTE.

THE Politics of Dante, to which in this lecture I shall confine myself, are governed by the principle that the free operation of reason in the citizen cannot create the best form of the state. To Dante it seemed almost a truism that anarchy and faction can be suppressed, and the highest good of man secured, only by the subjection of the whole world to the enlightened and unselfish rule of a single monarch. The first proposition, therefore, which he seeks to establish in the *De Monarchia* is, that, whatever be the subordinate organs of society, there must be "a Prince who is over all men in time, or in those things which are measured by time." This at once gives his conception of the State and prescribes its limits. There must be a single Ruler over the whole human race, and his jurisdiction must not extend beyond the concerns of the present life and the temporal welfare of man, while all spiritual interests must be committed to the guidance of the Pope as the divinely appointed head of the Church. In seeking to establish this thesis, Dante gravely advances arguments which we can hardly read without a smile; and indeed we should find it hard to understand how they could ever have carried conviction to any rational being, were it not apparent that beneath the highly artificial form of his reasons there glowed a strong enthusiasm for humanity, a keen perception of the evils of his time, and a permanent substratum of truth.

To show that there ought to be a single Ruler Dante appeals in regular Scholastic fashion to "the Philsopher," i.e., to Aristotle. In the *Politics* of Aristotle it is pointed out that "where a number of things are arranged to attain an end, it is fitting that one of them should regulate or govern the others, and that the others should submit." Therefore, argues Dante, we have the support of Aristotle for our contention that all mankind should be subject to a single Ruler. It need hardly be said that Aristotle never contemplated for a moment the possibility of a world-wide

empire. In the passage to which Dante refers what he is seeking to show is that nature intended the Barbarian to be a slave, the Greek to be master. We have here therefore a good instance of the uncritical way in which the medieval thinker read and appealed to the authority of Aristotle, as he read and appealed to the authority of scripture. But, even supposing Aristotle had meant to argue from the analogy of the rule of the soul over the body, and of the reason over the appetites, to the rule of the Monarch over all men, we should now say at once that such an analogy proves nothing. The Greek thinker, feeling his way to an adequate conception of the state, tried to assimilate the body politic to a work of art, in which a given material is formed by the shaping intelligence of the artist, and the analogy prepared the way for a deeper comprehension of society, but manifestly no valid inference can be drawn in this way in regard to the form which a perfect state ought to assume. Some of Dante's other proofs are even more external and superficial. What shall we say of a writer who argues that, as the whole movement of the heavens is regulated by one God, the whole human race should be under control of one Ruler? We feel how far we have travelled from this "high priori road" of superficial analogy. So, when we are asked to admit that the Empire is the only perfect form of social order, because man being made in the image of God, and God being one and the human race one, there must be one Ruler, we simply answer that the unity or solidarity of the race does not involve its subjection to a single Monarch, unless it can be shown that in that way the unity of the race is best realized.

Passing from this outer framework of Dante's thought, let us see what is the kernel of his political doctrine. The true life of man, he maintains, consists in the exercise of his rational powers, i.e., in the comprehension of the highest principles and their realization in the lives of men. Now this end cannot be attained unless the social order is fitted to secure peace and tranquillity. But how can there be peace without submission to a supreme authority? The individual man is at war with himself when the passions are not subject to the authority of reason; the family is a scene of discord when the authority of the father is set at naught; the village community must have its chief, the city its podesta, the nation its king. But, if we take the family, the vil-

lage, the city, or even the nation as the ultimate unit, we shall never have a stable social order. Perpetual strife is inevitable if we stop short of an all-comprehensive unity. So long as the territory of one people is limited by that of the other, the selfish tendency of men will lead them to grasp at unlimited sovereignty. Who is to settle the disputes which inevitably arise? If there is no supreme authority to which appeal can be made, wars and conflicts will be unending, and man will never attain the end of his being. Hence we must have one supreme arbiter of national disputes, i.e., the Emperor.

Again, society exists not only in order to preserve peace, but to secure justice to all men. Injustice is a violation of the rights of individuals, and all such violations proceed from the evil influence of the passions, which war against reason. What is wanted in the perfect Ruler is that he should be guided by reason, and therefore free from all merely personal desires. But where shall we find such a Ruler except in a universal monarch? A limited monarch will always be subject to the desire for conquest, and to other selfish desires which disturb the exercise of even-handed justice; but the Emperor can have no temptation to wars of conquest, since the only territorial limit to his dominions is the sea, and he can have no other interest to engage his affections but the good of his subjects; hence he is the ideal Ruler, whose reason is stimulated by that pure love for others, which is the true incentive to justice.

Lastly, a universal monarchy is best fitted to secure the third great end for which society exists, namely, the preservation of freedom. True freedom consists in living a noble and rational life. It is one of the characteristic marks of man as distinguished from the animals that he can control his desires by reason, instead of being controlled by them. Such a rational freedom is the greatest gift of God to man; it is the necessary condition of all well-being here, and of eternal happiness hereafter. Now, freedom in this sense, Dante contends, is best secured under the government of a single Emperor, while "democracies, oligarchies and tyrannies drive mankind into slavery, as is obvious to anyone who goes about among them." The Emperor, seeking only the good of his subjects, will prescribe laws which allow men to live the life of freemen. Dante distinctly insists that the Emperor

must be the servant of all, and that the citizens do not exist for the good of the ruler, but the ruler for the good of the citizens; and it is because a universal monarch can have no temptation to seek his own personal good, that the empire seems to him essential to the welfare of the world. In thus maintaining the necessity of a supreme legislative authority, Dante does not mean that all legislative power is to be in the hands of the emperor, but only that cities, nations and kingdoms should be "governed by a rule common to them all, with a view to their peace." Thus, as he thinks, harmony will be secured between the constituent parts of the human race, all moving together with one will. In support of these general considerations, Dante appeals to the testimony of history. From the fall of man to his own day, he contends, the world has never enjoyed tranquillity except during the rule of the "divine Augustus." "How the world has fared since that 'seamless robe' has been rent by the talons of ambition, we may read in books: would that we might not see it with our eyes! Oh, race of mankind! what storms must toss thee, what losses must thou endure, what shipwrecks must buffet thee, as long as thou, a beast of many heads, strivest after contrary things. Thou art sick in both thy faculties of reason; thou art sick in thine affections. . . . . Not even the sweetness of divine persuasion charms thy affections, when it breathes into thee through the music of the Holy Ghost: 'Behold, how good and how pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.'"

Having thus sought to prove that the only cure for the miserable political condition of man lies in a return to universal monarchy, Dante's next step is to shew that this monarchy must be Roman. There was a time, he says, in which he himself ascribed the supremacy of Rome merely to its superiority in arms, but deeper reflection convinced him that its success was due to the guidance of divine providence. He does not hestitate to apply to Caesar the words which he regards as originally spoken of Christ: "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth stand up, and the rulers take council together against the Lord and against his anointed." But he will do what in him lies to "break their bonds asunder and cast away their yoke," and therefore he will show that both reason and revelation unite in establishing the sacred mission of Rome.

The right of the Roman people to universal empire is proved, in the first place, by the noble ancestry of their founder, Aeneas, "Our divine poet, Virgil, and Livy both testify, that in his veins flowed the best blood from every part of the world." Secondly, the Roman Empire was helped to its perfection by miracles, which are an attestation of the will of God. Thirdly, the Roman Empire was based upon right; for, neglecting their own interest, the Romans sought to promote universal peace and liberty. Their government, as Cicero says, "might have been called, not so much empire, as a protectorate of the whole world." The same spirit animated the individual Roman citizen. "Shall we not say that they intended the common good, who by hard toil, by poverty, by exile, by bereavement of their children, by loss of limb, by sacrifice of their lives, endeavored to build up the common weal?" It is thus obvious that the Roman people assumed by right the dignity of the empire.

That the Roman people attained to universal dominion by the will of God is shown by their success, "that people which conquered when all were striving hard for the empire of the world conquered by the will of God." The Assyrians, Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, all strove for the prize but failed; the Roman people succeeded, as St. Luke testifies when he tells us that "there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed."

But not only is the claim to empire of the Roman people proved by their right and their providential success, but it may be established by arguments drawn from scripture. For, if the Roman Empire did not exist by right, Christ in being born under it sanctioned what was unjust; nor can the sin of Adam have been punished in Christ, for Christ would not have suffered a just punishment, if he had not been condemned to death by a duly appointed judge.

So strongly was Dante convinced of the necessity of the Roman Empire to the well-being of the race, that he has with difficulty suppressed his indignation against those who countenance the unrighteous interference of the Church with secular concerns, and towards the close of the second part of his treatise it bursts forth in fiery invective. "It is those who profess to be zealous for the faith of Christ who have chiefly 'raged together'

and 'imagined a vain thing' against the Roman Empire; men who have no compassion on the poor of Christ, whom they not only defraud as to the revenues of the Church, but the very patrimonies of the Church are daily seized upon; and the Church is made poor, while, making a show of justice, they yet refuse to allow the minister of justice [i.e., the Emperor] to fulfil his office." And again: "Let those who pretend to be sons of the Church cease to insult the Roman Empire, when they see that Christ, the bridegroom of the Church, sanctioned the Roman Empire at the beginning and at the end of his warfare on earth." After this outburst he goes on more calmly to examining the claims urged by its supporters in favor of the temporal power of the Church, and to give his reasons for stripping it of all its usurped authority.

For those who deny that the authority of the state comes directly from God mainly from zeal for the power of the Church, Dante has a certain respect, and he will therefore endeavor to show that their view is untenable. One of the arguments upon which they rely is that as the sun and the moon typify the Church and the Empire respectively, it is plain that the Empire receives its authority from the Church, just as the moon receives its light from the sun. But, not to mention other objections, the analogy proves the very opposite; for though the moon receives light from the sun, both were directly created by God, which shows that the Empire, no less than the Church receives its authority directly from God, while yet the Church ought to shed its gracious influence upon the Empire. Other arguments from scripture are similarly disposed of by a "Distinguo," but the whole method of reasoning is so foreign to our ways of thinking that we may pass them over as irrelevant. By such a method anything may be proved or disproved, the whole process being what Carlyle would call "endless vortices of froth-logic."

The main argument relied upon by the champions of the Church is that based upon the Donation of Constantine. Dante's reply is that Constantine could not alienate the dignity of the Empire without destroying its essential function, and therefore destroying the source of his own authority. Moreover, the argument proves too much, for if one emperor may alienate part of the jurisdiction of the empire, why should not his successors

alienate the whole of it? And finally, it is contrary to the very idea of the Church to receive temporal power from anyone, for the Church is expressly forbidden to possess gold and silver. Another argument for the temporal power of the Church is that Pope Hadrian bestowed the imperial dignity upon Charles the Great, and hence all his successors owe this dignity to the Church. But the Pope could not confer a dignity which was not his to bestow. Besides, the same line of reasoning would prove that the Church receives its authority from the Empire, since the Emperor Otto deposed Benedict and restored Leo.

Let us now see the positive reasons for maintaining the independence of the Empire and the Church. It is manifest that the Empire did not derive its authority from the Church, for the simple reason that it possessed authority before the Church existed. Nor can the Church have any power to grant authority in secular matters, since Christ expressly affirms that His Kingdom is not of this world. And if we consider the ends for which the Empire and the Church exist, it is plain that each has its own independent jurisdiction, and draws its authority directly from God. Man alone of all created beings has a two-fold nature, and, corresponding to these, there are two distinct ends, the happiness of the present life which consists in the exercise of his natural power, and the blessedness of life eternal. The former end he may attain by the use of his reason, the latter can be secured only by transcending reason and exercising the theological virtues of faith, hope and love. Hence man has need of two guides for his life: the Supreme Pontift, to lead him to eternal life, in accordance with revelation, and the Emperor, to guide him to happiness in this world, in accordance with the teaching of philosophy. Both powers are directly ordained of God. "Yet we must not deny that in certain matters the Roman Prince is subject to the Roman Pontiff. For that happiness which is subject to mortality, in a sense is ordered with a view to the happiness which shall not taste of death. Let therefore Caesar be reverent to Peter, as the first born son should be reverent to his father, that he may be illuminated with the light of his father's grace, and so may be stronger to lighten the world over which he has been placed by Him alone who is the ruler of all things spiritual as well as temporal." The Empire, in a word, is paramount in its own sphere,

but it ought to be the protector of the Church, and to receive with all humility the teaching of the Church in all spiritual matters. Thus neither can come into collision with the other, while the temporal and eternal happiness of mankind will be effectually secured.

I have thought it well to give such a statement of Dante's *De Monarchia* as should convey some idea of its form as well as of its content. The form is purely medieval and scholastic, and is totally inadequate to express what Dante had in his mind. For, beneath all this barren display of school logic, there burned an almost fierce fervour of patriotism, or rather cosmopolitanism, which it would be unfair to overlook and impossible to overestimate. What Dante longed for was that Astræa should return, bringing with her the reign of peace, justice and freedom; and the separation of the Empire and the Church seemed to him the only means by which that consummation could be attained. How impossible and even undesirable was such a return to this ideal of the past, a mere glance at the course of Italian history is sufficient to show.

The politics of Italy was determined for centuries, as Mr. Symonds points out, by the failure of the Lombards to conquer the whole peninsula. Venice, Ravenna and the five cities of Romagna called Pentapolis were left by Alboin, their leader, in the hands of the Greek emperors. Rome remained independent. In Southern Italy they failed to get possession of Bari, Amalfi and Naples. Thus Italy at a very early period was divided into distinct political units, which were never fused into one till our own day. Now this fact had the closest connexion with the relations of the Church and the Empire. It was only after the tenth century that the Popes exercised a direct influence upon the political development of Italy. Purified by the efforts of Henry III, the Church came to the consciousness of its power, and by the mouth of Gregory VII advanced the claim to dominion "over all creatures." Thus began that conflict between the Church and the Empire, which ultimately proved fatal to the latter. Meantime the cities of Upper Italy were quietly laying the foundations of their independence; and when Frederick I asserted his claim to dominion over the whole of Italy, they were able, by the aid of the Pope, to extort a recognition of their freedom.

And as the power of the Communes grew, so the people gradually gained an ascendancy over the nobles. In the conflicts of Emperor and Pope the Communes of Northern Italy naturally allied themselves with the Pope, in order to preserve their political independence. The triumph of the papacy, however, only prepared the way for their subjection to Tyrants, who often presented themselves in the guise of demagogues. The loss of freedom in the Italian cities was due chiefly to their want of cohesion; to hereditary feuds, faction and bad government; and to the imperfect fusion of the noble families with the burghers. In Dante's day the elements of discord and disruption were in full activity, and we can therefore understand how he should have sought for an escape from the evils, which he not only witnessed, but of which he was the victim, in a return to the Empire. His ideal was not new: it was the form which the consciousness of the unity of the race, first distinctly enunciated by Christianity, naturally assumed under historical conditions. The conception of the separate jurisdiction of Emperor and Pope had struck root as early as the fifth century, and it never ceased to haunt the medieval mind. But, in the beginning of the thirteenth century forces were at work which were destined to intensify these divisions and destroy the ideal bond of unity which had held them together. The distinct formation of independent nationalities, the growth of modern languages and literatures, and the rise of a third estate antagonistic to the nobility, all led to a new conception of society. The cosmopolitan spirit of the knight was unintelligible to the plain burgher, and we are not surprised to find the chivalrous lays of the time full of laments for the glory of a vanished past. In the beginning of the fourteenth century, the old ideal of a single race, ruled by one Emperor and one Pope, had lost its fascination, and on its ruins the new ideal of nationality was rising into view. In the faction-ridden communes of Northern Italy this new ideal seemed a mere dream, and we cannot be surprised that Dante should turn back to the ideal of the past.

The remedy of Dante for the evils of his time, as it need hardly be said, was based upon a false conception of the past and a defective foresight of the future. Not only is the universal Roman Empire a mere "*magni nominis umbra*," but it involves a

false conception of true relation of the individual to society. The highest form of the state, as we now see, is inseparable from nationality. No ruler is so wise as the whole people. Dante's idea of an Emperor who should be the embodiment of pure reason is contradicted by all that we know of the rule of an absolute monarch. But, even if such a monarch could be found, a universal empire has the fundamental defect, that it shuts out the citizen from the education which comes from personal participation in the government of the state. The end of the state is not simply to secure the prosperity of the people, but to develop the spiritual powers of every citizen, and in this development, as it seems to me, training in citizenship is a necessary factor. Dante did not see that even the discord and faction of his day were the confused expression of the struggle towards self-government. No doubt the selfishness of Guelf and Ghibelline, of Bianchi and Neri, was destroying the freedom of the Communes, and Italy had to pay dearly for its want of union and patriotism; but it is none the less true that the inextinguishable desire for political freedom was behind it all. The political problem which the Middle Ages were trying to solve, was to unite the free spirit of the Germanic people with that reverence for law which was the great heritage bequeathed to the race by the Roman people; just as its ethcial problem was to combine the spirit of Christianity with that desire for intellectual freedom and clearness which had come from Greece. And just as the latter problem can be solved only by insisting, not merely upon the right, but upon the duty of freedom in speculation, involving the freedom to fall into error; so the former problem can be solved only by the independence of the citizen, even when that independence is accompanied by the evils of faction and self-seeking. The reason implicit in a people will assert itself if it is only allowed free play.

We must not fail to observe, however, that, if Dante would sacrifice the independence of the political community, it is because only in this way, he believes, can true freedom be found. The universal peace which the Empire is to bring back to earth is the condition of judgment and freedom; and by freedom he means all that goes to the development of the higher powers of man. Though Dante cannot rid himself of the idea that the contemplative is higher than the practical life; yet, having made

this concession, he practically says that the only life worth living is that of the active citizen, who is at the same time interested in all the things of the mind. The production of wealth he does not regard as unspiritual, but only the selfish accumulation or expenditure of wealth; and his ideal embraces all the arts by which man is lifted above sense. We do not find in him, as in Plato, a reluctant renunciation of art as an "imitation" of the sensible: he views it as a medium, through which the highest truth may be conveyed. This is manifest from the delight which he felt in music, from the value he attaches to architecture, sculpture and painting, as well as the interest he shows in even the form of poetry. The full development of all the powers of the mind is his ideal of a worthy human life. So long as this end was attained it seemed to him a small matter that men should receive their laws and institutions from a supreme authority; nay, this end, as he thought, could in no other way be attained. In this as in all else Dante is the exponent of all that is best in medieval thought. Greece had bequeathed to Christendom not only the desire and the means of intellectual culture, but it had also handed in its special gift of art, mainly through the medium of Roman art. It is well to remember, as Mr. Bosanquet points out, when we speak of the "Dark Ages," that the period from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries was the great building age of the world; nor must we forget that the Church was the great patron of sculpture and painting; and that in Dante the two streams of chivalric and religious poetry were united, as Giotto his contemporary combines close and accurate study of nature with reverence for sacred themes. The modern world has gone far beyond the medieval conception of the state and the church, but the problem of combining culture with intellectual and political freedom is very far from being solved.

There is another thing which we should do well to bear in mind. Dante's ideal of a universal empire was no doubt a dream, but it was one of those inspired dreams of a great mind which are unconsciously prophetic. For, though there cannot be a universal emperor, there ought to be, and we trust will yet be, a universal people. Dante failed to estimate the importance of nationality as the necessary step to a wider unity, for nationality has been the great political educator of the race. Yet he was not

wrong in regarding national hate as of the same essence as faction. The highest progress of the race demands, not a "spirit of watchful jealousy" between nations, but a spirit of active co-operation in all that concerns the well-being of man. No doubt we are very far from the realization of universal peace, justice and freedom, but at least the progress of the mechanical arts, of political science and of philosophy are bringing us apparently nearer to it. If we take Dante's lesson to heart, we shall at least be led to admit that selfishness in a nation is as indefensible as selfishness in an individual. Like all men who fix their eyes on the Eternal, Dante was so enamoured of the ideal that he sought to anticipate at a stroke the slow progress of the ages. As Plato could only conceive of the perfect state as an idealized Sparta, in which the distinction of "mine" and "thine" was abolished by the negation of individual property and even of the family; as Goethe, in his passion for universal culture undervalued the principle of nationality, partly confusing it with that spurious but aggressive form of it which is almost indistinguishable from hatred of all other nations; and as Carlyle, in his desire to put the hero at the head of the state, seemed to forget that a hero can in our day only be found by a people politically free; so Dante, in the excess of his idealism, would bring about at once the golden age of the world. In one way these masters of thought were wrong, but in their protest against the narrow and mean ideals of their age, as in the large and liberal spirit by which they were animated, they put to shame our indifference and our enslavement to petty interests; and we read them ill if we forget the essential nobility of their aims in a perception of the inadequacy of the means by which they sought to attain them.

Of Dante's conception of the Church much the same has to be said as of his conception of the Empire. Like all medieval thinkers he cannot see how the spiritual interests of men can be kept secure without a supreme authority to decide in matters of faith. Freedom of thought in religious matters naturally seemed a contradiction to one who conceived of the Church as the guardian of a body of doctrine which had received its final statement. The free operation of the intellect, as he thought, can only mean freedom to fall into error. To us, on the contrary, it seems manifest that, just as there can be no perfect form of society

which is not based upon the free consent of the whole people, so there can be no system of religious truth which is not the product of the unbiassed reason. On this point there should be no need to insist: the duty of private judgment is the watch-word of the modern world, and no Protestant can be faithless to it without abandoning the central principle of the Reformation. What perhaps requires to be emphasized rather is, that when we have denied the medieval separation of Church and State, religious and secular, we can no longer regard any ecclesiastical organization as more than one of the organs by which the Christian principle of universal brotherhood is sought to be realized. The true invisible church is therefore co-extensive with all the means by which men are bound more closely together and helped to become "the Lord's free men." On the other hand whatever tends to produce rancour and uncharitableness, and to hinder the spread of intellectual and spritual freedom, is the World, even when it claims to be the Church. Dante no doubt would have rejected this view, yet, in so far as the Church was for him the symbol of the self-sacrificing life, it dominates his whole mind; and it is for this reason that he exhibits a divine contempt for the simoniac popes, and paints with such force and sympathy the devotion of a St. Bernard or a St. Francis.

PHILOLOGY AND EARLY TRADE.

A STRIKING illustration of the view that all branches of study are but different sides of the same great truth is furnished by the relations subsisting between Philology and the History of primitive Trade. The correlation of the forces of nature has its analogy in the correlation of the sciences. So intimately connected are they that they reflect mutual light on each other and that a great advance in any one of them is accompanied by a general forward movement along the whole line. The old French proverb '*Tout est dans tout*,' all knowledge is involved in each particular branch of knowledge, is not more trite than it is true. The knowledge of many things is requisite to do any one thing well. Nor is this a case of a little learning being a dangerous thing, but rather a question of turning aside from the stream of truth or floating on its broad current.

It is specially in those subjects that make large use of the historical method that comparative philology is enabled to render most help. Man is by nature an historian, an investigator of the past. He studies the past with eager interest, that he may the better understand the present and forecast the future. With a larger body of facts before him, his inferences and generalizations are more likely to be true. There is hardly a field of thought to which the historical method has not been applied and in which it has not yielded large results. It assumes the continuity of the human race, that the present has its roots in the past, that many things in our present social condition and in our modern institutions are an inheritance from previous ages, and that for a fuller understanding of them, we must study them in their origin and view them in their process of formation.

Far the larger portion, however, of man's activities lies outside the pale of the historical period proper, in the unrecorded acts of prehistoric times. To the oldest or palæolithic period, Archæology is the sole clue, to the next or neolithic period—that which preceded the dawn of authentic history, Comparative Philology, if not the sole, is the chief clue.

Comparative Philology, otherwise called the Science of Language, has often been maligned and misrepresented as but more or less clever juggling, and as having to do only with the correspondences of words in different languages. Many even well educated men, but not native to the guild, are disposed to concur with Voltaire's definition of it where he describes etymology as that study in which the consonants amount to little, and the vowels to nothing at all. It might have been so once—it is so no longer. No doubt it has its infinity of little details, in which one may become entangled and lost, and its special laws which may be applied in a merely mechanical way. But it has also its body of large generalizations, of broad principles, wide relations and striking truths that illumine the dark espanse of the past, and flash large beams of light into the present.

The investigation of words gives us the most reliable knowledge we can get of human life, thought and action in those ages which have left behind them no historical documents. The information thus derived from the analysis of the thought of the past, yields a large mass of facts touching the occupations, modes of life, religious beliefs—in short, the whole political, social and cultural development of those ages that preceded the historical period of the race. Such a wide field of study, with its numerous details, could be dealt with here in only the most cursory way. Of the many lines of enquiry followed out in accordance with the linguistic and historical method, probably none is of more general interest, or more in line with our present activities, than the history of the trade relations and the beginnings of intercourse between primitive races, respecting which the etymological study of language presents us with the following account.

The earliest literature of Europe, namely, the Greek, gives us as the usual designation of a member of another race the word ξενος, 'stranger' or 'foreigner.' The term βαρβαρος, 'barbarian,' was of later origin. It is one of the acute remarks of Thucydides in his history, that there were no barbarians to the Greeks in Homer's time since there was as yet no Hellenic race in contra-distinction with which alone the term was used.* Now earlier than any Greek, or Latin, or Keltic, or Teutonic, or Sanscrit use, is Indo-European use. And as the form of a word is

*Thuc. I. 14.

changed through the wear and tear of time, so in process of time is the meaning of a word changed and emptied of its original content. It is Comparative Philology that restores at once the original form and the original sense. Comparative Philology tells us that the Greek ξένος is connected with the Indo-European root 'kshen,' Sanscrit 'kshan' meaning 'to kill.' It thus yields us as the earliest sense of ξένος the meaning 'killer.'*

From this we can guage the civilization and intercourse of the earliest occupants of the Indo-European area. The vaunted state of nature is a state of war. Uncivilized races view each other with mistrust and hostility. Hate to the stranger is the note of barbarism. The state of primitive society was very similar to that of newly-discovered tribes in Africa and the Pacific Ocean. A survival of this hostility to aliens is found among the Spartans in their practice of ξενηλασία or expulsion of foreigners. As the purest-blooded and most conservative race of the Hellenic stock, they were but perpetuating an inherited practice. Homer makes mention of the man-eating Lestrygones. The inhabitants of the Tauric Chersonese killed all ship-wrecked mariners who landed on their coasts, and made drinking cups out of their skulls. It is on this national custom that Euripides bases the plot of his Iphigeneia in Tauris. Horace even in his day describes our British ancestors as still fierce to strangers, 'Britannos hospitibus feros.' As manners became milder with advancing intercourse and civilization strangers were regarded with a less degree of animosity, yet the fact that Romans and Greeks alike, in all periods of their history regarded death as preferable to exile, serves to indicate the indignities that were heaped upon the resident foreigner. It was therefore no mere empty sentiment, but a deep and pathetic truth to which Orestes gives utterance, when he says "What greater misery can betide a man than to be driven outside the borders of his native land?"† It was in fact no crime in the eye of the law to slay one not of the blood. Among the Germans no Wergeld was exacted for killing a stranger, and among the heathenish Russians, so tells us an Arabian historian, no stranger could venture without at once losing his life.

Side by side, however, with this hostility to strangers, we find

*O. Schrader, Handelsgeschichte und Warenkunde, p. 5. This work is a mine of information on the subject. Many of the statements in this article are made on Schrader's authority.
†Euripides, Elektra, 1314.

prevailing the practice of guest-friendship, a feature of great importance in its bearing on primitive ethics and civilization. One of the formalities connected with it was the bestowment of presents. The guest-friend coming from another people was recognized by his possession of a *σύμβολον* or token. That it was usual for the presents exchanged to be of corresponding value, we may infer from the comment made by the poet on the gift of Glaucus to his guest-friend Diomedes.*

> "Fool that he was to give gold arms for bronze, arms worth a hundred beeves for arms worth nine."

Evidently the connection points in its origin to a trade transaction, the fundamental principle lying at the basis of this friendship being that of barter, the giving of like for like. Tacitus tells us in his Germania, c. 21, that the same custom prevailed among the Teutonic tribes. "It is usual," he says, "to give to a guest on his departure anything he asks, and to ask of him in return a corresponding gift." The first step, therefore, made in the direction of higher civilization is when the idea of exchange to the mutual benefit of buyer and seller takes the place of mistrust and hate.

Now that we have seen how tribal and racial hostility first began to give way before the idea of a mutually advantageous intercourse, we may consider how this idea could best be facilitated and extended.

This was effected by the construction of roads. Road-making though carried to the highest pitch by the Romans was by no means an unknown art to the Greeks of even the earliest period, or to other nations. Isidorus in his 'Origines' attributes the honor of originating it to the Phœnicians. But the knowledge of building roads and streets goes back to an earlier period, and furnishes numerous words to the Indo-European vocabulary. The Greek *πάτος*—English *path*, is represented in Sanscrit by the word *panthas*, in Latin by *pons*, all having as their primary meaning *road* or *ford*, that of *bridge* being a later and secondary meaning. The meanings road and ford pass into each other, which is readily understood when we reflect that the course taken by a road was determined by the direction of the ford. One river famous in history received its name from the fact that all eastern trade passed

*Homer, Il. VI. 234.

over by its shallows, Euphrates coming from the Zend *peretu* (Huperetu) with the meaning of ford. This same term furnishes Modern Persian with its name for bridge *pfuhl*, derived from peretu (Max Müller, Physical Religion, p. 365).

A still greater advance in trade and international intercourse was made when the art of bridge-building was discovered. This belongs to a comparatively late period, but still one outside the historic period. So wonderful did the art appear to the Romans that the bridge-builder (pontifex), with his mysterious skill, was made a member of the priesthood, though the original meaning of the title had evaporated from it in historical times. How many centuries had elapsed between the earliest use of the art in Italy and the appearance of the Romans on the stage of history, it is impossible to say. It was long enough, however, to give a new sense to the word *pontifex*, a process not usually a brief one when the primary and secondary meanings stand so far apart. Caesar tells us that the Helvetii were struck dumb with astonishment when they found that he had crossed in one day by means of a bridge a river which it had taken them twenty days to cross.

That bridge building was not an Indo-European art, but one peculiar to European soil, follows from the fact that no common term is used in the different languages of the family. That it was struck out independently by the Germans and not derived from the Romans, notwithstanding the wonder of the Helvetii, may be inferred from the word *bridge* itself. It is the German 'Brücke.' Etymologically it is connected with the English '*brow*' in eyebrow, Sanscrit 'bhrus' and Greek ὀ-φρυ-ς in the sense of *arch*. The primary sense of 'brow' is alone to be found in the primitive Indo-European, the secondary meaning of bridge is Teutonic.

Already in the Greek Heroic Period regularly built and smooth roads, not mere tracks, are frequently mentioned. Telemachos and his friend Peisistratos drive in company in their chariot from Pylos to Sparta.* And in the Iliad in the famous comparison of Ajax to a skilled vaulter, as he leaps in the fight from ship to ship, the crowds that watch him with wonder are likened to the throng on a highway leading to a populous city.†

The practice of road-making was an early one in the history of Greece. The necessity of easier means of communication was

*Hom. Od. III, 486. †Hom. Il. XV. 679.

felt as soon as architecture, especially the building of temples, whose materials must often be taken from distant places, was developed to some degree of skill. The religious festivals and the national games also served to give an impulse to the art.

Their manner of making roads was peculiar to the Greeks and very different from the Roman practice. Tracks were usually made for the wheels alone. Except on level ground and in the vicinity of cities where there was great traffic, two vehicles could not pass. It was often impossible for a vehicle to turn out of the way. The road was devised for only one conveyance. Hence in the Theban myth the origin of the dispute between Laios and his unrecognized son Œdipus as to the right of way, and the death of Laios in the quarrel that ensued (Sophocles, Œdipus Rex). In swampy ground a dyke was raised called *γέφυρα*, which later became the proper term for bridge. Traces of these roads are still to be clearly seen today in Greece. The inferiority of the Greek roads to those of the Romans is brought out by the different languages. While the Greeks use the phrase 'to cut a road' *τέμνειν ὁδον*, the Latins use the phrase 'to fortify a road' *(munire viam)*. Inferior as the Greek roads were, they were an improvement on the primitive foot-track, and commerce advanced with the opening up of these roads which had primarily a religious end.

The great masters of the art of road making were however the Romans, "they made of masonry" says the Geographer Strabo "even their roads, cutting down hills and filling hollows, so that waggons carried the cargoes of ships". The first to be built was the Appian Way leading from Rome to Capua. In the time of the Empire, these roads were to be found in all parts of the Roman World, furnishing easy access for the Roman armies to the remotest tribes, and bringing the tribute of all nations to the Imperial City. So solidly were they built that in some parts of Europe they are still used without repair, and the word 'strata' street, has passed into almost every language of Rome's former dominions.

It is now in order to touch on the vehicles and animals used for the interchange of commodities in primitive times. From the fact that the words for 'wagon,' 'wheel' and 'axle' with many other parts of the vehicle are etymologically represented in the

Asiatic and European branches of the primitive Indo-European, we infer the knowledge of wheeled vehicles in prehistoric times. Some were possessed of only two, others of four wheels. The absence however of any common term for the 'spoke' which is represented in the most diverse ways in the different languages of the Aryan stock, indicates the non-existence of the thing in primitive times. Sanscrit calls it 'ara,' Greek ἀνήμη, Latin 'radius.' It is only in the Teutonic or bordering languages thatwe find the etymological relations of the word 'spoke,' namely, O. H. G. speihha, Lettish szpykis Slavish spica, the last two probably borrowed from the Teutons, who themselves borrowed the invention from the Kelts—the great horse-breeding race of primitive times. Wheels and axle were hewed out of the same log and turned together. Such were the wheels of the rude Roman 'plaustrum,' so called from 'plaudo,' to make a noise. That an advance had been made even before the race-separation, so far as to detach the axle from the wheels, is evident from the presence in so many languages of the word meaning 'linch-pin.' The large number of words to indicate various kinds of wagons implies a long acquaintance with the invention.

The Kelts especially were skilled in their construction and devoted to the practice of breeding and driving horses. Among the many terms borrowed by the Romans with the thing itself was the Keltic 'car,' which through the Latin 'carrus' has passed into most of the languages of Europe, with the exception of those in the far north, where trade was done in winter, and wheeled vehicles were of secondary importance to the sled.

The favorite beast of burden in primitive times, especially in Europe, was the ox. The word is found represented in all the Indo-European languages, subject, of course, to the regular phonetic changes. In Sanscrit it is 'go,' Armenian 'kow,' Greek βοῦς, Latin 'bos,' Keltic 'bo,' Teutonic 'chuo,' English 'cow.' Not only was the ox used in agriculture, attached to the plough, but also for hauling loads on the roads, and in addition at all high festivals, religious or social, in priestly processions and at marriage feasts. It was better adapted by its patience and leisurely movements for the rude roads and vehicles of the time than was the more quickly moving horse. The horse, too, was well known from the earliest times to Indo-Europeans and

Semites alike, but he was prized in the Indo-European period on other grounds than his utility in transport and commerce. As in the Palæo-lithic age the horse was an object of the chase, so in the Neo-lithic or Indo-European age his chief value lay in his flesh, hide and sinews, and in the milk furnished by the mares. Horses were kept in droves in a half-wild state like the *taboons* or native horses of Russia at the present day.

The quality in the horse that chiefly attracted attention in the earliest times was his swiftness. This Indo-European name 'the swift one' has passed into all the related languages. In Sanscrit it was 'asvas,' Greek ἐκκος (ἵππος), Latin 'equus,' Keltic 'ech.' From the earliest period the horse was used by the Assyrians for purposes of fight, attached to the war chariot. The Greeks long afterwards adopted this practice from their eastern neighbours, and we find the horse frequently referred to in their earliest literature—the Epic verse of Homer. Even there the horse is limited to the use of the nobles, and to the practice of driving, no mention is made of horseback riding, or of him as a beast of burden. At a later time when used for general draught purposes, and after the idea of swiftness had dropped out of sight, other names were adopted in the various languages, different names representing different functions. The Keltic 'copal,' meaning a horse for general purposes, passed into Latin in the form Caballus, and thence into the various Romance languages as Italian cavallo, Sp. caballo, Fr. cheval.

Earlier than the horse for purposes of road traffic, but later than the ox, was the mule. This animal, as a cross between the horse and the ass, was called in Greek ἡμίονος 'half-ass,' also ὀρεύς 'the mountain beast.' It was esteemed as more serviceable than even the ox and soon became a favourite. But it was specially in rougher and more elevated ground that it was most relied on. Homer tells us that the mule came into Greece from Asia Minor, a view supported by later Greek writers, and one that has been proved correct by modern investigation.

The ass was the last of the beasts of burden to be introduced into Europe. Even in the earliest period of Asiatic civilization it was known to the East. It is mentioned in the Rig-veda—the Sacred Hymns of the Hindoos—and in the earliest records of Assyria, reaching back possibly four thousand years before the Chris-

tian era. Neither in Homer, however, nor in Hesiod, who sings the joys and griefs of the farmer, is it spoken of as a beast of burden. At a later period, when its qualities became better known, it was much prized in Greece and Italy, and from Italy it passed into the rest of Europe, carrying with it its original name in the far East. As is the case of so many other culture-animals, practices and plants, the origin of the ass is to be traced to Asia. Its name in all the languages of Europe is derived from the Semitic 'a(n)thon.' Hommel,* one of the leading authorities thinks it probable that the animal and its name, which is 'anshu' in Assyrian, are to be connected with the Euphrates valley and its earliest civilization. In any case it was the last of the animals to be used in Europe for purposes of draught, and it was certainly unknown to the Indo-Europeans.

Many other points of interest present themselves for treatment in connection with the intercourse and first trading facilities between early peoples, promoted by the extension of roads and the introduction of animals of burden, but only one other point can be here discussed, namely, the provision made for the entertainment of a visitor to another country. In the earliest period the sole refuge for the traveller lay in the hospitality of his guest-friend. Inns there were none where travel was at the risk of life. Even when it became more common to resort to other countries, where a guest-friend was not within reach, food and shelter lay in the benevolence of some rich and large-hearted man. That there were such in many places, even in the earliest times, we may infer from what Homer says regarding Axylos, and his treatment of strangers:

> To the war he came
> From nobly-built Arisba; great his wealth,
> And greatly was he loved, for courteously
> He welcomed to his house beside the way
> All comers. HOMER, ILIAD VI. 12.

In Italy, at a much later period, large landholders furnished houses for the entertainment of travellers, and assigned to their management trusty slaves.

In the event of the absence of the guest-friend in Greece, or of some hospitable man of means and kindness, another resource

*Hommel, Die Vorsemitischen Culturen p. 400.

for the stranger was to betake himself to the smithy, χαλκεῖον, whose bright fire and the village gossips gathered round it made it a preferable halting place to the fireless shed λέσχη, attached to a neighboring temple—the last resort when all others failed—cheerless but safe under the protection of the gods. The smithy as the only other spot besides the chief's hearth where the fire perpetually burned was a favorite place of resort. There even the homeless found a refuge, as the fire was always smouldering. Hence in the Odyssey, XVIII, 327, the false servant maid Melantho enjoins her master Odysseus, returning home in the guise of a beggar to go off somewhere else to seek for shelter in his misery:

> O whither wanders thy distempered brain
> Thou bold intruder on a princely train?
> Hence to the vagrants' rendezvous repair;
> Or shun in some black forge the midnight air.

At a later period the πανδοχεῖον or house of general entertainment, was a well known institution in all commercial cities. The general diffusion of inns in Europe, however, was due to the adoption by the Romans of the Eastern system of post-stations, established at an interval of a day's journey from each other, along the principal roads of the Empire. In course of time the inns and stables connected with these stations, designed first for the convenience of the servants of the state, were used in the interests of the general public, for the reception of all comers and expediting them on their way.

So is it the case universally. Trade and travel increase at the same rate and by the same route. So closely connected are the two ideas, that they may be considered interchangeable. As in the English speech a 'traveller' is at the same time a 'trader,' so also in Germany are the two 'Handel' and 'Wandel' bound together in proverb and in fact. These ideas have their deep interest for us, not merely because of the barbaric conditions from which they simultaneously emerged, but also because of the greater culture, brotherhood and peace that follow in their wake. When they had no existence, human life had no value except within the narrow range of the *sib*, or brotherhood united by blood.

With their rise commerce was born, and though it may not appear a very noble thing to be a "nation of shop-keepers," yet trade is

becoming more and more the indispensable condition of national progress, comfort and refinement. Though not the highest ideal itself, yet commerce is largely synonymous with civilization, its scarlet thread; and under the conditions that foster it, flourish all that is highest and best in art, literature and science.

A. B. NICHOLSON.

FROM BROWNING

IN PRAISE OF SHELLEY.

Sun-treader, life and light be thine for ever!
Thou art gone from us; years go by and spring
Gladdens and the young earth is beautiful,
Yet thy songs come not, other bards arise,
But none like thee: they stand, thy majesties,
Like mighty works which tell some spirit there
Hath sat regardless of neglect and scorn,
Till, its long task completed, it hath risen
And left us, never to return, and all
Rush in to peer and praise when all in vain.

THE EARTH AND THE PHYSICAL UNIVERSE.

(Continued from the July number.)

See through this air, this ocean, and this earth,
All matter quick, and bursting into birth.
Above, how high progressive life may go !
Around, how wide ! how deep extend below !

THE Biologist approaches our subject through a study of organized beings and the general phenomena of organic life. He is confronted on all sides by a world teeming with living organisms, and extending in an unbroken chain from the microscopic unicellular plant or animal, to the highest complexity of organization to be found in the human race.

The fertile surface of the earth is clothed with an endless variety of weeds, and flowers, and forest trees, and peopled with thousands of terrestrial animals, which roam over it in search of their food, while the rocky and more inhospitable parts support their quota of fungi, and mosses, and lichens.

The sea swarms with both vegetable and animal life ; not only in the warmer waters of the torrid zone, where every surface drop glows with the phosphorescence of its lowly organized inhabitants, even in its darkest depths, and under the very shadow of the antarctic ice-cap it is rich in its number and variety of strange and peculiar animal forms.

And the very air, besides the innumerable insects which dance in the summer sun, and the birds which soar aloft, is alive with eggs, and bacteria, and spores of all kinds.

To classify these living things, and to marshall them in order, and to describe their external appearances and their similarities and distinctive marks, is not the chief work of the Biologist, however important it may be from some points of view.

He must endeavor to discover the origin of living things, that is, their mode of coming into being, or, as it is commonly called, their creation ; he must trace their development or growth through all their life-changes, and try to find out what inter-rela-

tions, if any, connect plant with plant, or animal with animal. For, from whatever point of view we consider plants and animals, we cannot avoid the conclusion that certain classes of plants, as also certain divisions of animals, have many characteristics, of both structure and habit, in common.

The task which the Biologist thus sets before himself is by no means an easy one; but in its prosecution he is very much better off than the Geologist. For the Geologist cannot possibly have pass before his eyes the process of formation of even the most insignificant rock-stratum in the earth's crust, whereas the Biologist can trace with great ease the microscopic and grosser development of as many plants and animals as he pleases.

Inter-relations amongst organic beings are indicated from a study of their anatomy, of their physiology, and especially of their embryology; and so strong is the evidence thus brought out in favor of some community of origin, that a careful investigation into their mode of creation, or first presentation in the organic world, becomes a matter of the highest importance.

That theory of special creations, so long believed in, in which everything came into existence, in the short space of six natural days, and in which every animal, and every plant possessed the form which it now has, and followed the mode of life which it now follows, is not tenable for many reasons, amongst which we may mention the following:

The six-day theory of creation contradicts the most important teachings of Geology and Biology, and by thus falsifying our observations in these subjects and our reasoning therefrom, it presents nature to us as a something which is unintelligible, inconsistent, and arbitary, and which, instead of being characterized by wisdom or design, is characterized by the very reverse.

The six-day theory of creation, by asking us to deny the most obvious experiences of our senses, experiences which in themselves are marked by the most eminent consistency, destroys the basis of all science. For science is founded upon human experience assisted by human reason; and we can have no experience of a creation which is an absolute formation of something from nothing, nor is it consistent with any part of our knowledge or with our modes of thought. Science assumes that the universe is governed by immutable and eternal laws, and it rests its

superstructure upon this assumption as a foundation. So that in a series of consecutive phenomena, if some can be traced to any intelligible law, while others are contradictory to it, the phenomena, and whatever may be their cause, lie without the field of science.

The difficulties, in the way of trying to reconcile this very special creation theory with the most obvious deductions from geological observations, are so great that of late years an attempt has been made towards some kind of reconcilation by supposing that the six days of creation were not natural days, but that the term *day* as here employed is synonymous with a great and indefinite period of time, having some distinctive phenomena to indicate something which might be taken for its beginning and its end. This to some extent gets over the geological difficulties, but any theory of special creations still leaves the Biological difficulties untouched. For, amongst other things, it fails to explain, for instance, why a frog changes its mode of respiration from branchia to lungs, while no animal ever makes the reverse change; it fails to explain why mammals should begin their embryonic development along the same line as fishes, and that they should pursue this line even unto the development of gill-arches as they do; it fails to explain why the higher animals should possess many rudimentary organs, which to them are useless, or at times troublesome or even destructive, but which being fully developed in some of the lower animals, serve for these an important purpose. And it fails completely to explain the hundreds of peculiar adaptations of animals and plants to their environments, or it attempts to explain them by a theory of design, which, although once in great repute, is in actuality opposed to observed facts, and which, by making the whole universe subservient solely to the benefit and enjoyment of man, is egoistic in conception.

The Biologist believes that nature is a manifestation of intelligence, and therefore intelligible, for wherever he has formed a sufficiently intimate acquaintance with any part of it, he is able to understand its processes and to comprehend the wisdom displayed.

This does not mean that nature has no mysteries; for what the Biologist does not understand is to him, as yet, a mystery, and in this sense, nature may be said to be nearly all mystery.

The growth of a plant from a seed is a mystery, but the fact that the same seed always produces the same plant, and not another, brings the operation within the domain of an intelligible law. Moreover, he believes that the solution of many of these mysteries is only a matter of time, and a happy combination of circumstances combined with sufficient powers of comprehension. And although he cannot expect to fathom the infinite, yet he has no doubt that when a solution to any of these present mysteries comes, the solution will reveal the fact that all processes are as conformable to immutable laws as are the motions of the heavenly bodies.

If nature is intelligible its operations must be in harmony with our intelligence, and this requires, as one of the first things, that nature shall be subject to the great law of continuity, or that the universe shall be a unit in the sense that the present must in all cases be connected with, and be developed out of the past.

The most abstruse theorem of mathematics involves the primary elements of number and space, and can involve nothing but these and their relations, although by a continuous generalizing and amplifying process we rise from the very simple to the very complex.

We who are growing in years involve in our present organization all the influences which have been brought to bear upon our past lives, and not these only, but also those which have affected the lives of our ancestors through a long series of past generations.

So the Biologist expects to find in his science, that the almost infinite complexity existing in organic nature, is but the development of the potentiality which once existed in the humblest cell, and that this development has been carried on throughout the long ages of time which have passed away since the first living thing appeared upon the earth, and which, while consisting mainly of cell multiplication and differentiation, has been due to causes which form a part of the very necessities of the universe itself. In other words, the Biologist holds that organic nature of today is but organic nature of yesterday so transformed as to be adapted to any minute changes of environment which may, in the mean time, have taken place.

But this statement forms quite a complete expression, al-

though a very brief one, of the theory of evolution—a theory as wide in its application as it was great in its conception.

The Biologist believes in the theory of evolution, because in one branch of his subject, embryology, he sees these processes of transformation being carried on under his scrutinizing observation, and lower forms being built up into higher organisms.

The microscope reveals to him a new world, in which all the functions and processes of life are confined within "the small dimensions of a point," and these cells, as they are called, though always small, have different orders of minuteness.

Every living thing in one stage of its existence is a single cell, and countless millions of these never rise higher. These one-celled organisms, which can be called neither plant nor animal, play an important part in the operations of nature, and new discoveries are continually being made in regard to them. Many of them are benevolent to the higher animals and plants, assisting in their nutrition and growth, while others, as the cholera bacterium, are more terrible, in their destruction, than an army with banners.

The single cell, if designed to go higher, divides into two, and each of these into two again, and so on, and thus tissue is formed. From tissues are built up organs; and from organs, the completed animal or plant, the position of the final product in the scale of organic beings depending chiefly upon the extent to which the cell development is carried out during the embryonic stage of the creature's life.

We do not know in what age or in what form life first appeared upon the earth, but in all probability it was in a unicellular, or possibly a molecular form, and before the advent of the Silurian age. At any rate the only remains which mark the earlier part of the old Silurian are those of low fungi, and seaweeds, and simply constituted animals of the protozoan type. Somewhere along the border land, which separates the Silurian from the overlying Devonian, vertebrated animals first make their appearance in the form of crudely constituted cartilaginous fishes. Thence, as we go upwards in geological formations, or come forward in time, follow in succession the serpent, the bird, the lower mammals, the quadrumana, and finally man.

Now, long and carefully conducted observations upon the embryology of an animal have shown, that, in its embryonic development, it recapitulates, or passes though, the stages which are common to the characteristic classes of animals beneath it. Thus the mammal, in its embryonic development, simulates respectively the fish and the serpent before it finally takes on the mammalian form; or rather, it passes through the piscine and reptilian forms in arriving at the mammalian form.

Reasons why are very difficult things to get at, but, from the fact that reptiles came into being before mammals, and fish before reptiles, we would infer that this peculiar phenomenon is explainable on the assumption that somewhere during the past life of the universe, mammals have been developed from the piscine form, through the reptilian form.

Amongst the thousands of peculiarities of organic life which here find their explanation, we shall refer only to what are known as reversions, in which an animal appears to revert, in one or more of its characterics, to some near or remote ancestral form. A peculiar and very instructive example of this has occurred in several well developed cases, in which human beings have been born with rudimentary gill-arches upon the sides of the neck. The true explanation is not that there has been anything like a reversion, or going back in form, but that there has been a want of proper development in those parts which appear to be reversions.

Without pursuing this part of the subject into further detail, I think that it will be readily seen that to the Biologist creation is not a single act or a single series of acts confined by limitations of time or space, but that it is continuous and universal. The process of creation began for this earth when the planet began to condense from its "fiery nebula," and the process has been continued ever since. And as soon as this earth became a fit abode for life the living organism began, and its development has been an unceasing creation which is being carried out as actively today as it was a thousand or a million years ago.

Again, the Biologist believes in the principle of evolution, because it gives a direct and reasonable explanation of the wonderful and peculiar plant and animal adaptations so plentifully distributed throughout the organic world.

Mediævel theologians and philosophers held to that theory of design wherein the forces and conditions of inanimate nature were supposed to have been so created as to be exactly adapted, in temperament and disposition, to the needs of animals and plants in all their forms of life. Volumes were written in the description and laudation of the wonderful beauty of this design, when a few careful observations, made without prejudice, and thought out to their logical conclusions, would have shown the writers that their whole theory of design was untenable. For, inasmuch as this theory held to the permanency of species and of specific forms, it required also a permanency or fixity in the conditions which surround the existence of organic life. But instead of these conditions ever having been fixed ones, they are now and always have been characterized by incessant, and at times, extreme variations. And instead of the conditions adapting themselves to the needs of the organic being, the latter must accommodate itself, as best it can, to the ever-changing conditions, or cease to exist. Hence, from the Biologist's point of view, organic life may be likened to a piece of somewhat hardened wax. If a great stress be brought to bear upon the wax, it will be broken into bits or even crushed into powder; but when it is subjected to a moderate and continuous pressure, the wax may be moulded into any desired form, and be made to accomodate itself to the most intricate markings of the die.

In like manner organic life may be said to be more or less plastic. If any great change takes place quickly in an animal's environment, the animal will not in general be able to accommodate itself to the new order of things, and will accordingly be swept out of existence, as hundreds of species have been in the past. Such a state of matters prevailed at the coming in of the great ice age, when the animals inhabiting the regions affected by it were forced to migrate, or, when that was impossible, to become extinct.

But if the change in environment be sufficiently gradual, which is the normal case, the animal or rather the race, will undergo any amount of transformation in order to satisfy the requirements of the changing conditions of life. And as these conditions are always undergoing change in some way or other, it follows that animal races are being perpetually more or less

transformed; and there does not seem to be any reason for setting a limit to the amount of transformation which may take place.

In short, the circumstance that a greater degree of adaptation to its surrounding condition is the only thing which gives one animal an advantage over another, in the great struggle for existence which is continually going on, compels, as a matter of necessity, that the victorious animal should adapt itself more nearly to its environment than its vanquished opponents had done, and hence that change, and not fixity, should characterise the organic world. And this in reality embraces the whole principle of organic evolution.

Having given this brief sketch of the principle of evolution, and of the observed facts upon which the the theory rests, let us consider how it affects the question of the age of the earth.

Man, according to the Biologist, whatever he may be morally and spiritually, is physically related to the lower animals, and is but the last link in that chain of development which extends from the beginning of terrestial life up to the present time. And for this reason, amongst others, we choose him for our first subject.

In the British museum there are Egyptian mummies dating all the way from 2000 years to 4500 years B.C. So that upwards of 6400 years ago the Egyptians were sufficiently civilized to discover and to practice the art of embalming, and hence to understand the art of weaving, and of working at carpentry, and of ornamenting the articles produced, for these mummies are wrapped in linen bandages, and their cases are made of wood joined together, and bearing hieroglyphics and picture drawings. Now civilization is a product of evolution, and all observations go to show that evolution is a slow process. And as the Egyptians did not come into a state of civilization at one bound, it is safe to infer that civilization in Egypt had made some progress as early as 7000 years ago, and probably much earlier.

But, long before a civilization like that of early Egypt appeared man existed upon the earth in savage and semi-savage states, in what are known as the Palæolithic and Neolithic ages. No history or historical monuments reach back to these remote ages, and we infer that man existed in these times only from the implements and markings which he has left behind him. For the

animal that sought his shelter and protection in caves, and knew the use of fire, and manufactured his instruments of offence and defence by chipping quartz nodules, and in later times polishing the products of his ingenuity, and that was capable of scratching rude figures upon the bones of his victims, can be placed amongst no class of beings but man.

Now it is seen from observations on races whose known history extends backwards for some thousands of years, that although these races are ready enough, in some cases, to copy a part of the civilization with which they are brought into contact, they have not been able, by their own efforts to work out a much higher state of civilization than that which they inherited from their remotest ancestors.

In fact the growth of civilization may be compared in some ways to that of a tree. When the tree begins its career as a young and tiny plant the adverse influences are so strong as compared with the vigor of the growing organism, that for some time any real progress may be slow and even doubtful. But when once the sapling has struck its roots deeply into the firm soil and reared its head into the higher and purer atmosphere, its growth is assured, and in its vigor it adds on more substance in a single year than it did in five years of its weak and immature existexistence.

Thus we cannot believe but that extremely long periods of time were required to advance man from the Palæolithic to the Neolithic period, and thence onwards to the earliest form of civilization of which we have any knowledge. But if this latter civilization has been in existence for somewhere about ten thousand years, or if it has taken that time to bring the civilization of the race from its primitive stages up to the present form, how many years must have elapsed since man first began to use fire and chip flint nodules! Surely from fifty to a hundred thousand years is not a wild or a careless estimate.

But we started with man. And when we bear in mind that, according to the Biological theory of evolution, man must have been evolved from some lower form, and that again from a form still lower, until we come back to the mass of formless protoplasm living in primeval seas or swamps or marshy places, we are forced to the conclusion that the Biologist is even more exacting than

the Geologist is, in his demands for time in which to build up the pristine and naked earth into the wonderful and beautiful world which we see it to be.

As, then, the Geologist and the Biologist appear to be a unit in their demands for a greater length of time than the physicist finds himself able to grant to them, and the arguments of the former appear to be logical in their form and forcible in their accumulation, it becomes worth while to enquire if the physical arguments are in every respect trustworthy; if the physical theories of space and of energy are as satisfactory as they might be, and if there are no discrepancies between these theories and any known physical phenomena. As a complete discussion of this subject would take us too far afield we must confine ourselves to a few brief remarks.

On the assumption that the force of gravitation, as we know it, extends throughout the universe and is an essential part of it, it is generally supposed that the motions of the heavenly bodies are such as can be accounted for by the attractions of other bodies, taken either individually or collectively. But knowing approximately the mass of the visible universe, in as far as it can seriously affect the motion of a body passing through it, it is not an impossible task to calculate, upon the basis of the received theory of gravitation, the greatest possible velocity which could be given to a moving body, such as a star, by the combined attractions of the whole visible starry system. Thus the velocities of the planets in their orbits are dependent upon the mass of the sun and upon the distances of the planets from the sun, and the motion of the solar system through space is probably due, in like manner, to the various attractions of the nearer constellations.

But there are stars, of which the one numbered 1830 in Groombridge's catalogue is a notable example, whose velocity through the starry system far transcends the maximum calculated velocity. The star 1830 Groombridge is now in our visible system, but it cannot always be so, for its velocity is so great that the combined attractions of all the stars in the visible universe are not sufficient to deflect it into a closed orbit. Hence, as far as we can see, it must, after the lapse of an immense time, pass

away and become a wanderer in the distant and invisible depths of an unknown and possibly infinite space.

As the observations establishing the existence of this great velocity are altogether trustworthy, it appears that gravitation is but a part of some greater but unknown law under which such anomalies must be explainable, or that the universe is subject to different laws in different parts. But whatever the cause may be, the extreme velocity of these so-called runaway stars, has at present no satisfactory physical explanation.

Again, almost every person is acquainted with the phenomenon known as an electric storm, when the northern aurora takes on, at times, a peculiar ruddy hue, and its streamers, in these climates at least, extend up to and sometimes appear to meet in a sort of corona at the zenith; and when, instead of being confined to the northern portions of the sky, the auroral display extends wholly or pretty well around the visible horizon.

On such occasions there is an immense amount of energy displayed, chiefly in the form of electric and magnetic action. The compass needle is powerfully affected, being swayed irregularly from side to side, and at times being turned completely around.

In the present day electric or magnetic energy is capable of being measured in amount just the same as any other form of energy, and its equivalent can be expressed in terms of heat. And it has been shown that the energy displayed in one of these large magnetic storms, which lasts, at the longest, not more than about twelve hours, is equal in amount to all the heat received by the earth from the sun in a period of three or four months.

What, then, is the source of this energy? It does not appear to come from the earth, as no sensible change is induced in the mean temperature of the earth's crust, nor is any sensible change experienced in the temperature of the atmosphere, or in the after course of meteorology; and it is highly improbable that it comes from the sun, as it is not possible to conceive how the rate, at which the sun emanates energy, could be so suddenly and so enormously increased, and for so short a period of time, and then fall back to its normal state, and leave not a trace of the unwonted commotion behind. And all that can be said at present is that the physical theory of the universe as at present held does not satisfactorily explain this unique phenomenon.

Again, energy is the capability of doing work, and in the physical theory the total amount of energy in the universe is believed to be unchanged, while it is also held that energy can undergo a kind of degradation, known as the dissipation of energy, under the influence of which all the energy of the universe may become, in time, so degraded as to be totally inapplicable to the doing of any kind of work. To make this plainer—the sun radiates heat to the earth, and this heat is the energy which builds up the tissues of plants, and raises the water by evaporation, and spreads it into clouds above our heads.

This water falls upon the high land, and collecting into rivulets, and streams, and rivers, runs downwards into the sea from which it came. In its downward course the water is slightly heated by the friction of its own molecules, by contact with the sides and bottom of the channel, and by falling over a precipice into the sea; and nearly all the energy, by which the water was raised from its ocean home, is thus changed into a form of low heat, which, instead of being all returned to the sun to recoup his loss, is radiated away into space and made inavailable. And thus in time the sun will practically die, by having parted with all its available energy, and all life and action now depending on the sun's heat will end. Or, as an eminent scientist has put it—"As probably there was a time when the sun existed as matter diffused through space, the coming together of which matter has stored up its heat; so probably there will come a time when the sun, with all the planets welded into its mass, will roll, a cold, black ball through infinite space."

If this is so, then, the time will probably come when all the millions of stars that twinkle by night will grow dark and die, and the universe become a system of extinguished suns;

> As when some forest fire scathes the upland hills
> And leaves a wilderness of blackened boles,—
> Where erst the pine and fragrant cedar grew,—
> And clothes the landscape in a robe of death.

If this is the course of nature, and the universe is not comparatively a new creation, some trace should be discernible of great systems moving through space, and which have already grown cold and dark. But nothing to suggest such a thing has ever been detected, for the variations of a star like Algol cannot

be explained upon such a hypothesis. It may be said, in fact, that, although this consummation of the universe is a logical deduction from the physical theory of energy, as now held, it is almost certain that it is not the correct one; and it is altogether probable that the physical theory is too imperfect to admit of being pushed to extreme cases.

The physicist finds it necessary, in order to explain rationally the phenomena of radiant light and heat and electrical phenomena, to assume the existence of a something called the luminiferous ether, which fills all space and which is endowed with certain properties. The existence of this ether is as satisfactorily proved as the existence of matter. For we can know matter only through the phenomena which it manifests, and the phenomena due to the ether, or certainly not due to gross matter, are as numerous and as trustworthy as those which belong to matter.

Whether the ether is but a form of extremely rarefied matter, as has been held, or whether matter is but an affection of the ether, as is held to some extent to-day, is not known; and probably cannot be known until physicists come to know much more about matter and ether than they do at present. But the properties which the ether must possess, in order to serve the purposes of its creation, are not the properties of matter as we know it. For the ether must be imponderable, it must suffer displacement without friction, and it must be capable of transmitting energy with enormous velocities—properties not belonging to crude matter.

It appears, then, that space is not a vacuum, but a plenum, filled with the luminiferous ether, and that of the many possible properties of this ether, we know only a few. But it is beginning to be suspected that, just as the sea is the source and home of all the water in the world, and the earth is the great fountain of electricity, so the ether is the infinite reservoir of all energy, into which all is poured, in the forms of heat, electricity, &c., but which may exist in it in some form unknown to us, in which nothing is lost, and out of which all energy is drawn. Our available space does not permit us to pursue this subject further, but it is almost certain that along this line will be found the explanations of the discrepancies already alluded to. We think we have said enough to show that the physicist is in no better position to

dogmatize upon the age of this earth than the Geologist and the Biologist are; and that to him as to others the final consummation of the universe is a sealed book, until he knows more about the primary source of energy, and of the destination of that which he considers to be degraded and dissipated.

N. F. DUPUIS.

THE IDEAL IN ART.

HIS mind (Hogarth's) had feet and hands but not wings to fly with. There is a mighty world of sense, of custom, of every-day action, of accidents and objects coming home to us, and interesting because they do so; the gross, material, stirring, noisy world of common life and selfish passion, of which Hogarth was absolute lord and master: there is another mightier world, that which exists only in conception and in power, the universe of thought and sentiment, that surrounds and is raised above the ordinary world of reality, as the empyrean surrounds this nether globe, into which few are privileged to soar with mighty wings outspread, and in which, as power is given them to embody their aspiring fancies, to "give to airy nothing a local habitation and a name," to fill with imaginary shapes of beauty or sublimity, and make the dark abyss pregnant, bringing that which is remote home to us, raising themselves to the lofty, sustaining themselves on the refined and abstracted, making all things like not what we know and feel in ourselves, in this "ignorant present" time, but like what they must be in themselves, or in our noblest idea of them, and stamping that idea with reality (but chiefly clothing the best and the highest with grace and grandeur): this is the ideal in art, in poetry, and in painting. When Meg Merrilies (in Scott's *Guy Mannering*) says in her dying moments—"Nay, nay, lay my head to the East," what was the East to her? Not a reality, but an idea of distant time and the land of her forefathers; the last, the strongest and the best that had occurred to her in this world. Her gipsy slang and dress were quaint and grotesque; her attachment to the Kaim of Derncleugh and the wood of Warroch was romantic; her worship of the East was *ideal*.—*Hazlitt.*

THE RELATIONS OF COLONIAL BRITAIN TO THE EMPIRE.

THE close sympathetic interest with which the proceedings of the Intercolonial Conference have been followed in Great Britain, indicates the completeness of the change which has taken place in public opinion there in regard to the political and commercial importance of the colonies. The incidents which marked this change will form a chapter in colonial history. A quarter of a century ago the tendency towards a protective policy on the part of some of the colonies had the effect of reviving amongst the commercial community of Great Britain the old-time impression that the colonies had been planted and fostered solely for the extension of British commerce. Self government had been conceded to these colonies and under it they had exercised their rights by imposing customs dues on British as well as foreign products—at first to raise revenue, but afterwards, in the case of some, to encourage local production as well. Political sympathy in Great Britain inclined towards the British merchant whose market was being seriously curtailed, particularly in Canada, where the competition of the American manufacturer was tending still further to diminish imports from the mother country. As discussion increased, feeling in political circles in England more especially among the Liberals became intensified, and during the regime of the Gladstone ministry of 1868-74, Canada at least, among the Colonies, was given to understand that if friendly separation were desired, the government of Great Britain would not place difficulties in the way.

Such a serious statement from an Imperial source could not fail to produce an impression on the Dominion Government of the day and on the people of Canada. The Minister of Finance in his budget speech in 1874, openly spoke of the struggle for the possibility of carrying out a distinct national existence. His utterances had with them the air of authority, but they failed to bring out any sympathetic response on the part of the Canadian people. Rebuffs and reverses generally force to the surface the

true mettle of men. The undercurrent of feeling in both Great Britain and the different Colonies was found to be distinctly imperialistic in tone. Men of broad views like Lord Salisbury, Lord Carnarvon, Lord Roseberry, Lord Derby, Hon. E. Stanhope and Hon. W. E. Forster, in England, Sir Henry Parkes in Australia, and Sir J. A. Macdonald in Canada, strongly combatted the idea of a dismantled kingdom, and pleaded for a more united and stronger empire. Eventually they awakened the popular feeling. Their views, already frequently before the public, attracted wide attention in the autumn of 1884, on the occasion, both of the dinner given in London to the Canadian Premier then on a visit to England, and of the very influential meeting held also in London, at which an association for the promotion of Imperial Federation was established. To the efforts of this Imperial Federation League and of the previously formed Colonial Institute, as well as of the various commissioners and agents general who have represented the Colonies in London during the last two decades, has been due not a little of the information about the Colonies and of the improved feeling towards them now so prevalent in Great Britain.

The immediate practical outcome of this increased interest in colonial affairs was three fold:—the Colonial and Indian Exhibition of 1886, which through the great assemblage of industrial products brought thus together showed to the two to three millions of its visitors the immense resources of the empire; the founding of the Imperial Institute, to which so many sections of the empire contributed; and the Intercolonial Conference of 1887, convened in London by Hon. E. Stanhope, the Secretary of State, for the discussion of questions of military defence and postal and telegraphic communications.

But other forces were also at work to conciliate even the commercial community. When Belgian iron appeared in Staffordshire and German cutlery in Sheffield, though there was not much weakening of free trade theories, there was more sympathy with the Canadian manufacturer, who had to battle with the overproduction of the American market.

The Intercolonial Conference held at Ottawa in July last is the latest outcome of the desire for a closer bond of union, and taking place at a time when the Imperialistic sentiment was

stronger, it attracted wider attention and is destined to secure more practical results than the London Conference of 1887. Convened by one of the colonies, it had also a greater official importance because it met the strong view expressed by Lord Salisbury, when premier, that the colonies themselves must take the next step towards closer union. Preferential trade and quicker direct communications by cable and steam were the themes of the Conference. These, carried into effect, will form the basis of a present quasi-union, and will, through riper intercourse and a better appreciation by the different sections of each other's sources, develope a closer bond. Time will smooth over difficulties which now appear formidable and will afford the opportunity for moulding men's thoughts to suit the coming change.

And now that the occasion has been so widely given for discussing the conclusions of the Conference, what may be considered as the view of the people of Great Britain in regard to them, and what the view of the Colonists themselves? Federation in the wider sense of an empire with a common tariff, and of Colonies with a full representation in the Imperial Parliament, has long since been considered, under present conditions, impracticable. Discussion has, however, now shown, on the one hand, that the Imperial Government would be supported by public opinion if it aided the cable and steamship proposals, and, on the other, that probably all of the colonies would be disposed to differentiate in trade matters in favour of one another and of the mother country. From all sides comes also the belief that quicker and more direct communication and better trade relations, if they can be arranged between the different parts of the empire, will lead to the intensifying of the national sentiment; to the drawing closer of the bonds which tend to make the people of the Colonies feel that they form part of the empire and not a mere adjunct; and, ultimately, perhaps, to all parts of the empire acting more in concert with each other in dealing in the questions of diplomacy and defence.

These are the anticipated results, but other indirect effects must follow. Hitherto the trend of emigration from the United Kingdom has been strongly towards the United States, and not altogether to the advantage of the empire. The leading elements in the current have been the Irish, who too often had had feel-

ings of unrest intensified in the new world into open dislike for the empire which they had left behind. Those of the same race emigrating to the Colonies have made good and loyal citizens. Seeing, then, that sending to the Colonies those who will prove friends is better than planting possible enemies in a friendly foreign state, what is the great influence the Colonies under more closely knit bonds can exert in attracting immigration? Are not a brighter future and a home, if possible, among friends, the goals of the emigrant? Quite apart, then, from the effect of alien labor laws in the United States, must not the current to some extent be diverted to the colonies under the influence of expanding trade, greater demand for labor, better information about the Colonies, and increased interest in the empire?

Still another effect of closer relations will be the diversion to the colonies of a share of the surplus capital of the United Kingdom, which has hitherto so freely gone to foreign countries. Improved relations mean more opportunities for trade, and expanded trade means more numerous and more remunerative outlets for capital. Here, if we afford a measure of safety, lie the attractions to British capital. Great Britain's investments in foreign countries have been vast. It is difficult to even approximate their amount, but a partial guide is the London Stock Exchange Daily List. From it we learn that the foreign government securities, payable in London, England, aggregate nearly $3,600,000,000, and if to this be added an estimate of the amount held in the country of the same securities quoted on the Stock Exchange, but payable in foreign capitals, a sum of not less than $5,000,000,000, and it may be much more, represents British investments at their par value in foreign government securities alone. Unfortunately most of these obligations stand at a heavy discount. Colonial governments, on the other hand, are represented in the same lists by a sum slightly exceeding $1,300,000,000, and it is to the credit of these Colonies that, probably without an exception, their obligations stand at a premium—in some a large premium—on the price at which they were issued. Again, the quoted stocks and bonds of foreign railways floated in London—excluding those of the United States—aggregate a sum of over $760,000,000, and if to this be added—what must be mere conjecture—an amount equal to one-third of the railway stocks and

and railway bonds of the United States quoted on the list, as representing the British share in the investments, we have towards $2,200,000,000 as Great Britain's contribution to the building of foreign railways. Its contribution to Indian and Colonial railways together, amounts to only $800,000,000. Without touching upon other industrial enterprises, or upon municipal loans, these somewhat conjectural figures sufficiently show the extent to which British capital has flowed into foreign channels in the past.

These are results which may be termed internal to the empire. There are results which may be termed external. One is the greater moral effect which an empire dominated by people chiefly of the same race and united for defence as well as in commercial interest, must have upon the nations. Such an assemblage of states, colonies and dependencies with their vigorous and increasing populations, occupying sections in every quarter of the globe and under every climate and producing or able to produce almost every known industrial product, must have an importance as a diplomatic and moral influence in the world outside. This influence will arise not only from the strength and unity of a great empire, the command of the vast resources which it possesses, and the courage and energy of its people, but also from the spirit of justice, which, in these later days, more and more inspires its dealings with other empires and states. This influence can only be for good in the councils of nations. and in the public opinion of their people.

Preferential trade is the proposal from the Conference, which presents the greatest difficulty to the English mind. It involves questions of markets, of treaties and, perhaps above all, of principle. Of Great Britain's imports, 77 per cent. is to foreign countries and only 28 per cent. to the British possessions. A preferential tax would considerably affect the proportions and help, it is true, the British possessions, but it might raise prices, and that is what Englishmen fear. The artisan dreads a tax, however light, on food products, the manufacturer fears lest a duty on his raw material may increase the cost of the finished product and hamper him in competition both at home and abroad, whilst the politician and manufacturer alike are apprehensive of retaliation in duties, which might result in foreign markets.

Again, Great Britain derives certain trade advantages from the continuance of the German and Belgian treaties. How far would these be counter-balanced by corresponding advantages were the treaties abrogated at the request of the Colonies? Differential trade, however, disturbs the principle of free trade, and the average Englishmen who, born and brought up in the atmosphere of free trade, and relegating arguments to Peel, Cobden and Bright, knows only that the island has prospered since the budgets of 1842-5 and the repeal of the Corn laws, has come to believe that a great principle is involved almost sacred to the nation.

We can sympathize with the drift of thought in the English mind. Just at this juncture, however, is there not a nobler principle involved, worthy of even some sacrifice to maintain? There is the evolution of the nation as well as the evolution of man and of mind. The Colonies are reaching political manhood. Are the people of Great Britain conscious of the opportunity offered them of taking the leading part in building up and consolidating a greater empire? "Great economic and social forces," says the biographer of Cobden, "flow with a tidal sweep over communities that are only half conscious of that which is befalling them. Wise statesmen are those who fore-see what time is thus bringing, and endeavour to shape institutions, and to mould men's thought and purpose in accordance with the change that is silently surrounding them." The tide of Imperialism is on the flow, and he is the wise statesmen who will take advantage of this tide in earnest effort to consolidate the empire even though some sacrifice is involved.

And after all, is the sacrifice great? At the extraordinary low prices of food products now, and through the enlarged production of the world, no prospect of a return to former high prices, the effect of the slight preferential duty which the Colonies would expect, need hardly disturb the minds of the English statesman and the English artisan. The vast surplus of food supplies in the United States must find a sale, and so long as Britain remains the market which controls the range of prices, there are thousands who will argue that on the producer the duty must necessarily fall.

Again, whilst the trade of the United Kingdom with the British possessions is only, presently, one-third of that with foreign

countries, Australia, Cape Colony and Canada export and import per head of population vastly more that any foreign country, and as these great colonies continue to increase in population and wealth, their aggregate trade with the United Kingdom must increase in a greater ratio as compared with that of foreign countries. Especially must this be the case with Canada if a differential duty diverts to any considerable extent to the United Kingdom its present trade with the United States. And, besides, it would not be the first time that Great Britain had legislation in favour of Colonial products. A differential advantage given to Colonial sugars and cottons was a feature of the tariff before the repeal of the Corn laws.

And with their world-wide experience in diplomacy, do English statesmen suppose that the small preferential duty which would be imposed on a certain few products would revoke retaliation? If a McKinley tariff and the taxation of a large range of products were in view, the subject would be worthy of very serious thought. In the case of food supplies, wherever the British market controls prices, there may be distinct advantages to continental nations in buying, for instance, in the United States at the lower prices which the British duty may entail.

The further considerations which must soon arise in the process of the unification of the empire, are the share which the Colonies are to assume in the cost of diplomacy and defence, and the representation which these Colonies are to have in the councils of the empire. With the desire so prevalent for a closer union, these are considerations which time cannot fail to solve.

Assuming that probably all of the wealthy Colonies will be ready to aid in maintaining diplomatic relations with foreign courts, and in bearing the burdens of defence, a suggestive course in providing for the cost would be by the imposition of a small tax on the registered shipping and on the total imports, of each colony. This would not only reach those who directly received the advantage of protection from the navy, but would spread the cost over the people of the Colony generally, and would be so light that it would hardly be felt.

Representation of the Colonies at Westminster has always presented a difficult problem, but, even there, the quasi-ambassa-

dorial powers which we have given to our Commissioners and Agents-General suggest that if these representatives were made ex-officio members of the Imperial Parliament with the right to discuss and vote on foreign and Colonial questions it might afford a present temporary solution of the question. The general spirit of fairness which now pervades Parliament in considering Colonial questions would be a sufficient assurance to these representatives of the support they would receive. In the course of time, as the Colonies increased in population and importance, the interests involved would demand a larger and more effective representation, and especially might this be the case if a Home Rule bill gave seats at Westminster to a separated Ireland.

Whilst the Colonies are thus aspiring to the status of empire, how far are we, the inhabitants of these Colonies educating ourselves into a high standard of citizenship. There is still a better development needed in our national character—still great room for improvement in the moral force of our people. We in the Dominion want a greater infusion of a national sentiment which will find expression in a deeper love of our country, in a more healthy pride in our institutions and a more earnest determination to improve them. We want freedom of thought and action, untrammelled by prejudices of party, race or religion. We want our public offices filled by men who can show the recommendation of ability and honour and not by those whose chief claim is that they can establish their nationality or religious belief or that they have faithfully served their party. We want our civic affairs managed with intelligence and economy, and not made the sources of bribery and peculation. We want our politics freed from that phase of party which sees no virtue in an opponent and, because it is out of power, takes pride in depreciating its country, and equally from that phase of party which maintains power at the expense of a record which should be above reproach. Finally, we want each man to feel that he has a country to live for as well as a country to live in, and that, whatever his position in life, he can exercise some influence, however small, in giving the shape to the course of his country's future and force to its current.

A scheme more worthy of a statesman's efforts than even an Imperial union is a close permanent alliance between the two great English speaking nations, under which all their own differ-

ences arising from time to time would be referred to arbitration, and each would afford to the other aid in case of aggression by other powers—the great purposes being the promotion of peace and prosperity, not merely among themselves, but among other nations as well. The world knows no more noble effort among nations than the promotion of peace and the suppression of the horrors of war. Why should not two such nations as Great Britain and the United States form a friendly, permanent alliance with these noble aims in view? The intelligence, education, enterprise and wealth of their people—all sources of power—have made these nations great; they are akin in blood and Christian sympathy; they have colossal business interests with each other which it would be folly to interrupt; and whilst the one has vast proprietary interests in every quarter of the globe and commercial interests with every nation, the other with its vigorous, energetic people, controls the more important part of a whole continent. Such an alliance would have an influence for good reaching far beyond the mere parties to it. Whilst it would ensure peace and encourage trade between these two nations themthemselves, it would tend largely to bring about peace throughout the civilized word. On the one hand, the alliance being defensive, not aggressive, would prevent either nation from lightly undertaking useless or preventable wars in which it might not have the sympathy of the other; on the other hand, the moral and diplomatic influence of the alliance on foreign powers would necessarily be most marked. What Bismarck, however confident of the strength and resources of his people, could hope to cope with the vigorous manhood and wealth of resource of Great Britain and the United States? And with the business interests of these two nations extending themselves to every part of importance in the six continents, what foreign powers entering into war with each other, and placing thus a barrier to the commerce of their ports, could afford to altogether disregard the diplomatic representation of the alliance, if made in the interests of peace and commerce?

Such an alliance would have other lasting effects on the people themselves. It means more friendly relations; a better recognition of the common parentage; more disposition to trade freely with each other; fewer strained constructions of acts of Parlia-

ment and Congress to suit jealous competitors in trade; and fewer difficulties hitherto often purposely placed in the way of the settlement of international disputes.

With the large restless foreign element now so prominent a feature in the American population there is no hope that the War of Independence will ever be forgotten or regretted, no hope that Great Britain and the United States will ever assimilate their tariffs or become, both of them, converts to free trade, no hope that they will in the future be other than close commercial competitors in every foreign port, as well as at home, but there is a hope that with the intelligence, education and Christian principle which so eminently characterize their people, these two great nations can, in friendly alliance, be made the instruments for the promotion of peace and good will throughout the world.

A. T. DRUMMOND.

CICERO AS PROCONSUL.

"A wise man, my boy, a wise man and a lover of his country."

—AUGUSTUS TO HIS GRANDSON. QUOTED BY PLUTARCH.

NOT the least interesting episode in Cicero's life is his year in the proconsulate. The office had sought the man and it was accepted, at the call of duty, if not with alacrity, at least with resignation and a determination to serve the best interests of the provincials whom he was summoned to govern. Had he been anxious for such a position before, he could have had it before, and would no doubt, after his praetorship and after his consulship, have allowed his name to be submitted to the ballot by which every year the provincial governorships were distributed among the higher magistrates of the current year. But he had no need and no desire to pile up wealth or repair shattered fortunes in the usual proconsular way by the plunder and oppression of the provincials (it was the common method of setting a noble bankrupt on his legs); and besides he took much the same view of the provinces that a modern Englishman does of 'the colonies:'

"I can scarcely bear the insipidity of everything here", he writes; and again: "Cling to the city, my friend, and live in her light. Every foreign employment is obscure and petty for those whose abilities can make them famous at Rome." Rome is to the Roman the centre of the world; she is the centre of civilization, of commerce, of literature, of society and refinement. She has not only destroyed the liberty of the outside world, but paralysed its activity. Once before, in the discharge of the duties of the quaestorship, Cicero had gone abroad as paymaster or minister of finance to the governor of the province of Sicily; and returning home at the close of the official year, filled with a sense of merit for disinterested public service and with confident anticipation of public commendation, he found to his astonishment that he had never been missed. Cicero's self-complacency (his greatest foible) did not easily recover from this shock and he resolved thenceforth to restrict his public activity to the Roman forum and senate-house. But in the year 52 B.C. Pompey (then sole consul) secured the assent of the people to a law (*Lex de jure magistratuum*) which obliged Cicero once more in the service of his country to leave the centre of affairs. By Pompey's law no ex-magistrate was to receive a provincial governorship until five years had elapsed from the expiration of his magistracy; meantime ex-consuls and ex-praetors, who had not held a provincial governorship under the old régime, were required to accept office. Cicero was accordingly appointed proconsul of Cilicia, a large province which included the southern half of Asia Minor and the island of Cyprus. Cilicia had been first occupied by Rome in B.C. 102, with a view to suppressing the piracy that had long infested the Mediterranean and had here its chief seat; but it was not till 64 B.C. that Pompey, after his crushing defeat of the Cilician corsairs, erected the country into a province, organized in the regular Roman way. The remnant of the pirate bands he settled in the Cilician city of Soli, a name curiously preserved in our word *solecism*, originally applied to certain deviations from linguistic usage allowed themselves by the people of this place. The capital of the new province he made Tarsus, no mean city even then, and celebrated for wit and a taste for intellectual pursuits, and in later times the centre of Christian interest as the birthplace of the apostle Paul.

Pompey, at the same time, constituted the neighboring province of Syria, by which term was denoted the district running south from Cilicia to Egypt and east to the desert of Mesopotamia. Syria with Cilicia constituted the 'buffer state' between the Roman empire and the Parthians. This remarkable people—a never failing object of interest to the student of history as one of the few native populations that successfully defied the power of Rome—had, a year or two before Cicero's appointment to the proconsulship, inflicted a memorable defeat on the Romans under the triumvir Crassus on the fields of Carrhae and Sinnaca. Of forty thousand legionaries who had crossed the Euphrates, only some ten thousand returned to the province. The grey-haired general sought and found death upon the field. His head was cut off and sent as a trophy to the Parthian king, who, in mockery of the dead triumvir's greed, ordered the mouth to be filled with molten gold. It was indeed the menacing attitude of this brave and warlike people that had induced the Roman Senate, in whose jurisdiction the administration of provincial affairs lay, to appoint a man of consular rank like Cicero, to a province like Cilicia otherwise of small importance.

Cicero set out from Rome for his province on May 10th, B.C. 51; and from this date till his return to Italy in the end of November of the following year, a complete account of his movements is extant, contained in about forty letters (chiefly confidential, addressed to his friend Atticus) and two despatches to the home government.

After spending a few days at Tarentum with Pompey (Pompey, he said, would furnish him with some advice for the new undertaking), he sailed across the Adriatic to Actium, on the coast of Greece; and thence proceeded by land to Athens. He says that he suffered a good deal of inconvenience (from sea-sickness) in the passage across and concluded accordingly to continue his journey by land—especially as their might be some unpleasantness in doubling the next head-land preparatory to sailing up the Corinthian Gulf! The Romans were indeed wretched sailors, being much of Dr. Johnson's opinion that a ship—besides being in perpetual danger—was no better than a gaol. He reached his province the last day of July. His "progress" through Greece and Asia Minor, he says, excited

considerable suprise; in fact men flocked from field and village to see him, as if he were a prodigy. It was not that he was the man who had saved the city from the villainy of Catiline and had received from the Senate the title of 'father of his country' (though all that was mentioned too); it was because he levied no contributions on the communities through which he passed! The right of requisition was the legal right of the Roman proconsul even when *en route* for his province. He was limited by law in his exactions to certain articles; but the law, as might be expected, was evaded. All kinds of requisitions were made. An official called Gaius Verres—though only a member of the governor's staff—once levied from the cities *for himself* on a similar progress about $200,000 in hard cash, not to mention the gems, vases, statues and paintings (he had a taste for art) of which he plundered private individuals. This was the natural result of a fundamentally bad principle of government. The provinces in theory were regarded as conquered countries; they were the 'landed estates of the Roman people.' The public administration, civil and military, was quartered upon them, and this opened the door in practice to the commission of the most glaring acts of extortion on the part of public officials. Cicero boasts to Atticus of his own moderation in the matter (he calls it 'incredible abstinence.' Not a single cent had been exacted from the towns along the route towards the expenses of himself or his staff. They did not accept even free lodging: they slept in their tents. He had come into the provinces to mitigate the severity of Roman rule and make it acceptable, if possible, to the provincial.

His own province—he soon found—required his best efforts in this direction. His predecessor in the proconsulate of Cilicia was Appius Claudius, a haughty member of the Roman nobility and a brother of that Publius Clodius—who had been the willing tool of the triumvirs in procuring Cicero's banishment in 58. Like most of the Roman nobility, Appius always treated Cicero with true patrician arrogance which indeed Cicero takes no small credit to himself for not resenting. But Appius was 'loyal' (i.e. a member of the same party) and with Cicero it was always the country and the constitution first. Appius was a man of influence and highly connected—Pompey's son had married one of his daughters, Brutus another—and it was important, in

view of the political storm already threatening, that harmony should prevail among all who were loyal to the oligarchic regime. As a governor, Appius was neither better nor worse than the average Roman proconsul. He was indeed impeached for extortion and misgovernment on his return to Rome; but such impeachments were of too frequent occurrence to single anyone out as conspicuously infamous. But such a governor! "The province," Cicero says in a confidental letter to Atticus, "is simply ruined. It is the same story everywhere; people cannot pay their taxes. There are groans and cries from every district. Some of the atrocities committed by him are more like the acts of a wild beast than of a human being. Life is simply a burden." And again: "The province is drained dry by the expense he has put it to—to say nothing of the rapine and licentiousness of both himself and his staff." Such is the burden of Cicero's confidential correspondence. In his public despatches he makes no allusion to the condition of his province: the party interests involved were too serious; possibly such a state of things was nothing unusual.

That such should indeed have been the ordinary condition of the Roman provinces (i.e., of the world at large) in the time of Cicero, may well excite surprise. But the rule of the oligarchy, which had so long swayed the destiny of the great republic had failed; and nowhere so conspicuously and so dismally as in the provinces. The oligarchs were now engaged in a life and death struggle—hopeless and short-sighted—to perpetuate their own existence and their hands were full. But the Roman system of provincial government was vicious. The provinces had from the first been exploited in the interest of Roman revenue, and the wealth they poured into the exchequer had exempted the citizens of Rome from taxation for over one hundred years. The provincials had duties but no rights; the home government was not to be held responsible for their comfort or prosperity. Still, though the condition of the people was thus of minor importance, that of the land itself was the greatest. Roads were built, agriculture encouraged, and commercial centres established; public opinion severely condemned provincial misgovernment and oppression, and a standing court was instituted to check them. In spite of all, even when the central administration was sound and vigorous, evils

must have arisen. But in Cicero's day the trials for provincial misgovernment were a mere mockery of justice: the courts were worked as a part of the political machine and a good governor ran as much risk of condemnation as did a bad one. If the jury was not accessible on this side and remained proof against the spirit of party, it was rarely inaccessible to bribes. A man might very well take his chance. Freed from all checks, far removed from the influence of public opinion, a Roman governor knew no restraint except his own humanity and self-respect. He often owed his appointment to the corrupt expenditure of money at home; the temptation was too great, human nature was too weak and he usually made haste—he had but one year—to recoup and enrich himself at the expense of the province. The means were ready to his hand; he was practically absolute, being supreme both in civil and military affairs. The Senate allowed him troops and ships and money (Cicero refunded $40,000 of the government grant, much to the disgust of his staff); but the theory was that such expenditure was solely for the protection of Roman citizens and Roman interests. The governor was empowered to levy both men and money from the provinces for their own defence. We know from Shakespeare's Falstaff how "damnably the king's press may be misused." And it was so here: Money was paid for exemption from military service, for exemption from quartering soldiers, and—in evasion of the law that ordered payment—in commutation of requisitions for military stores. And all this, over and above the regular money-tribute or the tax in kind paid to the central government and over and above the regular allowance made by the province to meet the governor's expenses (Cicero pocketed from this about $100,000). The country was in fact under martial law; the proconsul had the power of life and death, and his will was supreme. But he was not only commander-in-chief, he was also supreme judge. If he cared to hold the scales unevenly and bear out knavery against honesty, injustice never failed to command its price. The venality of the proconsular tribunals was simply notorious.

There were also minor exactions such as the robbery of gold and silver ornaments and of art treasures, demands from the provincials for money and wild beasts for the Roman shows, for

money to satisfy the cupidity of the governor's staff, who were not likely to be behind their master in rapacity and for money to erect statues and temples in the provinces in honor of their tyrants.

But the extortions even of the proconsul and his staff sink into insignificance when compared with those of the Roman money-lender and the Roman publican, as the middleman who collected the taxes was called. The money-lenders swarmed like harpies over the empire, always ready to advance money to needy individuals or communities, at from twelve to forty-eight per cent., compound interest. Cities or princes that once fell into their toils had slight hope of extrication from what was nothing but a state of bondage. Arrears of interest were collected by the most rigorous process known to the law, or sometimes, when a pliant governor could be got, by military force.

The exactions of the publican were no less oppressive. The Roman system of collecting taxes was hoplessly bad: they were 'farmed' (as the phrase goes) by middlemen. All taxes, except the money-tribute, were put up at auction and let out to the highest bidder for a period of five years. This was the case with the octroi dues, the port or customs dues, and the tithes, which were paid in kind. The privilege of collection was bought up by companies of capitalists and exploited for what it would bring. They had to recoup themselves for their out-lay and they did it handsomely, at the expense of the provincials. They were thus of course always working for their own hand, the opportunity oppression was tempting, and the name of publican, by which they were usually known, became a by-word of reproach throughout the empire. The produce of the farm was at their mercy: it might be swept away at a moment's notice to pay the debt not only of the farmer himself but of the community to which he belonged. Stagnation and desolation followed in their train, with mental and physical inertia only broken when some act of unusual atrocity forced a cry of pain from the down-trodden provincial.

Cicero, as already stated, entered upon his official duties on July 31st, B.C. 51. He determined to give the first part of his year of office to the discharge of his military duties, and at once took the field with his little army. He had never been in camp since a boy of seventeen, and probably had never been in action in his life. But he behaved in the conduct of this campaign in a way not unworthy

of a Roman imperator. He had sensibly secured the appointment of a batch of military men upon his staff. One of these was his own brother Quintus, a soldier of great prudence and gallantry who had served with distinction on Caesar's staff during the campaigns in Gaul. Another was Gaius Pomptinus, who, as governor of the old Roman province of Gaul, had won credit by his defeat of the Allobroges. Accompained by such distinguished captains, he took the field with confidence and marched to the eastern frontier of his province. The Parthians had crossed the Euphrates under Pacorus, the son of their king Orodes, and had advanced to the gates of Antioch in which city Cassius (afterwards the conspirator), who had been quaestor on the staff of Crassus and was now in charge of the province, had shut himself up with all his forces. On receipt of this intelligence, Cicero marched into Cappadocia which was more exposed, he says, to attack than Cilicia, and the rumor of his approach, he adds, both encouraged Cassius and alarmed the Parthians. Be that as it may, the Parthian attack on Antioch failed and they recrossed the Euphrates after suffering considerable loss at the hands of Cassius, including that of one of their generals. Pacorus, soon after, turned his arms against his own father and internal dissension among the Parthians prevented the renewal of their attack upon the Roman empire. Cicero advanced south and east as far as the foot of the Amanus range, with the view of holding the passes against any attack on the part of the enemy. He took the opportunity of reducing the independent tribes of this region who, secure in their mountain strongholds, had hitherto successfully defied the Roman arms. He pitched his camp at Issus, which his vanity did not allow him to forget was memorable as the scene of the defeat of the Persian king Darius by Alexander the Great (a greater general, he writes Atticus, than either Atticus or himself). The capital stronghold called Pendenissus, he invested in the Roman way with vallum and fosse and agger, and assailed with archers and engines of war, until, on the forty-seventh day of the siege, Pendenissus was taken and razed to the ground (Of course, he writes to Atticus, you will say you never heard the name before; but it is not my fault if the place is not in Aetolia or Macedonia). The booty—except the horses—was given to the soldiers; the inhabitants were sold as slaves (the amount realized was

about half a million dollars); the proceeds were scrupulously paid into the state chest. Cicero had managed his first campaign with spirit and success and he was hailed "Imperator" by the soldiers on the field of battle, an honor which was usually followed by a triumph. The Senate appointed a public thanksgiving to the immortal gods in honor of his success, though Cato opposed the motion on the ground that it would be a greater honor if the credit of the victory were ascribed to the general himself. The triumph never came; men's minds were soon taken up with weightier matters.

All fear of the Parthian invasion having subsided, Cicero next turned his attention to his civil duties. With the object of bringing justice to the doors of the people of the whole province, the Romans usually established in every province a system of circuit courts. Cicero held such courts at Laodicea, Cibyra, and Apamea, and in Pamphilia, Lycaonia and Isauria. He won all hearts by his affability and courtesy. He made himself accessible to all. No one, who had a petition to offer or a wrong that required redress, had to seek access, he says, by means of a secretary or a groom of the bed-chamber. Men went straight to the proconsul himself. He respected the native laws and customs in his administration of justice; he examined the accounts of the native magistrates, and in some cases made them disgorge their ill-gotten gains; and, by scrupulously declining to make requisitions or accept presents, he enabled the communities to pay up their arrears to both money-lender and publican.

Two cases that came under his jurisdiction deserve attention, as illustrating at once the character of Cicero and the character of Rome's rule in the provinces. Ariobarzanes, king of Cappadocia, was one of those "client princes" whom Rome used as instruments of dominion to prepare their peoples for the ultimate acceptance of Roman rule. He had been specially commended to the new governor's care by the Senate; but Cicero writes Atticus that he did not know what he could do for him unless indeed he declared him bankrupt and repudiated his debts. He owed money to Marcus Brutus who was very anxious to have him 'squeezed' for the arrears of interest. Cicero told the king that he must pay up; but the difficulty of collecting the money exceeded the governor's ability; nothing could

be got out of the king. He offered the governor a present for himself; but his revenue was already swallowed up (he said) *in paying interest on money he owed to Pompey*. This amounted to twenty-five thousand dollars a month!

The second case is even more astounding. Marcus Brutus had, by means of an agent called Scaptius, advanced a sum of money to the town of Salamis in Cyprus, at interest at the rate of forty-eight per cent. per annum. The rate was illegal; but a decree of the Roman Senate had been passed allowing interest to be collected as agreed upon in this particular bond. The agent Scaptius had been appointed to a military command under Appius, and, armed with this authority, had attempted to coerce the magistrates of Salamis to pay up. With the help of a troop of horse, he kept them imprisoned in the town-hall until five of their number were starved to death. A deputation from the island met Cicero on his arrival in Asia Minor and implored his protection. Cicero ordered the cavalry to be withdrawn. Scaptius had the effrontery to apply to Cicero for a re-appointment to his military command. Cicero declined: he would not give such a position to anyone engaged in trade in the country; he would, however, recover the money for Brutus. The Salaminians were ready to pay; in fact (they said) the present of money they annually made the Roman governor was more than the sum they owed to Brutus; and, as Cicero had declined this present, they were well able to pay. The only question was as to the amount of their debt. Cicero had already announced that he would recognise interest at twelve per cent. Nothing higher. Scaptius claimed forty-eight. This meant ruin for the town. They were willing to pay principal and interest to the amount of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars; Scaptius claimed two hundred and fifty thousand. *He took Cicero aside* and begged him to let the matter stand over. He knew that the next governor would be more pliant. Cicero consented, though the Salaminians begged to be allowed to deposit the money in a temple to stop further interest from accruing. This piece of injustice Cicero perpetrated, not out of personal regard for Brutus, who, he says, always treated him in a dogmatic, disagreeable way, but in the interest of the republican oligarchy, with the perpetuation of which they both believed the existence of the country was bound up.

The whole transaction reveals the famous liberator, Marcus Brutus, in a bad, though somewhat novel, light. He is usually regarded as one of the world's 'uncrowned kings.' Shakespeare, who represents Plutarch's view, calls him in the *Julius Caesar* "the noblest Roman of them all" and makes him say:

"For I can raise no money by vile means:
By heaven, I had rather coin my heart,
And drop my blood for drachms, than to wring
From the hard hands of peasants their vile trash."

Such is not the judgment of history. But we are bound to believe that Brutus was no worse than the rest—perhaps better. If so, it is not hard to see why the days of the Roman oligarchy were even then numbered. The lust of wealth had eaten like a canker into the Roman heart and driven out reason and humanity and true patriotism. The public men of Rome seemed like nothing so much as a herd of swine rushing violently down a steep place into the sea.

Cicero himself appears, as he always does appear—and no public man of ancient or modern times is more accurately known—not as a paragon of all excellence as represented in the pages of Dr. Conyers Middleton or, as Mommsen would have us believe, as a weak-kneed, unprincipled trimmer—but as a man, vain indeed, but of generous impulses and transparent honesty of intention driven by politicial exigency and mistaken patriotism to make an evil compromise with high principle.

J. FLETCHER.

CRITICAL NOTES.

SHELLEY AND BROWNING.

THEY were very unlike each other, Shelley and Browning in the form and substance of their poetry. Shelley seems nearly always to be dealing with great abstractions, vague Pantheistic conceptions of life, gigantic syntheses of history which annihilate the social and political differences of centuries as if they were hardly worth noticing. An epic written by him on Moses, or Mahomet or Napoleon would not exhibit any substantial difference with the different subjects. It would be a representation of the same struggle between the eternal despot, the oppressor of the human race, and that eternal slave to laws, conventions and hypocrisies, the mass of mankind, with all the modifying circumstances of environment and civilisation omitted. In his poems the *dramatis personae* are mostly great symbols, Promethens and the Oceanides, Alastor and the witch of Atlas. Symbolic serpents and eagles, blood-red comets and stars, abyssmal caverns, trackless oceans, and voices weird and solemn remind us more of the author of the Apocalypse than of any writings which are known as poetry. In such a world the individual is almost lost. He is a mere name, a symbol, a leaf blown about by the winds and tossed up in the front of the great revolutions and cataclysms of the human race. Shelley's place amongst English poets may be differently estimated, but even those who estimate it most highly will hardly claim that he has added a single really human type to that great gallery of 'men and women' which literature has created and endowed with a reality as lasting as that which belongs to the heroes and notabilities of history.

With Browning it is precisely the reverse. He is essentially dramatic and concrete and in all his poems the centre of interest is an individual life. He knows the movement of the ages and the high generalisations of philosophy as well as Shelley, perhaps even more critically, but it is only as these agitate the life of the individual and are reflected in it that he takes notice of them. He would never, as Shelley does, write a hymn to Intellectual Beauty in the abstract, but in the rhapsody of Abt Vogler, in the disciple's chant over his dead master, the Grammarian, in Rabbi Ben Ezra, or Pictor Ignotus, there

is the individualized form, the incarnation so to speak of Shelley's conception; and while nothing is lost of its wonder and glory, its reality for the ordinary reader at least is much more manifest.

Hence though both are equally priests and worshippers of the ideal, interpreters of what is mysterious and infinite in the nature of man, Browning who can discern that element even in what we might consider weak and disordered forms of individual life has a joyous and exuberant energy, a delight in life which is not in Shelley. Even in face of the great shadows of existence, in face of sorrow, or failure, or death, Browning's voice in robust and triumphant. His optimism is invincible because it is based on his strong sense of life and wise acceptance of its facts.

Shelley on the other hand is the most uniformly sad of our great poets. There is a deep melancholy in most of his poetry. He is constantly striving to define or body forth some infinite form of existance or power in nature and history in comparison with which the life of the individual is as nothing. To use a phrase of Hugo's, he is always gazing into the abyss, contemplating that great process of decay by which all individual existence is sinking back into the sea of Being from which it arose. The world of Shelley's thought though it has a certain grandeur, even sublimity, is cold and gloomy. It is curious to notice what a prominent place images of ruin and decay have in his poetry. His vein in this respect is unsurpassed. What an image that is, for instance, in the *Adonais*, of old Rome, the Rome of the Popes and cardinals, as it was fifty years ago!

> And grey walls moulder round, on which dull Time
> Feeds, like slow fire upon a hoary brand.

I open Shelley at any page almost and come upon such images of ruin and decay as these

> Like the last glare of day's red agony.
> Death feeds on his mute voice.
> Where marble demons watch
> The Zodiac's brazen mystery, and dead men
> Hang their mute thoughts on the mute walls around.

and a hundred others all eloquently expressive of the sombre tint of Shelley's imagination.

There is an interesting example of the difference of spirit between the two great poets. Both are looking on a scene almost the same of the Italy they loved so well, the seashore near Naples with its

magnificent coast line, its heights, its opulence of colour and sunshine. And nothing surely could excel the manner in which Shelley has described the delicate, evanescent yet escential features of the scene, the all pervading light and warmth of Italian landscape.

The sun is warm, the sky is clear,
The waves are dancing fast and bright,
Blue isles and snowy mountains wear
The purple noon's transparent light
Around its unexpanded buds;
Like many a voice of one delight,
The winds, the birds, the ocean floods,
The City's voice itself is soft, like Solitude's.

I see the Deep's untrampled floor
With green and purple seaweeds strown;
I see the waves upon the shore,
Like light dissolved in star-showers, thrown:
I sit upon the sands alone,
The lightning of the noon-tide ocean
Is flashing around me, and a tone
Arises from its measured motion,
How sweet! did any heart now share in my motion.

But even in these beautiful verses there is an undertone of melancholy which makes itself felt in a certain settled gravity of accent and rhythm. The shadow is there however softly it sleeps on the surface. And in the next stanza the habitual melancholy of Shelley has broken out in an cry almost of despair.

Alas! I have nor hope nor health,
Nor peace within nor calm around,
Nor that content surpassing wealth
The sage in meditation found.

That is the cry which the sight of the Bay of Baiæ in all its noon-tide glory awakes in the heart of Shelley.

It is true these are 'Stanzas written in dejection', but except in a few short lyrics, this tone of melancholy is never altogether absent from his poetry. And the cause of it is that his poetry contains so little of what is concrete, so little of the actual movement of life, and so much contemplation of the infinite and the ideal in a form which seems to destroy instead of stimulating our sense of the individual life. This isolates him from the sympathies of ordinary humanity. And

he feels his isolation and in his proud sad way laments it as part of his destiny

Some might lament that I were cold,
As I, when this sweet day is gone,
Which my lost heart, too soon grown cold,
Insults with this untimely moan:
They might lament—*for I am one*
When men love not;—and yet regret.

A sick eagle, lonely on the heights! while below in the lower air, the swallow is merrily hunting his prey and fields of crows are busy picking up worms in their cheerful gregarious way.

In Browning's poem, *The Englishman in Italy*, it is virtually the same scene, but how differently seen and pictured for us. There are vivid details, strong descriptive touches in it—

Oh, those mountains, their infinite movement!
Still moving with you.

but there is nothing that approaches the breadth and harmony of Shelley's picture of sound and light and movement on the noon-tide ocean. What Browning does give us, however, with extraordinary fullness and power is the way in which men live on this spot of earth. For though he is no landscape painter like Wordsworth and Shelly, he has a picturesque stroke of his own, very novel and powerful in description.

His picture of the Italian fisherman is a good example of his manner, the fisherman who arrives daily from Amalfi and pitches down

his basket before us,
All trembling alive
With pink and grey jellies, your sea-fruit;
You touch the strange lumps,
And mouths gape there, eyes open, all manner
Of horns and of humps,
Which only the fisher looks grave at,
While round him like imps
Cling screaming the children as naked
And brown as his shrimps.

What a strange manner that is! robust and natural even to roughness, disregardful of the old standards of elegance in style,

but there is a wonderful faculty of representing life and nature truly and vividly in it, and there is a subtle charm in the perfect freedom ahd spontaneity of its movement. And it is capable not only of such realistic pictures, in which Browning is hardly to be rivalled; it has its higher notes sage and solemn as the music of the epic poet, and yet still preserving that fundamental characteristic of free and natural movement.

Over all trod my mule with the caution
  Of gleaners o'er sheaves,
Still foot after foot like a lady:
  So, round after round,
He climbed to the top of Calvano,
  And God's own profound
Was above me, and round me the mountains,
  And under, the sea,
And within me my heart to bear witness
  What was and shall be.
Oh, heaven and the terrible crystal!
  No rampart excludes
Your eye from the life to be lived
  In the blue solitudes.
Oh, those mountains, their infinite movement!
  Still moving with you;
For, ever some new head and breast of them
  Thrusts into view
To observe the intruder.

In these lines one may feel the difference between the spirit of Browning's poetry and that of Shelley's. Browning has unfailing interest in the life of the individual and rejoices in all forms of its manifestation. In his poem there is the bounding rhythm and energetic phrase of a hopeful exuberant life. It is a psalm of faith and delight in creation,—'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof.' While Shelley absorbed in transcendent contemplation and gazing fixedly at the absolute has almost lost touch with the common life of men. Nevertheless there is a strong affinity between those two. With both poetry is a philosophy of life and both in their different ways take hold of that which is abiding and eternal in it, Shelley in his high flight through the empyrean of philosophic ideas, Browning in his profound analysis of life in its manifold individual forms. Neither

has ever spent a rhyme on the merely picturesque, or the sentimental or the romantic, and the poetry of both is still perhaps to a great extent unreadable for those who cannot escape from the conventional and traditional aspects of life into the genuine freedom of the ideal. Some sense of this fact probably prompted that incomparable tribute which Browning long ago, before he too became a mighty name, and even in a way popular, paid to Shelley in his poem of *Pauline*

Sun-treader, life and light be thine forever.

If anyone wants to know what new development of English blank sense has taken place since Wordsworth, let him read that and the next nine lines in *Pauline*, which he will find quoted on another page of this issue.

JAMES CAPPON.

CURRENT EVENTS.

TO the average man, the war between China and Japan concerning Corea is unintelligible in its causes, operations and probable results. He is interested, as he would be in a dog-fight. He has a hazy idea that the war may be good for trade somehow and possibly bad for trade. If a soldier, even a citizen-soldier, he is sure that Russia is pulling the strings, and that it behoves Britain to keep her eyes open to secure equivalent advantages. If he is interested in missions, he is anxious to know whether the Churches should send in more agents or hold their hands or recall the men and women now at work. But, all the time he is groping in the dark. "White men mighty onsartin," remarked an Indian, who felt that he was incapable of understanding white mens' motives and unable therefore to predict what they were likely to do. Whites feel a similar helplessness in dealing with yellows, with a semi-contemptuous conviction that it is hardly worth knowing. They forget what a great part Tartars have played in history and that the race, possessed of modern implements of war, and without the moral restraints imposed on us by religion and habit, might possibly again play havoc on a terrible scale; and that wars like the present are calculated to give them that familiarity with new weapons, which is the one thing they lack.

The War between China and Japan.

In this condition of mind, compounded of nine parts of ignorance and one of indifference, he learns nothing by reading the telegraphic despatches concerning marches, battles, sinking of ships, uprisings of the Coreans, and the other details of the campaign. In every account, Japanese might be substituted for Chinese or *vice versa*, and the net result so far as real knowledge of the state of affairs is concerned would be the same on the mind. All that can be done is to wait for the end of the war; or, a very big brush should be used. Unfortunately that can be used by few, and of these some use it on one side and some on the other.

A possible war between Britain and Russia, has been likened to a conflict between a whale and an elephant. Neither could win, for neither could get at the other. It is much the same with China and Japan. Japan could no more conquer and hold China than Britain could conquer and hold Europe. Even to hold France, when France was humbled and distracted, was more than she could manage. For an island kingdom of forty millions of people to subjugate a continental people of four hundred millions is an impossibility. Japan's measure of success is likely to depend on two factors,—the quality of the new soldiery and the extent to which China is honeycombed with disaffection towards the Manchu dynasty. As to the first, it is continually

forgotten by papers, generally well-informed, that the rank and file are no longer the old Samurai class, the best swordsmen in the world, and perfect dare-devils. Those men, the military retainers of the daimios or hereditary nobles, would have made splendid soldiers, but when the feudal system broke up a generation ago, it was thought wise to put them in positions where they would be least dangerous to the new order of things. They became officers, civil servants, policemen or pensioners, and the army was largely recruited from the lower classes. It has yet to be proved that the new material is equal to the two-sworded "Knights" of the olden times, proud of their silken robes and the crest of their clan, prouder still of the swords their ancestors left them, who disdained work or business, and felt that the slightest stain on their honour or reflection on their courage must be avenged by death. The equipment of the new army appears to be complete, even to ambulance trains, but it is not likely to be more complete nor the officers any better than those of the French in Tonquin, who—though always gaining victories—in the end agreed to a peace which left the fruits of victory with China. The one hope that Japan might entertain is the capture of Pekin, and consequent internal rebellions which would paralyse the Chinese Government. The first, however, is a much more difficult nut to crack than is supposed. It could hardly be accomplished without the total defeat of the Chinese fleet and the destruction of the fortresses which guard the opposite sides of the entrance to the Gulf of Pe-Chi-li. As to the second, no one can speak positively.

THAT China should overrun and hold Japan is equally out of the question. The London Spectator thinks otherwise. The war, it says, may develope a Tartar General of ability, who—after crushing the enemy in Corea, might conceivably throw 100,000 men across the narrow sea and conquer Japan, seeing that there is no such thing as patriotism among Oriental peoples. The writer evidently knows nothing of Japanese history and character, and above all of their universal and passionate patriotism. China has tried invasion before and with an "Invincible Armada" too, but the experience was as decisive as it was in the case of Spain against England. In the 17th Century, the Mougol Tartars having overcome the Sung dynasty in China and conquered the adjoining countries, sent embassies to Japan, demanding tribute and homage. They were sent home again, with a haughty answer. Other envoys came and their heads were cut off. Hostile expeditions were tried, and as they accomplished nothing, it was determined, in 1281, that the island kingdom should be swallowed up. 3,500 ships, with 100,000 Chinese and Tartars and 7,000 Coreans, sailed for Japan. Only 3 of the soldiers ever saw China again, and these were sent back to tell the tale. In the national feeling which was aroused, in the religious enthusiasm of the people, in the cyclone which burst on the invading fleet, and in the slaughter of those who made the land, the story reminds us of the Spanish Armada episode in English history. No invasion has been attempted since. To

transport a force adequate to conquer forty millions of people attached to their own soil, proud of their history, brave, skilful and united would be an impossibility for China, even with all the advantages that steam-power gives to an invader. If the Japanese are not patriotic, we must find a new definition for tne term. They are willing to make any sacrifice for their country, and would attempt the impossible rather than submit to national dishonour.

THAT Japan should hold Corea permanently, is also out of the question. It would be more dangerous for China to have such a neighbour flanking Pekin that it would be for England to have France in complete possession of Belgium and Holland. China would fight for generations rather than accept peace on such terms. It is one thing for Japan to beat the Chinese and Corean armies. She has done that before and she can do it again. She has even held Corea for years, gaining great glory but draining away her blood and treasure thereby. In the end, however, she had to leave. And, if she had only to reckon with China, she would have to leave again. She cannot afford a thirty years war, for modern war is expensive and her resources are not exhaustless. But she knows that Russia too would not allow her to annex Corea, unless for a price that would be her sure eventual ruin. In the meanwhile, Russia is not ill-pleased to see the two Eastern powers, with whom she has to deal, weakening themselves. If it amuses them, it certainly does not hurt her. As for Britain, her voluntary surrender of Port Hamilton proved what her policy was. Unlike Russia, she has no sinister end to gain, and Japan, if wise, will seek through her good offices to establish administrative reforms in Corea on an international basis, and then retire. Will she be content with this, in the hour of victory? Magnanimity, on the part of individuals and nations, is true wisdom, but history shows so little of it, that no nation is in a position to throw stones at another. Japan is more likely to strike for Pekin, and, if so, she takes heavy risks. In justice to her, let it be understood that for years Corea has treated with indifference her well-founded complaints of injustice, and that China has been contemptuous. The idea that Japan entered on the war as a political move, in order that the Cabinet might make some political capital, is preposterous. Japan has larger trade interests in Corea than any or all other countries, and she has a right to insist that these shall be protected. Whether she could have secured this end without going to war is a question. My own opinion is that she exercised forbearance for a longer time than any European country would have shown, and that longer delay could not have been expected. The people, as one man, are behind the Government, and they are the best judges of their own honour and interests. They declare that they are not fighting for conquest; that they ask for nothing but the observance of treaties; and that it will please them better to see Corea secure from all foreign control than to have it as a Province of Japan.

AFTER four years of labour pains, the Democratic party in the States has brought forth the Gorman Bill. How deep the President's resentment is we may judge from his letter to Mr. Cutchings, and how bitterly the best men in the party are disappointed, the elections in Maine and Vermont show. The November elections will probably prove that the same feeling extends all over the country. Canada has had a lesson, in letters sufficiently large for the unlearned to read, on the difference between the constitutions of the two countries, as well as a lesson on the danger of fostering special interests, in which "the communism of pelf" must be stronger than even the cohesion of party.

President Cleveland and the Gorman Bill.

In 1890, a combination of protected interests passed the McKinley Bill. It was the most complete system of "scientific protection" ever evolved on this continent, for it aimed at protecting all classes. The agricultural clauses were not drawn in a spirit of hostility to Canada, as has sometimes been said, but simply that the farmers of the States contiguous to Canada might have their fair share of protection. Many of our own farmers, who are opposed to the protection of coal oil and store goods, are eager to be protected against American corn and pork. The American farmer was more reasonable. He was willing to bless the manufacturers but he asked a share of the blessing for himself. McKinley, accordingly, threw his shield round him, and the Senate was so "fixed" by the admission of new, scantily-peopled Republican States, that it was believed that it would be impossible to throw off the shield for at least eight years. The November elections of 1890, however, showed that the people at large did not appreciate the blessing even of scientific protection. To the amazement of good Republicans they kicked vigorously, by sending an overwhelming Democratic majority to Congress. That would have settled McKinley at once, had the States only had the Constitution of Canada; but in the land of freedom, the Senate has co-ordinate powers with the people's House and nothing could be done. Give McKinley time; let him have a fair chance, his friends said, and the people will see his beauty. The Constitution gave what they asked for; but with the lapse of years, he seemed more objectionable than ever, and in 1892 the Republican rout was so complete that—contrary to all expectations—the Senate was captured as well as the Executive and the Congress. Again, had the States only had our Constitution, the popular mandate would have been instantly obeyed; but in the land where alone there is "government of the people, by the people, for the people," McKinley still reigned supreme till last August, and when he stepped down, his place was taken, not by Wilson who represented the Democratic party, but by Gorman, who represented the Sugar Trust!

THE victory of the protected interests is complete. They have not only baffled the popular will again and again, but they have degraded the branch of their Legislature which had hitherto been honoured by the world. Freeman declared that the U. S. Senate

was as much superior to the House of Lords as Congress was inferior to the House of Commons. If the great historian were alive now, he would have to give a different verdict. For, at any rate, the House of Lords has never been even suspected of boodling or condoning it in any of its members. But when one Senator confesses that he had "inadvertently" ordered his broker to buy stock in the Sugar Trust, while the duty was pending, and others let it be known that the Trust must be satisfied, and the representatives of other interests insisted on their pound of flesh, and when—in conference with the popular house—the representatives of the Senate took the position that they had come, not to confer or to compromise, much less to yield, and that the question was simply between their Bill or no tariff legislation at all, what can be said for the Senate? No despot would ever have attempted, against the expressed will of the people, what the Senators have done. The House of Lords dare not touch a money bill. They accepted, last Session, Sir William Vernon Harcourt's Budget, though it was ostentatiously and almost insolently directed against themselves. But in the States, a handful of millionaires or the lacqueys of millionaires laugh at the people and at their own party platform, clap on new taxes and enrich themselves or the rings they represent with the spoils Strange to say, there is scarcely a murmur of popular discontent. Murmurs might be interpreted as meaning that the Constitution of the United States is not perfect, and it is safer to rail at the Almighty than at the Constitution. It is impossible not to admire this sturdy faith. Our neighbours come of a good stock. The old English tenacity, the *nolumus leges Angliae mutare*, is evidently in them. They are likely to accomplish something great in the world. At any rate, a high authority has said that a nation, without deeply rooted Conservative instincts, cannot accomplish anything.

THE President was too strong for the rings on the Silver question, but they had their revenge when it came to the tariff. His own action helped them, though he meant far otherwise. Long before this, he must have felt that his letter to Mr. Wilson was a mistake. It should not have been written, unless he had made up his mind to veto, in case the Senate insisted on the Gorman Bill. That letter put him in the power of the Senators whom he had previously angered, and it misled people who believed that he was a man whom party necessities could not bend, a man who would not change if once the word went forth from his lips. Perhaps his success with the Silver Bill, and the universal approval which greeted his letter to Governor Altgeld and his proclamation in sending the troops to Chicago, made him fancy that a strong letter would stiffen his party in Congress and evoke a national sentiment so universal as to make the Senators quail. But the circumstances were different and circumstances alter cases. The majority of the Republican Senators were with him in the fight for honest money. Well they might, for the strength of their party is in States which do not produce silver and

which have no idea of enacting that fifty cents make a dollar. The Chicago riots, with the attitude of the Governor and the municipal authorities, threatened society, and the wide-spread paralysis alike of trade, of travel and of authority so alarmed people that a universal sigh of relief went up when a strong voice was heard, declaring that order would be maintained. But the tariff, unfortunately, is a party question, and the mass of the American people know nothing of economic principles. They know when they are hurt, but to know what hurts them is another thing. The Republicans as a body are still wedded to protection, and there was only an uncertain Democratic majority of four or five in the Senate. Such a letter as that to Mr. Wilson put their backs up. To be told that they had betrayed their trust and that their Bill was a fraud was too much for human nature, especially when the language came from the head of their party. If he thinks so, why did he not let us know unmistakably, before we had committed ourselves, was a natural rejoinder. They determined therefore to stand together, and when that was known, the party in Congress had to stand with them. They could not go back to their constituents, confessing that they had not been able to do anything. That left the President standing alone. What was he to do? He could not sign the Bill which he had denounced. But to veto it was leave McKinley in possession. Never was a President in a more cruel strait. A strong man is expected to say yea or nay. He said neither, and the Bill became law, just as if there had been no President.

Did he take the right course? The majority answers yes. The Gorman Bill was better than the McKinley and he had no right to deprive the people of its benefits. A minority answers no. The national honour is of more consequence than a measure of tariff relief and the President had declared the Gorman Bill a dishonour. Had he acted up to that declaration, the people would have vindicated him and punished the traitors. As it is, the traitors have won, and the Sugar Trust and its friends pocket forty millions, with the added satisfaction of knowing that they forced Mr. Cleveland—the strongest President since Lincoln—to practically abdicate his position. In his letter to Mr. Wilson he sounded the trumpet as leader, but when the time came to lead, he announced himself as one of the rank and file. The sound of the trumpet meant then not war but bluff, and Mr. Cleveland is the one man from whom bluff was not expected.

Of course, the pressure was so great that only granite could have resisted. Had he stood firm, what would have happened? Unspeakable confusion for a time, and then a clear issue between the parties, with Mr. Cleveland as leader of one party. Now, there is neither a clear issue nor a leader.

THE terrible revelations of 1891, concerning the Public Works Department of the Dominion and Quebec Provinces, aroused the conscience of the people, and the prosecutions which were undertaken promised a new regime. It was understood that Sir John

The Curran Bridge Scandal.

Thompson had taken a decided stand and that Sir John Abbott was with him. But the cancer is very deep, as deep at any rate as the party system, and the disease is showing itself again as foul as ever. Nothing certainly could be more complete than the corruption connected with the Lachine Canal Bridges. So numerous and experienced were theforces engaged in the conspiracy of plunder, that Mr. Haggart professed himself unable, even with the help of detectives, to get at the heart of the business. Indeed, he naively confessed that he was not aware of anything being amiss until he read an item in the Montreal Star! Here was public work going on, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars more than the estimates, but the Department—presided over by a responsible Minister, with a capable Engineer-in-chief and scores of skilled employees —is dependent for information on a newspaper costing one cent! It would appear that the country should employ a newspaper staff or in some way change its system or its men. According to the inquiry made by the Public Accounts Committee, the excess in the cost of the work was about $200,000, and he must be an extremely credulous person who fancies that the Committee detected everything. Some subordinates were dismissed and a promise was given—not yet fulfilled—to prosecute the contractor. A new view of the matter, however, is now given by another member of the Cabinet, the Hon. Mr. Ouimet. According to him, there was nothing wrong about the business, and people, instead of referring to it should speak only of what Count Mercier did in 1891. His words to the electors at L'Assomption, on Sept. 18th, are so unequivocal that—if true—the subordinates who were dismissed should be reinstated, with a public apology. "The Liberals," he said, "would speak about the Curran bridge! The Baie des Chaleurs scandal was more seasonable, considering the weather. The Curran Bridge had cost dear, but not more than it ought to have cost. The work had had to be performed rapidly. Every day that it remained unfinished after the opening of navigation would have cost the mercantile community at least a hundred thousand dollars. Men had, therefore, to be kept at work night and day, and the extra expense had been unavoidable." ! ! !

How extremely satisfactory to be assured of this! Only a very unreasonable critic would ask why Mr. Ouimet was unable to satisfy so *exigeant* a colleague as Mr. Haggart, or to defend the extra expense either in Parliament or before the Public Accounts Committee. Probably the same critic might add that, when all the circumstances of this case are considered, the defence shows a more shocking condition of affairs than the crime.

For, since Mr. Ouimet delivered himself, Mr. Justice Burbidge has pronounced on part of the case, and when a Judge speaks from the bench, our judgment is no longer tossed to and fro between rival politicians and party organs. The feet of the poor public are then on a rock. His Lordship, in rendering judgment in the Exchequer Court, on a petition of the contractor, which was dismissed with costs, made some startling statements. The same person, it would seem, acted as time-keeper for and took pay from both the contractor and

the Crown! Is that the principle on which the Department of Railways or Public Works usually acts? Again, of a total claim of $284,192, there were proper certificates for $80,384. For the balance of $203,798 the certificates were "to say the least, utterly valueless!" The only marvel is that the Department should have been careful about $80,000, when it was quite indifferent about $203,000. Further, the contractor had deliberately destroyed his books and papers, and yet came into court as a supplicant for justice! He and his friends should certainly get justice. Again, "The excessive cost of the work might be charged partly to the idling on the part of the men, but the evidence pointed rather to a falsification of the pay lists as the principal cause. Evidence showed that the supplicant did not hestitate to falsify his accounts!" We now see what a Minister of the Crown means when he declares that the extra expense of the work in question was "unavoidable."

IT is difficult to write of such a case with calmness; still more difficult when it is only a specimen, and when it is remembered that in the last days of the last session of Parliament over four millions of dollars were voted, in the face of a steadily falling revenue, as subsidies for railways which are purely local and which will now assuredly be "milked" for the party. Men may differ in opinion about the tariff. They may think it right to tax an article of general consumption, like coal oil, one hundred per cent., or practically to shut our ports against British goods, though Britain is the one sure market for our stuff and though our national interests are the same as hers and she has to pay the piper for their defence. Arguments can be made on different sides of such questions and we must listen to them and answer them respectfully. But no argument can be constructed in favour of systematically robbing the public strong-box, with the tacit consent of a guardian of the strong-box, and his denial afterwards that there has been any robbery at all. By these things a country loses its soul. If we cannot stamp these things out, we are not fit to be free. The interest of the whole is the interest of each part, and each citizen is therefore bound by the very instinct of self-preservation to register a vow before the altar of his conscience that, so far as he has the power, these things shall for ever cease and determine in Canada.

CORRUPTION, condoned by Cabinet Ministers, penetrates to the lowest stratum of society. At the meeting of the electors of L'Assomption already referred to, ex-alderman Jeannote, the sitting member, gave a lucid explanation of what he had done for them. "He pointed to the number of positions which he had secured for electors of L'Assomption County. Appointments to the aggregate value of $6752 annually had been obtained for them through his influence in the corporation of Montreal. The money that paid them did not come out of the pockets of his electors; it was the citizens of Montreal who were taxed for them. He had secured four Govern-

ment posts for his friends last year. *There were still more to be secured in the future.* His electors would always find him their faithful and devoted servant. He was comfortably off, and a bachelor, which left him free to look after their interests."

This is delicious. Other members do such things but, as a tribute to public decency, keep them a dead secret. But, Mr. Jeannote has no mawkish scruples. He publishes his good deeds from the housetop. And, though the meeting was a joint one, and Mr. Tarte was present for the opposition, no one uttered a word of protest. Mr. Tarte cared for only one thing. The Government, in defiance of the Constitution, must disallow the Manitoba school-law. "My heart," he said, "melts at the sight of my fellow-countrymen ill-treated." Mr. Ouimet agreed with him that the one thing needful was that children in Manitoba "should learn on the school-benches the religious principles which make good citizens." How edifying this mutual zeal for religion! It reminds us of the husband protesting love for his wife in public and vehemently kissing her photograph, while every one knew that at home he starved her, stripped her and beat her within an inch of her life. For, while there may be ecclesiasticism, these cannot be religion without morality, and public is as imperative as private morality. From the platform there was only praise for the good Mr. Jeannote. "Your member" said the representative of the Government to the assembled people, "had the quality of independence, and that was a quality which a Goverment appreciated. It was from the independent members that they expected and received valuable suggestions for their guidance, and the value of such members could not be over-estimated!"

There is nothing in Pickwick to beat this. If Grip does not draw this picture of "the independent members," it should be sent to Punch. But, what a difficult country Canada is to govern, when politicians openly avow that it must be governed on the principle of buying the members and of the members buying their constituents! Who does not long for a true national party to arise? Will the Patrons of Industry prove to be such a party? As our farmers must eventually bear the main burden of government, purity and economy of administration concern them directly. They represent, too, the best elements of the population, and if they can be aroused and organized, they can do what they please, if only they understand that their great duty is to select honest and capable leaders. A farmer can betray a cause just as readily as a lawyer, and once he has secured an office as his price, he can snap his fingers at angry constituents. The Patrons had better look out for two or three men out of whom statesman can be made. Let them think not of the calling of the Candidate, but of their own platform and of the capacity of the Candidate to get it manufactured into law at Ottawa.

G.