

www.forgottenbooks.com

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

BY

ARCHIBALD WEIR, M.A.

AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORICAL BASIS OF MODERN EUROPE," "A STUDENT'S INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL PHILOSOPHY"

"Oblivion is the dark page whereon Memory writes her light-beam characters." — CARLYLE



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
The Riverside Press, Cambridge
1907

GENERAL

Published October 1907

PREFACE

THE purpose of this volume is to review in their logical connection the chief groups of events which formed the groundwork of European history in the nineteenth century. Though historical in form, the book does not pretend to be a history, but aims only at presenting such a preliminary view of the immediate antecedents of modern civilization as will supply a sufficient basis for a comprehensive study of our age. To effect this object, it has been necessary to abandon the usual artifice of bringing all history under the head of politics, and to distribute the subject in the following manner.

The introductory chapter endeavours to indicate as summarily as possible the evils of the monarchico-feudal system in the eighteenth century, and the ideas of reform which were generated by the contemporary intellectual movement. The second chapter reviews the work of the chief reforming monarchs and ministers, in order to exhibit the actual state of Europe in the latter part of the century, and to draw attention to the fact that monarchy by its good offices obtained over men's minds considerable influence, which survived the Revolution, and has played a prominent part in subsequent political history. The same chapter, however, shows how monarchy failed to meet all the urgent wants of the time; and the next chapter gives an account of the causes which precipitated the Revolution. The fourth chapter deals with the

165883

Napoleonic period so far as is required to range in their places the most notable results of the Revolutionary movement. Two more chapters consider the changes in Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia, Scandinavia, Turkey, Servia, and Greece, from which the modern history of these countries takes its departure. The seventh chapter describes the industrial revolution in England, which operated more than any other order of causes to change the conditions of political, social, and individual life throughout civilized communities. The eighth supplements this account of modern industrialism by indicating in outline the mechanical progress to which the industrial revolution was mainly due, and by reviewing briefly the formation of the theory of political economy, which was to assist in the development of industrialism. The ninth chapter shows how inductive research attained to a success, which, without intermission, has led physical science to its present state of influence and power. The same chapter supplements the intellectual side of this account by pointing out how the deeper problems of existence received a new statement in Germany, which, with the tendencies of British thought, has governed speculation till our own day. In Germany, too, closely connected with the national regeneration, and rich in humanizing elements, occurred a literary revival which is the subject of Chapter X. In England, also, literature entered on a new development, which enabled it to respond to the needs of an expanded society, and to contribute to European culture. This subject is reviewed in Chapter XI.; but the literary innovations in France, and some even in Germany, which fall within the chronological limits covered by the above events, are so manifestly characteristic of the time of reaction that it would have exceeded the purpose of this volume to have included them in the same survey.

A concluding chapter briefly comments on the results of the foregoing reviews, and demonstrates that the historical problem of our time far transcends the scope of the dictum that history is past politics and that politics are present history. The dominant order of changes is now, indeed, industrial. It is the striving of men to obtain wealth and material comfort that in this age mainly determines the form and objects of their political organization. It is this which sets the aims of their self-culture and the ideals of their scientific research. What in past times was determined by reverence for God, the state, and the family, or by fear of present or future punishment, is now for the most part controlled by the principles of co-operative production and distribution. We have, indeed, the ideas of religion for religion's sake, of art for art's sake, of self for self's sake, of culture for culture's sake. But only in a secondary manner do the ideas of social perfection and individual development, of speculative truth and positive belief, influence now the policy which proximate utility dictates. Yet the period bears no resemblance to those moments of history when ease and luxury have been the guiding ends of a ruling few. The principle of comfort and opportunity for all has yet to be exhibited in its full meaning ; but it is as clearly of quite peculiar character as its realization is evidently the function of our age.

The leading contention of this book is that the period it embraces is different from all other periods, and that the differences must be taken into account if the teaching of modern history is to be informative and stimulating. Those who have to teach modern history, as at present taught, must often feel that they miss the interest which might be imparted if its scope were expanded to comprehend all the elements which constitute our complex civilization. It is possible to become absorbed in all that

can be known or conjectured of ancient history; but it is difficult to feel enthusiasm for the study of a history which calls itself modern, but fails to deal with the greater part of that which has made life modern.

It has seemed unnecessary to burden the text with references to authorities. But in an appendix I have given a list of the chief sources of information, which should be used to extend acquaintance with the subjects treated herein. And in a supplementary list I have named many other sources which assisted me, negatively as well as positively, to arrive at my conclusions, though I am conscious that some obligations must have eluded me.

A. W.

FIELD HOUSE,
OXFORD,
December, 1906.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE v

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF NOTABLE EVENTS . . . xi

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY 1

CHAPTER II

MONARCHY AS A REFORMER 13

CHAPTER III

THE ADVENT OF THE REVOLUTION 56

CHAPTER IV

THE NAPOLEONIC DESPOTISM 90

CHAPTER V

THE QUICKENING OF GERMANY, ITALY, AND SPAIN . . 131

CHAPTER VI

MOVEMENTS IN RUSSIA, SCANDINAVIA, AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE 150

CHAPTER VII

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND . . . 174

CHAPTER VIII

PAGE

THE NEW MECHANICS: THE NEW ECONOMICS . . . 194

CHAPTER IX

POSITIVE SCIENCE: CRITICAL PHILOSOPHY 223

CHAPTER X

NATIONAL LITERATURE IN GERMANY 260

CHAPTER XI

NATURALISM AND THE REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LITERATURE 281

CHAPTER XII

RESULTANT IDEAS AND TENDENCIES 303

APPENDIX

LIST OF PRINCIPAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION . . . 325

LIST OF ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION . . 326

INDEX 331

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF NOTABLE EVENTS

WHICH, WITH FEW EXCEPTIONS, ARE REFERRED TO IN THIS VOLUME

1670. Promulgation of the Danish Kongelov.
1689. Accession of Peter the Great.
1731. Hadley's reflecting quadrant.
1738. John Wesley converted through the influence of Peter Böhler, the Moravian.
1740. Accession of Maria Theresa.
1741–42. Richardson's *Pamela.* Fielding's *Joseph Andrews.*
1748. Accession of Frederick the Great.
1749. Hartley's *Observations on Man.*
1750. Pombal's Ministry begins in Portugal.
(*circa*) Pianoforte derived from the spinet and harpsichord (Cristofori's cembalo col Piano e forte exhibited in Florence early in the century).
1752. Franklin's kite.
1755. Earthquake destroys Lisbon.
Kant's Nebular Hypothesis.
Haydn's first string quartett.
1756. Accession to power of the elder Pitt.
1759. Accession of Charles III. of Spain.
1760. Accession of George III.
1762. Accession of Catherine II.
Rousseau's *Contrat Social.*
1765. Harrison's marine chronometer.
1767. First nautical almanack published.
1768–70. Arthur Young makes his tours.
1768–71. Captain (then lieutenant) Cook's first voyage in H.M. Bark *Endeavour.*
1769. Arkwright's first patent for spinning by rollers.
Watt patents his reciprocating steam-engine.

1771–72. Herder associates with Goethe at Strasburg.
1772. *Coup d'état* of Gustavus III.
First Partition of Poland.
Maskelyne's Schehallion measurements.
1773. Publication of Brief "Dominus ac Redemptor Noster."
Accession of Victor Amadeus III.
1774. Accession of Louis XVI.
Turgot becomes Minister of Finance.
Priestley disengages oxygen from mercuric oxide.
Goethe's *Werther*.
Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji.
1775. Goethe removes to Weimar.
1776. Fall of Turgot's ministry.
Declaration of American Independence.
1780. Accession of Joseph II.
Jeremy Bentham's *Introduction to Principles of Morals and Legislation*.
1780–91. Mozart's maturest compositions.
1781. Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*.
Schiller's *Räuber*.
1783. Accession to power of the younger Pitt.
Crabbe's *The Village*.
1784. Cort patents improved processes for puddling and rolling pig iron.
Goethe composes his Essay on the intermaxillary bone; published 30 years later.
Cowper's *The Task*.
Herder's *Ideen zur philosophie der Geschichte*.
1786. Pitt's futile Sinking Fund established.
Death of Frederick the Great.
Burns' Kilmarnock Poems.
1787. Dr. Cartwright patents his power-loom.
Werner: *Kurzer Klassification und Beschreibung der verschiedenen Gebirgsarten*.
1788. Threshing-machine invented by Meikle.
Abolition of the Danish slave-trade.
1789. Meeting of the States-General at Versailles.
Accession of Selim III.
Schiller professor in Jena.
1790. The *Faust fragment* published.
1791. The Birmingham Riots.
Treaty of Sistova.
1792. Outbreak of the Revolutionary War.
Treaty of Jassy.
Beethoven invited to Vienna by Haydn (1823: The Choral Symphony completed).

1793. Board of Agriculture established.
1794. Friendship of Schiller and Goethe.
1795. The "Speenhamland 'Act of the Berkshire Magistrates.'"
Bramah patents his hydraulic press.
Hutton's *Theory of the Earth* (Playfair's Illustration, 1802).
1796. Death of Catherine II.
Laplace's Nebular Hypothesis.
1797. Peace of Campo Formio.
Dr. Andrew Bell publishes his pupil-teacher system.
1798. Law of Conscription in France.
Malthus's *Essay on Population.*
Lyrical Ballads { Coleridge. / Wordsworth.
Schiller's *Wallenstein's Lager.*
1799. *Coup d'État.* Brumaire 18 (Nov. 9).
Schleiermacher's *Ueber die Religion. Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern.*
At the end of the century the English practice of applying the era of the *Annus Domini* for reckoning the years B.C. was adopted on the Continent.
1800. Union of Great Britain and Ireland.
Rumford (William Thompson) asserts that heat is motion.
Nicholson and Carlisle decompose water by electrolysis.
Volta's electric pile.
Bichat—*Traité des membranes.*
1801. Peace of Lunéville.
Concordat between Bonaparte and Pius VII.
Wheat in England, 156*s.* 2*d.* per quarter.
Young's Bakerian Lecture on the Undulatory Theory of Light.
Southey's *Thalaba.*
1802. The first Factory Act, restricted to apprentices.
The SS. *Charlotte Dundas* is successful, but is prohibited.
Herschel shows that orbitual motions exist among the binary stars.
Jenner voted first parliamentary grant for introducing vaccination.
Edinburgh Review.
1803. Berzelius's *Essay on the Division of Salts through Galvanism.*
1804. Bonaparte created Emperor.
Code Napoléon.
1805. Third Coalition war.
Battle of Trafalgar.
Dalton discovers law of chemical combination by multiple proportions.
Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel.*

1806. Overthrow of Prussia.
Davy's Bakerian lecture on electrolysis.
War between Russia and Turkey: Servian revolt.
1807. Peace of Tilsit.
Abolition of the British slave-trade.
Edict of Emancipation in Prussia.
1807–8. Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation.*
1808. Napoleon invades Spain.
Russia seizes Finland.
Romilly succeeds in commuting the death penalty to transportation for picking pockets.
Accession of Mahmoud II.
First part of Goethe's *Faust.*
Vaccination made compulsory in Bavaria.
1809. Franco-Austrian war: Peace of Vienna.
Dethronement of Gustavus IV.: accession of Charles XIII.
Lamarck's theory of evolution.
Byron's *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers.*
Quarterly Review.
1810. Napoleon marries Marie Louise of Austria.
Assembly of the Spanish Cortes in Cadiz.
Six hundred British ships and cargoes in the Baltic sequestered under the Continental system in the ports of Prussia, Russia, and Sweden.
Wellington responsible for continued resistance against the Napoleonic despotism.
Election of Bernadotte as Crown Prince of Sweden.
Berlin University takes the place of Jena.
1811. Bell (afterwards Sir Charles) distinguishes between sensory and motor nerves in his *New Idea of the Anatomy of the Brain.*
Peasants in Prussia granted land in fee by commutation.
Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility.*
1812. Fall of Speranski in Russia.
Napoleon's Russian campaign.
The Spanish Cortes in Cadiz publishes a constitution.
Peace of Bucharest.
The *Philomuse* Society established.
Best Dantzig wheat in Mark Lane, 180*s.* a quarter.
Cuvier's *Recherches sur les Ossemens fossiles de Quadrupèdes.*
Byron's *Childe Harold.*
1813. Treaty of Kalisch.
Battle of Leipzig.
Ferdinand VII. becomes King of Spain.
Arndt's *Der Rhein Deutschlands Strom nicht Deutschlands Grenze.*

1813. J. B. Say's *Traité d'Economie Politique.*
1814. Deposition of Napoleon.
1814–15. Congress of Vienna.
Norway united to the Swedish crown.
The *Philiké Hetairia* established.
The *Times*, November 28th, printed by steam.
Scott's *Waverley.*
Körner's *Leier und Schwert.*
1815. The hundred days, March—June.
Battle of Waterloo.
Davy's miners' safety-lamp.
William Smith's geological map.
1815–16. Schubert's Erlkönig (Op. 1).
1816. Shelley's *Alastor.*
1817. Ricardo's *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation.*
1818. Keats' *Endymion.*
1821. Death of Napoleon.
1829. James Mill's *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind.*

AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY

"'Tis time
New hopes should animate the world, new light
Should dawn from new revealings to a race
Weighed down so long, forgotten so long."

ROBERT BROWNING.

Monarchy at the Head of the Modern State.—By the beginning of the eighteenth century Europe had abandoned for ever the feudal system of the Middle Ages. Monarchies had long usurped the powers of government. They had successfully centralized authority in their own hands, and had made themselves independent of partially responsible delegates. They had given internal peace to the districts brought under their rule; and the communities, which had thus been permitted to expand, had developed far beyond the limits covered by the old institutions. They presided over important classes, which were unknown to the purely feudal *régime*; while the classes, which still seemed to fill the places they formerly occupied, had been deprived by the royal policy and the progress of society of their original basis and functions. And as the monarchies had possessed themselves of a monopoly of the management

of internal public affairs, so they had rendered themselves indispensable to the control of external relations. Having welded the people into nations, a system of international intercourse had grown up under their auspices, which could neither be neglected without constant danger to the communities, nor be entrusted to the care of others without grave, even if temporary, inconvenience. In short, the modern state, with monarchy at the head, was too firmly founded to admit the possibility of a return to mediæval feudalism.

Persistence of the Feudal Order.—Yet, though irrevocably superseded, the feudal order still retained a powerful hold upon European institutions. In most countries there still remained nearly intact a great part of the old organization which sovereigns had not found it in their power or to their interest to destroy. From a feudal basis the monarchies had risen, and on a feudal basis they continued to rest. Hardly an institution existed beneath the throne which did not bear on its face proof of derivation from the Middle Ages. The thrones themselves were often surrounded by customs and limitations which indicated to the least careful observer the origin from which they had sprung. The whole social structure was still formed after a mediæval type. The peasantry, when not sunk in serfage, was still subject to feudal dues and exactions. The nobility, though stripped of its ancient power, still enjoyed most of the privileges and exemptions it had possessed in the days of its territorial greatness, together with new ones awarded as compensation for its confiscated power. The Church, where Catholicism still guarded its acquisitions from secular impiety and Protestant reform, likewise retained its share of material and social advantages, with a large measure of its intolerance and darkness. The armies, though by their regular

maintenance the final triumph of monarchy had been achieved, were divided into grades to correspond with the division between the nobility and the peasantry. Manufacturing industry and trade were controlled by an elaborate and cramping system of guilds, monopolies, and fiscal hindrances. Municipal constitutions were founded either on charter, often obtained by repeated purchase, or on mediæval tradition. The law cheated equity with delays and out-worn precedents, while justice itself was perverted by prescriptive inequalities, and stained with the cruelty of barbarous times.

Consequent Burdens on Society.—The result of this persistence of an effete system along with the development of a new order was naturally very disastrous to the greater part of society. The former rulers and leaders of the people still received their dues and advantages without performing in return their corresponding duties. Nay, where they retained a pretence to responsibility, they too often abused their office, or sold it to extortioners. They had been rendered superfluous by the course of events, yet they still enjoyed the most splendid share of the good things produced by the community. The power which had displaced them did not, however, demand one whit the less reward for doing the work. On the contrary, instrumental though it had been in dragging the people out of the feudal mire, it contracted some very oppressive vices in consequence of the presence of the aristocracy. The better to secure the willing homage of the territorial nobility, monarchy had enveloped itself in a magnificence irresistibly attractive to a vain and idle caste. It also kept at the public expense a number of rich and dignified offices and sinecures, which could be dispensed as rewards to those notables who were fortunate enough to win favour, or

were formidable enough to require conciliation. Nor were these burdens redeemed by economy in the necessary expenses of government. It is notorious that in this respect the new order could claim no advantage over the old, while it was more subject to wasteful and corrupt practices. To all of which charges must be added frequent engagements in long and costly wars undertaken from ambitious, frivolous, and unworthy motives. The nations, moreover, found in the economic policy of the monarchies no help to enable them to sustain these gratuitous burdens. With the internal pacification of the land and the expansion of society, industry had long outgrown the swaddling clothes of infancy; but little had been done to ease it from their stifling folds by the national economic policy of the time.

Anomalous Position of the Catholic Church.—The ecclesiastical foundation was, perhaps, as rotten as any part of the feudal *régime*, but it scarcely merits the unqualified condemnation which the privileges of the nobility, the trade corporations, and the central and provincial fiscs seldom escape. The vast possessions and feudal powers of the Church no longer served their original purpose, and, beside being to this extent harmful to the interests of the community, were generally misapplied, to the utter demoralization of the higher clergy and the monstrous multiplication of slothful monks and nuns. Yet where its organization touched the wants of the people, it probably satisfied them as well as was practicable under the circumstances. Through its lower clergy and charitable institutions it did much to comfort the classes crushed by the burdens imposed by this unequably constituted state of society, and it afforded in some sort a refuge to many too unkindly stricken by an ignoble lot.

Need of Agitation for Reform.—Europe, then, it is evident, needed thorough social regeneration. It would have been the better for judicious reform from the moment when invasion by the new order rendered superfluous a single detail of the ancient institutions. But history teaches that reforms are seldom timely, and that hitherto they have been usually remedies for the insufferable rather than wise concessions to the inevitable. Nevertheless, it would be erroneous to suppose that the evils under which Europe was groaning could find reparation by simply becoming extreme. Evil alone never determines the point beyond which reform cannot be deferred. In the collapse of the rottenest systems the action of some extraneous factor is ever discernible. The maladies from which Europe was suffering might have been a thousand-fold worse, yet they would have been only the more obstinate if it had not been for the interference of an agency sufficiently strong, well situated, and instructed, at once to upset the existing equilibrium and to point out a better ideal for reconstruction.

The Eighteenth-century Movement.—This agency was the so-called eighteenth-century movement. Never before did an intangible force so overwhelm society. It mastered the talent of the time; it gained respect, often homage, from kings; it fascinated the nobility, enchanted the middle classes, and, finally, percolated downwards to produce a ferment in the lowest strata. Yet the movement was not due to the proselytizing fervour of some inspired evangelist, or to the persuasive example of some beautiful character. Empty, vain, and babbling, as it may seem to sages of to-day, it was to its generation a spring of wisdom welling from the recesses of the past up to the surface of human life. It was a great revulsion of feeling against established evil,

excited by the world coming to a consciousness of its advance in knowledge and in reason. The discoveries of science and the gropings of philosophy had given man courage to confront his life, to probe it, to judge it, and to condemn in it what seemed to him not good. Persuaded that he had learnt to know good from evil, he subjected his existence to such scrutiny as, two centuries earlier, the Protestant reformers had applied to his religion. Great names are associated with certain aspects of this movement, but to no individual did it owe its existence or success. As it burst spontaneously to the surface, so it swept along by its own irresistible force, independent of the fortunes of a name, unhindered by the vicissitudes of a clique.

Objects of Attack by the Movement.—Though essentially an intellectual movement, it was, of course, primarily founded on that progress of society which had taken place beneath the ægis of monarchy. Its onset was mainly directed against feudal abuses and ecclesiastical imposition. Kings incurred attack only so far as they were guilty of tolerating and perpetuating these evils, or were inclined to create others as bad by arrogating to their office rights and sanctions inconsistent with the progress and welfare of society. Whatever was seen to oppress the individual in mind or body was exposed and held up to burning obloquy ; whatever appeared anomalous, grotesque, cumbersome, or fraudulent, was given a prey to scathing ridicule. Nothing was too venerable, too sacred, or too august, for irreverent discussion. Into one omnivorous crucible of criticism was thrown every heritage from the past.

The Age of Criticism.—It was indeed the age of criticism. "Unser Zeitalter ist das eigentliche Zeitalter der Kritik, der sich alles unterwerfen muss," said Kant in 1781, when he put forth the most subversive inquiry

which the old beliefs have had to encounter. Kant's own criticism was as far removed from the prevailing tone as judgment is from mockery, yet the age is rightly thus characterized if recklessness and crudeness of method can assure it the title, in preference to our own inquisitive reforming time. For the power of the dominant criticism is not to be found in a happy combination of energy and determination with sound knowledge and ripe wisdom. Rather it was because its destructive force and persistence were unhindered by wise regard for the less apparent conditions of life that its onset was so desperate and unfaltering. The vexations and anomalies of the effete social state provoked the hostility of the intelligence which had exercised itself in the physical investigations of Newton, and in the analytical discourse of Locke. At the hands of such an adversary, the traditional order could not but receive unceremonious treatment. No historic sense tempered indignation against prescriptive abuse.* No well-considered lore extenuated the crimes of the existing order by giving a glimpse into the dangers and difficulties which beset the path of social development. But as primitive observers of nature impute apparent anomalies to devilish or capricious design, so did the critics of this social state ridicule and declaim against every blemish, as if it were the work of deliberate villainy and guile. And there was no one sufficiently well-informed and eloquent to indict them before the people for ignorant travesty. No wonder, then, that they converted the public to their views; no wonder

* That the critical movement never came under the discipline of sober and candid retrospection is not inconsistent with the fact that the writings of Montesquieu, Turgot, and Voltaire introduced a new era of historical study, and that even in the famous book of Helvetius, a new and truer view of the past found expression. But these were consequences rather than determining factors of the movement.

that Burke had occasion to lament that all the solemn plausibilities of the world had lost their reverence and effect.

Secular Character of Rationalism.—The first step in the evolution of progressive ideas was significant of its ulterior results. Until discredit had been thrown on the belief that the world was governed by Divine ordinance, and that the Christian Church was the representative on earth of this supernatural dispensation, it was impossible for rationalism to approach the existing social arrangements with unfettered action. This condition English deism effectually performed so far as the thinkers of the Continent were concerned. In its own home, deism neither enjoyed a sufficiently prosperous career, nor was surrounded by appropriate circumstances, to affect very seriously the current social creed. Its sceptical attacks were met by a number of orthodox divines, who knew well how to plead their cause with effect before the English mind. Nor was its tendency to encourage free-thinking likely to influence materially the national manner of regarding social questions in a country where Protestantism had long been dominant, and had recently issued triumphant from a revolutionary conflict with one of the Lord's anointed. On the Continent, however, neither able apologists nor sober habits of independent judgment and action existed to dull zest for sceptical doctrines. Such doctrines addressed themselves with more than their real cogency to an eager audience. They combined with a debased version of metaphysic from the same country to flatter the thinkers of civilized Europe that they had at last obtained complete freedom from the bonds of superstition, and the possession of a philosophy worthy of the dignity of human nature, and adequate to all the needs of human life.

Diffusion of Rationalism.—The teaching gained reception through a people especially open to its charms, and peculiarly fitted to be its promulgator. In those days France, though ready to borrow the thoughts of England, possessed the intellectual hegemony of continental Europe. French was the language of culture and polite society in all lands, and French works were classics for the whole reading public. France, however, had exhausted its race of great writers of the seventeenth century, and had been left by Bayle in a state of fertile receptiveness for any philosophical theorizing which might prove a relief to the hollowness of the society bequeathed to Europe by Louis XIV. Transplanted to this soil, the infidelity, the sensational philosophy, and the Newtonian science of England produced a growth of lax ethics, of scientific scepticism, and shallow metaphysic, which permitted society to indulge its immoral proclivities, absolved it from the dread of future punishment, and at the same time interested it with serious discussion. This intellectual tendency thence spread through Europe, and became the most marked characteristic of the age.

Principle of Equality.—There was a very close logical connection between the dominant scepticism and the main notions for which it prepared the way. Men came to distrust both the dogmas of revealed religion and the pretensions of the established order to Divine dispensation because they had come to acquire more confidence in their own reason and intrinsic dignity; in other words, because they had come to regard themselves, not as cyphers to which artificial value was given by an external power, but as units possessing the same inherent worth, though ranged in a variously graduated order. Hence followed the theory of the natural equality of men, which appears throughout the movement

under the guise of philanthropy, humanitarianism, democratic ideals, individualism, and belief in human perfectibility. It was this which gave the key-note to the tritest complaint of the time, but echoed by Rousseau when he announced that men were born free but are everywhere in chains. From the doctrine of the natural equality of men sprang the whole portentous brood of eighteenth-century ideas. Whether quickened by pity into philanthropy, or by sympathy into humanitarianism, the doctrine remained essentially the same. Whether logic deduced from it the rights of man, democratic principles of government, or the axioms of social and personal liberty, it never lost its identity. Even the sentimental enthusiasm for the state of nature was but a reflex from the dreams of the equality which Nature was believed to have intended man to realize.

Confidence in the Intervention of Monarchy.—The passion for equality was not, however, incompatible with confidence in the good offices of despotism. Desire for disciplined freedom was still distant from the minds of men accustomed to accept all amelioration from the hands of monarchy. And herein, again, the influence of France made itself strongly felt. In no country had the absolute power of the Crown more firmly established itself, or struck deeper root into the minds of the people. No sturdy national instinct existed here to fend impetuous malcontents from a delusive belief in the illimitably beneficial powers which a well-intentioned monarch might exercise: no participation in public affairs kept the literary theorists aware of the practical difficulties which hedge even the benevolence of kings. But long disuse of the liberties of self-government, and the severe tutelage to which the Crown had subjected the nation, had well-nigh destroyed all manly trust of the people in their own ability to

govern themselves. The gravest advocates of reform congratulated the country on its possession of a head who, without risking the compromises of party warfare, could yet give it perfect institutions by the well-directed exercise of lawful prerogative. The fancied liberties of the English people were often regarded with contempt. The restrictions of a traditional constitution were conceived to defeat the possibility of a true emancipation.

Grounds for relying on Reform by Monarchs.—Nor were these sanguine expectations unwarranted by the situation itself and the actual events of the time. Of the recognized powers into which European society was then divided, the first, which seemed to have claims to the reforming *rôle*, was certainly the Crown. Not only were the selfish interests of the aristocracy and higher clergy inimical to change, but the prospect of solid advantage appeared to invite monarchs to bring their states out of the slough of anomaly and inequality. What could better promise to increase the number of their subjects than measures for adjusting fortunes to a natural level? What could better save them from the vexations of an inelastic revenue than an equable distribution of taxation and the grant of freedom to the spontaneous energies of their people? How could they hope to obtain better servants or more able ministers than by inviting merit to serve the state without distinction of birth, and by opening to all responsible and arduous offices a road for those classes whose minds and faculties had been trained, developed, and informed in the real business of life? Whence could they expect to get faithful and enlightened teachers for their people if the popular and established religion were disfigured by careless and sensual dignitaries? Obscured as was often their view of the real state of affairs by the conditions of their station, and frivolous when not vicious,

as were frequently their characters, the princes as a body could not entirely fail to see what type of social system would most inure to their advantage. And if self-interest attracted them to become the regenerators of modern society, their power unmistakably singled them out as the executors of any considerable reform. Though not omnipotent, their authority so far transcended that of any other body in their states that, while little or nothing could be achieved without their sanction or connivance, a determined and judicious effort on their part was capable of carrying through the most extensive improvements.

OF
CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER II

MONARCHY AS A REFORMER

"Though all kinds of government be improved in modern times, yet monarchial government seems to have made the greatest advances towards perfection. It may now be affirmed of civilized monarchies, what was formerly said in praise of republics alone, that they are a government of Laws, not of Men. They are found susceptible of order, method, and constancy to a surprising degree. Property is there secure; industry encouraged; the arts flourish; and the prince lives secure among his subjects, like a father among his children. It must, however, be confessed that, though monarchial governments have approached nearer to popular ones in gentleness and stability, they are still inferior. Our modern education and customs instil more humanity and moderation than the ancient, but have not as yet been able to overcome entirely the disadvantages of that form of government."

DAVID HUME.

"Le souverain bien loin d'être le maître absolu des peuples qui sont sous sa domination, n'en est lui-même que le premier domestique."

FREDERICK THE GREAT.

Monarchy and the Eighteenth-century Movement.—Monarchy did not ignore the claim of progress on its resources, and the appeal of enlightenment to its interests; nor did it refuse to take counsel with the irresponsible thinkers. Contemporaneously with the intellectual movement, the policy of many rulers was directed with notable energy towards the more complete defeudalization of their states and the better co-ordination of their administrative functions. And as these

steps were taken partly in recognition of the social principles recommended by speculatists, so they reacted again upon the theories of writers and confirmed their reliance on the exertions of sovereigns. But the reaction was not exactly a rebound of the original influence. The reforming monarchs were by no means mere pupils of the philosophers. They were rather co-operators with a lesson of their own to enforce. The lesson, it is true, agreed well with the doctrine of the theorists, but it was none the less the property of the sovereigns. It consisted in overruling with entire want of tenderness everything which stood in the way of their plans and aggrandisement. Were they plighted engagements, ancient treaties, respectable traditions, or recognized rights of sentient individuals,—if they did not possess sufficient vigour to secure respect, they had to submit to very inconsiderate treatment at the hands of reforming absolutism.

Peter the Great, 1689–1725.—The first great reforming monarch of the century was not, however, immediately concerned with the defeudalizing process in Western Europe. Peter the Great, if judged by the effect of his work on the development of Russia, must be considered one of the greatest figures of the eighteenth century. But the state of Russia at that time was too far removed from that of its more advanced neighbours for his reign to present many points of direct contact with the liberalism of the Western monarchies. Yet he has claims to an honourable position among the reforming sovereigns. The transfer of the hegemony of the North from Sweden to Russia, and the conversion of the latter from an Asiatic state into an influential European power, were events which demonstrated in good season the possible strength of autocracy. Henceforth the Western states had to reckon with a Russian

factor in their international policy. This obligation, it is true, they at first believed to involve few less favourable incidents than assistance in partitioning Poland, or gratuitous crusades for the discomfiture of the Turk, but it nevertheless urged with considerable cogency the possibilities within the reach of absolute power.

Character of Peter's Example.—Nor did the effects of Peter's example stop here. Semi-barbarian though he was, and benighted as was his country, he exhibited in a conspicuous manner traits peculiarly characteristic of the liberal absolutism of the eighteenth century. To guide him in reforming the internal administration of Russia, he had recourse to the philosopher Leibniz; and to help him in improving the material and intellectual resources of his country, he laid under contribution every department of Western civilization. He despised no part of the enlightenment of his time, and ever showed himself to be animated by its spirit. The solid profits to be gained by war, whether just or unjust, were as little obscured in his mind by the glamour of military glory as in that of any diplomatic huckster of the century. His rule was despotic to a degree known only by Russia among European nations. Yet he showed himself above all inspired with the belief that he was the trustee for his people, that it was for his nation that he worked, and that in his nation he would find the only worthy and enduring success. He loved the Russian people, says Kostomárof, not in the sense of the Russians contemporary with and subject to him, but in the sense of that ideal to which he wished to bring the people. To his soldiers on the field of Pultava he declared that they were fighting for Russia and not for their Tsar, who was ready to sacrifice his life for his country's weal. And when caught in the power of the Turkish vizier on the Pruth, he was believed to have

sent a letter to the senate at home, warning its members that in all probability he would be taken prisoner, and peremptorily forbidding them to execute any command they might receive purporting to come from him in captivity. This letter has been pronounced a forgery, but its extended currency at least demonstrates the general notion entertained of Peter's conception of his office. Frederick the Great only confirmed the lesson embodied by the legend, when from his camp in Silesia he commanded Podewils that, if he were taken alive, his orders were not to be respected, and the State should purchase his liberty by no unworthy means.

General Influence of Peter on Russia. — For Russia itself, Peter's greatest work was the annihilation of those barriers which had shut out the country from the influences of European civilization. Contact with the West was his prime concern and his most fruitful achievement. The destruction of the Streltsi—a great advance, though the reputation of these irregular troops has suffered much injustice from their resemblance to the Janissaries—his administrative reforms, his foundation of a system of popular education, his transference to the Crown of the power of the patriarchate, his endeavours to disseminate knowledge, and his attempt to lay upon Slavic barbarism a veneer of foreign manners, would have wrought but little had the country been left in Muscovite seclusion. As it was, Russia did not immediately profit to any great extent by these internal improvements. The force of the conservative opposition was so great that Peter's reforms would have sunk into abeyance on the removal of his stern will, unless influences from abroad had continued with short intermissions to breathe into them vital energy. When Peter died, the empire fell into the hands of an oligarchy tutored by the example of Sweden on the death of

Charles XII. In his lifetime Peter found it impossible to form a staff of honest and capable agents; and when he did not employ foreigners, he had to depend on terror to secure the execution of his commands. On his death, the one Russian patriot was no more. All hope of further progress depended on the operation of foreign civilization, or the appearance of some great and enlightened successor.

Peter's Reign and Russian Society.—On the organization of classes, Peter left a deep and lasting impression. Unfortunate in its final results, his action was not uniformly beneficial at the outset. Indeed, to the serfs his legislation, intent on rendering the resources of the country more available to the Crown, was, on the whole, decidedly detrimental. In some cases agrarian liberty was directly subverted, and in others the bondsmen of the soil were turned into personal chattels. On the other hand, to the commercial classes he was a father. From him the urban population received definite recognition and status, and industry and the arts first obtained instruction and encouragement. The nobility he placed on an entirely new basis and imbued with a fresh spirit. Not only did he insist upon its members acquiring the elements of education, and often sent the younger ones abroad to learn arts and methods unknown at home, but he converted the whole order from an aristocracy by birth into a hierarchy by service. Under him the magnates lost their exclusive place, the princes and Boyars were deprived of their high positions, and all the nobles were invited, or rather compelled, to become officials of their Emperor, and to obtain their rank by the dignity of their office. He instituted fourteen degrees of the Tchin, corresponding to the grades of military rank, which were repeated in the civil service, the navy, the court, and the Church. Thus rank and

office were made equivalents, and, though the rigour of this system was considerably relaxed during succeeding reigns, the members of the noble caste were lastingly enlisted in the service of the modern state.

Uncertain Results of Peter's Reign.—Hence it came about that the upper classes of Russian society were drawn with wonderful rapidity into the vortex of European civilization, while the bulk of the people remained almost stationary. Chained to the soil and service of superiors, the Russian boors were cut off from all access to the West; the traders pursued their calling, unharassed by the difficulties of the Archangel route, and slowly drew through the Baltic the advantages of intercourse with more advanced nations; the nobility, persuaded to renounce territorial importance, sought honourable employment by thronging the government service, and strove to shine by assuming the semblance of European culture. Over the result to which this arrangement has been moving obscurity still hangs, and seems to grow denser and yet more dense.

Comparison between Peter and Frederick II.—In no way does Peter's connection with European progress show itself more plainly than in the affinity of his career to that of the monarch who was most deeply engaged in bringing to a focus the tendencies of the time. From Peter the Great it is natural to pass to Frederick II. of Prussia. In the work of both men, sternness of character combined with quick intelligence, unscrupulousness allied with devotion to the aggrandisement of their states, application to business supported by a cruel disposition towards war as its instrument, are characteristics so prominent that the history of the one inevitably suggests that of the other. Above all, both, though despotic, were conscious of the ministering nature of their office. But the primary conditions of

their careers were different. Peter, by his sole exertions, compelled a vast empire to enter irrevocably into the fertilizing medium of European civilization. Frederick was but the most brilliant member of a house whose renown it is to have created, by strenuous and repeated personal exertions, a powerful and influential state out of a small and barren province. There were Hohenzollerns who had done all that man could do to increase the extent and importance of Brandenburg before Frederick II. raised the kingdom of Prussia to be the rival of the House of Hapsburg. Yet, if he cannot share with Peter I. the dignity of having given Europe a new state, he at any rate deserves the fame of having so far completed the work of his forefathers as to have assured to Prussia a commanding future without requiring from his successors more than the usual prudence and common sense of his family. He was, moreover, the central figure among the rulers of his time no less by reason of his intellectual activity and personal opinions than by reason of his success in war and politics.

Relation of Frederick II. (1748–86) to the Intellectual Movement.—We may, indeed, search in vain the life of the semi-civilized Tsar for parallels to much which made the career of the philosopher of Sans-souci important for Europe. His country was already a sharer in the general fund of European culture, and he himself was in closest connection with the spirit of the age. An aspirant to literary fame, delighting in the society of the writers of the day, and thoroughly informed with French taste and ideas, he commanded the attention of his generation in the great world-debate that was then going on almost as effectually as he dictated terms to it in diplomacy and war. Through him the doctrines of enlightenment, charged with official authority, addressed themselves to the

intellect of society, while his deeds supported them to its coarser elements. From his pen, through his precept, by his example, the truth that the sovereign is the first servant of the state gained notoriety and associations which it has not lost to this day.

"Friedrich II.," says Bluntschli, "ist in Wahrheit nicht bloss der Begründer eines neuen Staatswesens, sondern ebenso der erste und vornehmste Repräsentant der modernen Staatsidee." If at this period the Prussian monarchy had not exhibited to the world a conspicuous example of success attained by claiming unlimited authority for government, men would in later days have put less faith in the efficacy of mere legislation and administration. More powerful still was the effect of the general report to which his words and doings gave rise. The appearance in the political arena of a monarch whose evident mission it was to endorse the teaching of speculative liberalism, acted on the public mind as a warrant to the advanced thinkers, which they were not slow to appreciate. That a king arose who was mercilessly severe towards shams of every kind, who ruthlessly destroyed whatever withstood his designs on the mere plea of respectable antiquity, who was full of bitter sayings against folly and vice in high places no less than against effeteness in outworn institutions, was an event more favourable to the cause of reform than any single episode of the century, if we except the independence of America.

Frederick fails to keep Pace with the Time.—Yet Frederick the Great was far from embodying fully the progressive spirit of the age. Cynical by nature, embittered by his early experiences, he learnt to treat life with a grim distrust utterly foreign to the hopefulness which was about to animate Europe. The period of his intellectual formation was, unfortunately, almost

synchronous with the purely sceptical phase of the progressive movement. Consequently he remained insensible to those spontaneous efforts towards improvement of which society was then giving tokens. He never brought himself abreast with the last quarter of the century, nor did he understand that he had lost touch with the times through want of sympathy with men's aspirations. Before he died he had yielded his position as the cynosure of Europe to Joseph II. of Austria.

Personal Character of Frederick's Rule.—Long the foremost figure in Europe, Frederick was yet more prominent in his own state. The father, who had created for him by stolid thrift and resolute management the army and funds by which he so roughly elbowed for Prussia an eminent place in Europe, also left him a system of administration carefully adapted for the personal supervision and military discipline of the whole kingdom. The craze of Frederick William for drilling soldiers and hoarding money was not a whit more intense than his passion for driving his people to their work and keeping them employed at it as he thought best for the state. In one sense this king was as much the founder of Prussia's greatness as was the Great Elector. If the latter is renowned for having raised the country by his own energy and ability from the dejection into which the Thirty Years' War had cast it, the former equally deserves the credit of having saved the state from the debilitating influences imported by the first Hohenzollern who called himself king, and of developing in his people the virtues of obedience, industry, and economy. These contributed at least as much to the success of Frederick the Great and the aggrandisement of the realm as did the activity and adroitness of the last of the Electors towards its being.

The effect of this policy was the more considerable since, in the words of Carlyle, the common occupation of other rulers at that time was to play "burst-frog to the ox of Versailles." This Frederick II. fully understood. He was too much imbued with the ruling culture to appreciate in matters of the mind the German character and the possibilities latent within its unpolished exterior; but he relied on the obedience and exertions of his subjects to a degree fatuous in one less acquainted with the Prussian people. And, carrying out his maxim of a sovereign's duties, he developed the machinery of his father's governing system till he held in his own hands the threads of every department of the administration. By him the Crown's control of the people and its manifold responsibilities were so much extended and isolated that his successors, who were of less kingly fibre, only escaped utter confusion by entirely reorganizing the Prussian polity.

Frederick's Relation to Germany.—It is difficult to form a conception of Frederick's relation to the Germany of the eighteenth century. At that time, as every one knows, the holy Roman Empire was in the last stage of decay. Divided into many hundreds of principalities, varying from a manor to an independent power, whose sole bond of union was a constitution of tedious and impotent forms, it contained within itself all the elements which produce anarchy, misgovernment, and oppression. Shaped from top to bottom by feudal tradition; unvisited by the purging hand of power; demoralized above by follies and vices borrowed from the French court, and deadened below by the degraded and servile condition of the working population; torn by the jealousies and hostilities inseparable from petty irresponsible sovereignty; ever ready to listen to the insidious designs of treacherous foreigners;

—it presented a spectacle of feebleness, meanness, and deformity which provoked the contempt and excited the rapacity of all beholders. Among the rulers of such a corrupt mass the presence of a man like Frederick the Great could only arouse apprehension and hatred. Among the people themselves the hardships he inflicted on his subjects produced abhorrence, while the arrogance of the Prussian soldiery and officials inflamed the dislike which plentifully subsisted between the different fractions of the German nation.

Effect of Frederick's Career on the Empire.—Nor was the external policy of Frederick calculated to moderate such feelings. To probity it made no pretension, and however palliated to posterity by extenuating circumstances, it was to contemporaries violent and perfidious. Comprehensively regarded, his career would have had the effect of rousing the people from their torpor and of reminding them that the days of great deeds and national reforms had not passed away for ever. But views of this kind were then as foreign to the mass of Germans as was the single idea that it was this state of Prussia, thus elevated by Frederick, which would some day be the main agent in Germany's regeneration. Still, one act of direct benefit Frederick clearly did for Germany. He brought the rottenness of the Reich into such rough contact with the real conditions of things as had never been known before. He helped more to overthrow the crumbling old institution than did any other person except Napoleon. Nevertheless, this same man was eventually forced by the ambition of a scion of the House of Austria to call upon the empire to defend itself against impious attack and arbitrary consolidation.

Unscrupulous Character of Joseph II.—It was the Emperor Joseph II. who drove the old Frederick to

this paradoxical proceeding. Frederick was aware that the Emperor was filled with that unreasoning greed for territorial aggrandisement which was then the dominant motive in European politics. To his cynical mind the aggressive and unscrupulous side of Joseph's character was the most apparent. Because Joseph was unsuccessful in his enterprises, and was withal not the man to command success under any circumstances, history has forborne to expose quite nakedly how deeply he was involved in the unvirtuous statecraft of his time. Yet it would appear that he was as little averse to diplomatic knavery and unjust violence as that rival whose great success with those means has earned a disproportionate amount of vituperation. This was abundantly manifest in Joseph's foreign policy ; and his innovations in his hereditary dominions betrayed so frequently an eagerness to concentrate into his own hands all the available forces of the monarchy that no room was left for doubt as to the primary motive of the whole scheme. Not reluctance, therefore, to resort to the political strategy of a faithless and arbitrary age distinguishes Joseph from the rest of the ambitious monarchs of the eighteenth century. Failure alone softens that glare of censorious criticism which beats upon him in common with all the despotic forerunners of the present order.

Joseph's Philanthropic Impulses.—On the other hand, he was representative of his generation in a far more favourable sense. Though he wrote no "Anti-machiavel," or "Fürstenspiegel," as did Frederick, nor compounded a medley of philosophical opinions such as was published by Catherine II., what expression he did give to his principles of reform succeeded in enlisting a belief in his sincere solicitude for mankind which the world never entertained of contemporary rulers, and which the world would not have accepted of this man

if he had been merely a time-serving hypocrite. Doubtless the evident connection between the causes of his failure and his uncircumspect philanthropic temperament has evoked a tendency to dwell on this pleasanter aspect of his character; doubtless, too, even when thus charitably regarded, his conduct shows itself only secondarily governed by generous impulse. Still, we must believe that he did indeed reflect the nobler sentiments which visited society towards the close of the eighteenth century, but which we are too prone to ignore when we apply to the period our rude test by results.

Joseph's Disappointments.—Consequently, though Joseph died filled with chagrin and deeply sensible of his ill success, he was not without the poor reward of posthumous fame. By cruel chance, misfortune completely blighted the latter days of his existence, and no whisper of posterity's extenuating verdict reached the dying man. He never knew that the disappointments which overwhelmed him would serve to give additional proof of his sincerity to a world whose pitiless condemnation of failure is ever tempered by compassion for disaster. And seldom is clemency better bestowed than on the memory of this erring and chastened monarch. Rash in conception, rash in action, he was also rash in withdrawing his ill-fated decrees; but impetuosity does not alone account for the heart-broken abnegation of his schemes. There was something of true pathos in his resolution of January, 1790, in which he confessed that, having introduced changes in the administration purely with the intention of furthering the general weal, and with the hope that the people, after closer acquaintance, would approve of them, he had at length become convinced that the people preferred the old conditions, and found in them their whole

happiness. "Accordingly," he continued, "I yield to their wishes, and declare the administrative order which obtained at my accession to be restored." *

Joseph's Influence on Austria's History.—But such a catastrophe did not involve total loss of permanent result. It is true that the retractations of Joseph had to be confirmed and extended by his successor, the wise and enlightened Leopold II. It is true that the Austro-Hungarian monarchy started on its nineteenth century career from a point little more elevated than that attained by Maria Theresa. To the lessons which the great queen learnt from the example of Prussia, to her humanity, her high estimate of education and her disciplined piety, to her appreciation of her husband's financial abilities and the wisdom of her better advisers, was due much of the administrative and military efficiency, the agrarian and fiscal improvement, the advances in industry and education, the freedom from ecclesiastical dominion, which the monarchy enjoyed at the beginning of this epoch. Nevertheless, abortive as were most of Joseph's innovations, they materially contributed towards the defeudalization of the lands of the Hapsburgs, to the emancipation of the people from the yoke of the nobility and priesthood, and to their advancement in knowledge and toleration as well as in physical well-being. Moreover, while the reaction against Joseph's policy was the main cause of that unprofitable delay in Austria's development which supervened on the accession of Francis II., it is to Joseph that all subsequent desire for progress must be traced. Insomuch as he failed, he failed because he

* Hence the currency of the term "Josephism" is to be deprecated. The word connotes nothing peculiar to Joseph II. His methods were only the methods of his age. But his fate was all his own, and this is just what the expression "Josephism" does not include.

was premature. A time came when unreadiness gave way before the influence of the modern spirit. The germ of this spirit Joseph cast into his dominions. From him dates the growth of that liberalism which eventually leavened the stolid conservatism of the Austrian empire.

Persistence of Foreign Influences in Russia.—As it was in Russia that the first great liberal monarch of the century appeared, so it was there that the last was found. After the death of Peter I. the government of the country passed through many vicissitudes, but as change followed change we look in vain for the patriotism and energy of the great Tsar. Not a trace of any agent but personal and party interest is to be seen controlling the formation, life, and dissolution of the numerous governments. The chief nobles continually sought to make the constitution a virtual oligarchy by contriving that the wearer of the crown should by some means or other be held under their influence. The sovereigns, conscious of their faulty titles, and apprehensive of treasonable conspiracies, were ever obliged to strain to the utmost Peter's autocratic principles, and to surround themselves with a crowd of servile favourites. In fact, up to the reign of Alexander I. the main business of the Russian autocrats was the maintenance of their absolute power. Still, though all constitutional progress was thus prevented, things did not remain wholly stationary. The sovereigns were always more foreign than Russian, and their sympathies prompted them to have foreigners for their trusted servants. The encroaching spirit of the magnates of the nation made it clearly safer policy for them to put their confidence in adventurers from abroad than to surrender themselves to the problematical loyalty of their more considerable subjects. As Peter had learnt

most from the Dutch, so his successors sought chief guidance, first from the Germans, and later from the French.

Reign of Catherine II. (1762-96).—At the date of which we now speak, Catherine II. was bringing to a close a long and brilliant reign. A foreigner of insignificant origin, and a usurper, she had striven to make herself popular by calling herself Russian. Yet she was never either Russian or popular. Her colossal ambition, alike in its beneficent and pernicious activity, defeated this result. By her military enterprises she laid on the people all the burdens which attend a policy of conquest. In her endeavours to win the applause of Europe by posing as an enlightened ruler, she necessarily ran counter to what Russians regarded as their traditional, though long mistreated, *régime*. Her own force of character, however, and her good fortune, preserved the power she failed to fortify with the affections of her people. The memory of the glories of her reign long outlived the regrets of which they were the occasion.

Nature of Catherine's Liberalism.—When Russians consent to remember only the agreeable in Catherine's reign, they can at least plead the desire to leave undisturbed the accepted sequel to the work of Peter the Great. The empress claimed to be Peter's successor, and the claim has secured general assent. Her pretensions are far from being entirely justified, yet they possess enough foundation to warrant homage from the national imagination. Destitute of the grander features of Peter's character, and incomparably inferior to him in the power of controlling and training her rude subjects, she, the educated, lettered German, equally excelled him in her taste for literature and her support of advanced ideas. But her patronage of liberalism and

culture must not be over-rated. Ambition formed its principal motive. She knew that lasting fame was to be obtained only at the hands of the thinkers and writers who had challenged the attention of the Western world, and she therefore strove to gain their approval, and even, womanlike, their adulation. To suppose that she was a deliberate promoter of the revolution which was overtaking European civilization would be inconsistent with her conduct in later years. Her professed antipathy to the French Revolution may in some degree be accounted for by her wish to embroil the other Powers in a war with France, in order that she might have her hands the more free to carry out certain very dear but iniquitous plans of her own in Poland. It is not doubtful that, even if her anxiety to further the freedom and welfare of the people were as intense as her staunchest upholders may contend, she never seriously thought of assisting in the work, except by the methods of despotism. The story of her Duma, gathered from the four corners of all the Russias, did good service to her fame at the time, but the year-long farce soon lost its plausibility, and is now only cited to her discredit.

Nature of Catherine's Despotism.—Catherine was indeed, a despot by nature and force of circumstances. Yet she had a wide enough view and a strong enough hold of facts not to forget that the most absolute authority is dependent on the disposition of the multitude. But in practice this attenuated form of liberalism was sorely mutilated by the evil consequences of her personal faults. It was not alone her imperious foibles that thwarted her better views. Her rule, unfortunately, was almost entirely determined by, or conducted through, those favourites whom she attached to herself with all the prodigality of an oriental monarch, and

multiplied with the profusion meet for an empress in an age conspicuous for female frailty. In this manner, much perfidy and brutality was imported into her actions, with which she cannot be directly charged. But vicarious responsibility of this kind forms a poor defence for a woman of the understanding of Catherine. When all excuses on this score have been allowed, her ambition, with all its attendant wickedness and cruelty, still remains unrelieved by nobility of purpose or genuine humanity.

Catherine as the Successor of Peter.—Though Catherine grievously missed being Peter's peer, she succeeded in giving Russia a natural complement to Peter's innovations. The purport of her wars was very different from that of his; the changes introduced by her departed in spirit far from his disinterested reforms. Happily, ambition to follow a patriot's example cannot avoid achieving something very like the results of patriotism. Under her rule no great legislative measure was inflicted upon the Russian people. That reform which would have won for her the loudest praise from her literary friends, the emancipation of the serfs, was not to be carried by one who was a foreigner, a usurper, and a female. This being impracticable, she found it convenient, as Peter less unwittingly had done before her, to increase the area and rigour of serfage. The commercial, industrial, and intellectual progress of Russia gained much from her long reign. The power of the Church was further diminished by confiscations of its property, works of philanthropy were undertaken, the administration of justice was improved. But it was no more given to her to extract a code of law out of the legal confusion of her realm, than to extirpate the corruption which infested every branch of the imperial service.

Catherine's Influence on the Nobility.—Most noticeable, perhaps, was Catherine's agency in civilizing the nobility. It was during her reign that the social usages and culture of civilized Europe, which had been seeking admittance for the last century, finally established themselves at the Russian court, and their domicile on the Neva grew into a fine and well-built town. The results of this exotic cultivation were at first naturally superficial, and in many respects long remained so. They have, moreover, greatly tended to exaggerate the distance between the noble caste and the common people, and have thus helped to produce that estrangement of classes which has sadly hampered the good influence of educated persons, and narrowly limited the range of education itself. But the downfall of Muscovite barbarism, and the acceptance of a more generous and universal civilization in the upper stratum of Russian society, was an indispensable condition for the imposing entrance into the politics of Europe which Russia made at the beginning of the next century, under the guidance of Catherine's mobile grandson.

Reform by the Lesser Monarchies.—Thus far reforming absolutism flowed directly from the main depositaries of monarchical power. Autocrats themselves planned and wrought, using agents only as instruments to the ends which they themselves conceived. But it was impossible for the most powerful monarchs alone to profit by the lessons of the progressive movement, when the advanced party held the ear of the public and compelled it to harken to the new doctrines. That other rulers of less degree should participate in the general diffusion of reforming energy, and play in their more limited spheres similar parts, was clearly inevitable. Accordingly, alongside of the great monarchs, we find the inferior sovereigns and the administrators

of delegated power taking an active share in the work of national redemption.

Pombal's Ministry in Portugal (1750–77).—The overthrow of the Jesuits, that deed which moved Europe more deeply than any other event before the Revolution, was chiefly the work of the minister of one of the most insignificant states of Europe, the remote and feeble Portugal. The circumstance is the more remarkable because, uninfluential as Portugal naturally is by position and resources, it was still less considerable at this time by reason of its backward condition. But when the government of the state seemed to be sinking irretrievably into monkish darkness and slothful extravagance, it passed into the hands of a bold, arbitrary reformer, one of the most imposing personages of the century, Sebastian Joseph de Carvalho e Mello, Minister of Joseph I., celebrated as the Marquis of Pombal.

Pombal and the Earthquake of Lisbon.—Carvalho had been imbued with the new political doctrines by study and by extensive acquaintance with the life of the leading European states. The opportunity to carry his ideas into practice was given him by the queen-mother. But to his own powerful character was due the vast predominance which he obtained in the conduct of the government. By his personal weight he made the king blindly subservient to his will, ousted the Jesuits from political influence, and spread terror through the corrupt and parasitic nobility. On the occasion of the great earthquake in 1755, amid the inundations, ruin, and conflagration to which Lisbon was abandoned, he alone confronted the awful catastrophe with unshaken spirit. Then, in truth, he showed himself the man, whom, "si fractus illabatur orbis, impavidum ferient ruinæ." Ultimately through his efforts a finer, richer,

and healthier Lisbon was erected on the ashes of the old.*

Pombal's Successful Reforms.—Established in his supreme position, Pombal applied himself with unexampled energy to the work of fortifying the independence and developing the resources of his country. He found it destitute of money, defensive power, and industry. He left it at the end of a ministry, lasting a quarter of a century, with full coffers, with a militia which had proved its worth by honourable and successful service under foreign officers of experience, and with advancing agriculture, new and revived industries, and a flourishing trade. He had the satisfaction of freeing his country from dependence on the foreigner for necessities, without diminishing the influx of treasure from America. To no work did he devote himself with greater ardour than to the task of replacing the educational system of his defeated foes, the Jesuits. When his king died, however, the aged minister was disgraced. Persecuted with false accusations by the many and powerful enemies he had made in the course of his uncompromising career, he saw a reactionary *régime* almost wreck the work of his arduous life.

Pombal's Conflict with the Jesuits.—That Pombal, with his impatient arbitrary temperament, should be harsh even to tyranny was inevitable. To the Jesuits he dealt out the strongest measure of his rigour. The fathers bitterly hated him as their godless supplanter in the government, they provoked him by attributing the earthquake to his unhallowed policy, and they incited the populace to riot against his decrees.

* Pompal's reply to the lamentations of the trembling king on this occasion is well known. When asked what was to be done under this infliction of Divine justice, he answered, "Bury the dead and attend to the living" (*enterrar os mortos, e cuidar nos vivos*).

Finally, the Company of Jesus exasperated him beyond endurance by creating a rebellion among the Indians in Paraguay, when Portugal proceeded to take possession of certain provinces which Spain had transferred to it in pursuance of an exchange agreed upon by the two governments.

Degeneration of the Jesuits.—This was, perhaps, the most audacious act upon which the Jesuits ever ventured; but it was in only too exact conformity with the general conduct which had come to be characteristic of Loyola's order. They were now in the midst of the most worldly phase of their existence. To their political enterprises they had added extensive commercial undertakings, and to their notoriously flexible casuistry they had fitted very equivocal principles of proselytism. But their fall was near. Though powerful at the courts, and possessed of immense wealth, they had justly incurred the jealousy of the people and the restless hostility of the whole free-thinking party. They could retain their power only so long as their political influence was unassociated with disaster, only so long as their patrons remained unmoved by the intellectual forces which were undermining the traditional system. And just as the courts became permeated with the new ideas, the two Jesuit strongholds at Vienna and Versailles received a severe shock in an unsuccessful conflict with the two great Protestant powers, Prussia and England.

Expulsion of the Jesuits from Portugal.—The first state in which their polity was attacked and their presence prohibited was, however, one in no way concerned in the Seven Years' War, and was one whose independence and dynasty they had originally done very much to establish, namely, the realm of the Braganzas. There Pombal's advent to power brought them summary expulsion. Not content with dismissing the

fathers from attendance at court, and lodging complaints against the society's mercantile undertakings, he seized on their alleged complicity in an attempt to assassinate the king as a pretext to banish them from the Portuguese dominions. With no regard to their comfort or their future, he pitilessly arrested all members of the order, dangerous and harmless alike, and despatched them to Italy, where they endured considerable hardship before they found accommodation.

The Brief, "Dominus ac Redemptor Noster," 1773.—In France matters followed much the same course as in Portugal. Bad fortune, added to the hostility of Madame de Pompadour and Choiseul, deprived them of their influence at court. An exposure of their regulations in the course of a commercial lawsuit convinced the public that the society must submit to some reform if it were to continue to operate in France without detriment to the civil power. The general of the order, however, replied to a demand for a change in the constitution of the French Jesuits with the well-known answer, "Sint ut sunt, aut non sint"—an answer eloquent for more than one degenerate institution of that time. The suppression of the order duly followed, and finally its members were banished from the country. In Spain, too, the religious but despotic Charles III. was led to regard them as menacing to his authority, and on their exciting seditious disturbances against the reforms of his minister Squillace, they were sent off under circumstances still more cruel than those which had attended their banishment from Portugal. A like fate overtook them in Parma and Naples, and they even lost the protection of Maria Theresa. Only in the dominions of the heretical King of Prussia and in orthodox Russia did they find protection. Frederick was well pleased to use them as

schoolmasters when their power was broken, and Catherine gladly seized another means of influence in Catholic Poland. The schism continued to embarrass Catholicism till the famous brief abolishing the order was issued in the pontificate of Clement XIV.

Reign of Charles III. in Spain, 1759–88.—The man to whom is attributed the principal part in inducing Clement to proceed to this extremity was the Spanish ambassador Moñino, afterwards known as the Count of Floridablanca. And his conduct on this occasion was a token of more than a passing motive in the diplomacy of Spain at Rome. It was, indeed, the expression of a change in the national policy at Madrid. Floridablanca was foremost of several who at this time strove to restore life to the Spanish monarchy, and to bring the country more on a level with the rest of Europe. But neither to the well-meaning king, nor to Floridablanca, nor to Aranda, nor to Campomanes was granted power to rouse a degenerate and priest-ridden people to live only for its better self. Monarchy could not at once undo all that it had done to encourage the vices of this stiff-necked race. Notwithstanding the fanatical loyalty of his subjects, Charles III. failed to secure implicit obedience to his prudent mandates of reform. The more vigorous policy of his ministers was thwarted by the opposition of the clergy and the national inertia. Nevertheless, this reign brought the country to the verge of social reform, as it had tentatively introduced it to political progress. Even Godoy, the despicable minister-favourite under Charles IV., was impelled to maintain in some sort its tradition by real effort on behalf of intellectual advance. At its close a well-founded hope in the nation's power of spontaneous advance was attained. But the new reign and the great European convulsion dashed all these hopes

to the ground. Years afterwards Spain had to begin anew, and under pitiable disadvantages, that work of self-redemption which is still in progress, and whose crude and chequered course has caused the reign of Charles III., in its true eighteenth-century aspect, to be almost entirely disregarded.

Charles' Reign in Naples, 1735–59.—No less unfortunate was the same Charles' earlier reign in Naples. His attempts to civilize the country and to develop its resources were rewarded with some measure of success, and were meritoriously extended by Tanucci, whom he left at the head of the regency during the minority of his son Ferdinand IV. Something of value was gained. The barons at least were enticed by the attractions of the court from exercising an armed tyranny over the provinces, and some of their most invidious prerogatives were abolished. Limits were set to the power and wealth of the priesthood; the papal ordinances were made subordinate to the royal approval; and the administration of justice was in part reformed. The interests of commerce were attended to, and many useful public works were executed. But no portion of the time's enlightened principles gained permanent adoption in the government, whose new experience of a ruler's care was soon exchanged for the worst tyranny of Bourbon misrule.

Spirit of Reform in Italy.—Yet Italy was not without a part in the new movement. In Naples appeared one of the earliest attacks on the political power of the Church in favour of the absolute sovereignty of the state. This was the book of Giannone, whose influence throughout the peninsula was of very considerable political importance in determining the insubordinate attitude of different states towards the papal power. Several other notable works of liberal meaning

might be enumerated which were produced by Italy in the age when men like Beccaria, Vico, Genovesi, and Filangieri thought and wrote. In truth, if Italians subsequently showed themselves ready to receive the ideas of France, it was only because they had diligently prepared themselves for the lessons of the gospel of progress. Nor did the governments remain indifferent to what was going on around them. In Tuscany, under the Grand Duke Leopold, the anomalous distinctions which separated the constituent portions of the duchy were removed by introducing uniformity of justice, taxation, customs, and administration. A more national and less sacerdotal character was given to the accepted Catholicism. The agrarian system was amended, and the privileges of the nobles were curtailed; drainage works and like improvements were undertaken, and monopolies were subordinated to the public interest. But to all this was not wanting that foil which, in some shape or other, ever accompanied the benevolent action of the reforming sovereigns. Leopold was intent upon doing everything for his people in a paternal manner. He was thus led to develop the old system of espionage into the police engine, which was the most vexatious heritage bequeathed to the Italians of the last century. Nor did that part of Italy which was immediately under Austrian dominion escape the hand of reform. Even the papal states had a Pius VI. Only in the aristocratic republics did the new tidings pass unheeded.

Rule of the House of Savoy in Piedmont.—Somewhat grim and gloomy was the form which the increased activity of government assumed in the dominions of the House of Savoy. In this respect, as in so many others, the military monarchy which was destined to conduct the contest for Italian independence and unity resembled that larger soldier-state

which fought the battle of German freedom and consolidation. Victor Amadeus II., the founder of the kingdom, was not inferior to the Hohenzollerns in his efforts to strengthen his state by educating the people, and slackening the bonds of superstition. His son, Charles Emanuel III. (1730–73), though his despotism brought ruin to all that remained of constitutional freedom, followed a like policy, and further centralized the administration and reformed the feudal tenures. But in both reigns the difficulties of self-preservation necessitated the maintenance of a burdensome military force, and favoured feudal subordination of classes.

Military Character of Piedmont's Polity.—In the reign of Victor Amadeus III. (1773–96) this aspect of military monarchy became still more prominent. Self-defence being his chief concern, the king sought to make the Piedmontese army like the highly wrought model of Prussia. Thus he burdened his small state with exactions which it could ill sustain; and he followed the pattern system so closely that the exclusiveness and arrogance of the nobility, stronger here than anywhere else in Italy, was encouraged in the same pernicious manner as in Prussia. But in both countries habitual subordination of classes to one another and to the royal service was the essential condition which enabled the sovereigns to overcome the difficulties that were strewn around their nationalizing mission. Though attended by many unpleasing social consequences, it was this class subordination which enabled the two peoples to support the trials which they encountered as champions of the freedom and brotherhood of their kin.

Monarchy in the Scandinavian States.—In the Scandinavian states the tendencies and vicissitudes of European state-life of the monarchico-feudal period

received peculiarly clear illustration. Here prevailed later, perhaps, than anywhere except in Poland, the worst evils which the feudal order left in the way of monarchy. Here the Crown engaged at closest quarters with the nobility in behalf of its own power and the liberty of the people; here it became most suddenly supreme, and founded the most absolute governments. In open day the position of the nobles was subverted, and the sovereigns were entrusted with the sole charge of the people's interests. In these countries was epitomized the defeudalizing process which dragged out to such tedious length in the greater part of Europe.

The Danish Revolution.—In Denmark the transition from the feudal to the monarchical order had been summed up in a single crisis, and effected by a bloodless revolution in the seventeenth century. Till then the king had practically been elected by the noble families, and his functions had been restricted and perverted by the stipulations to which the oligarchy habitually forced him to assent. Conversely, the nobility had enjoyed the most extravagant rights, privileges, and immunities. The Reformation, elsewhere so conducive to the strengthening of civil government, had only increased their power to enslave the people and rob the state. By hard fortune from without, these abuses were brought to a speedy termination. After experiencing a severe reverse in the Thirty Years' War, Denmark came into continual and disastrous collision with Sweden. Twice was Copenhagen beleaguered; twice was it saved from capture by the devotion of its king, Frederick III., and the valour of its citizens. On the conclusion of peace, it was evident that some extraordinary effort was necessary to save the state from ruin. In September, 1660, a parliamentary assembly, consisting of representatives of the

nobles, clergy, and burghers met at Copenhagen to consider the means to be employed. The peasantry, whose right to be represented in the Parliament was indefeasible, had been brought too low by the nobility to put in an appearance, and it devolved on the burghers and clergy to defend the nation from the cupidity of the privileged classes. The refusal of the last to subject themselves to the operation of a general excise tax occasioned a coalition of the ecclesiastics and citizens against the valuable monopoly, which the nobles had come to enjoy, of renting the Crown lands at a nominal rate. The contest thus excited soon resolved itself into an agitation for the conversion of the elective sovereignty into a hereditary monarchy.

Monarchy established in Denmark.—From the first the nobles were overpowered by their antagonists. They were unable to preserve any of the conditions they had imposed upon the Crown; nay, they were compelled to acquiesce in a total surrender to the king of the work of forming a new constitution. Nobles, clergy, burghers, and peasants alike empowered the king to found a throne, heritable by both male and female descendants, according to the pattern which he thought best suited to the country and the existing institutions. This surrender led to the later acceptance from Christian V. of the Kongelov, "the one written law in the civilized world which fearlessly carries out absolutism to its last consequences." And Frederick III., with his advisers, proved himself not unworthy of the responsibility. Under his auspices monarchy, with all mildness and caution, purged Denmark in a few years of the worst feudal evils, which in most other countries were partly extirpated by a protracted contest, and partly lingered under the protection of the Crown.

And the newly created monarchy was equally prompt to assume the manners and semblance of European royalty. Frederick's successor, Christian V., by help of his minister Griffenfeldt, lost no time in clothing the throne with splendour and in surrounding it with a graduated order of nobility. Yet further went Frederick IV., who reigned during the first thirty years of the eighteenth century. Along with an increased exercise of his prerogative, this king manifested a true zeal for progress and enlightenment, like the rest of the more advanced politicians of the time. Measures were taken in favour of the serfs; education received attention for the first time; the administration and finances were managed with success; industry was encouraged; and the interests of commerce were regarded.

The Coup d'etat of Gustavus III. in Sweden, 1772.—Far less summary than the single Danish revolution was the strife by which Sweden attained to true monarchical government. From the beginning the kingdom of the Vasas was reft by antagonism between the power of the Crown and the ambition of the nobles; but in this connection we can only advert to the final act, which established for good the supremacy of the sovereign. This happened as late as the reign of Gustavus III. This young king had witnessed in his father's reign the extremities to which the aristocratic factions could reduce the nation. He was energetic and arbitrary in temperament; he was convinced of the monarchical principles of the century, and desirous of fulfilling the highest functions belonging to kings; and he was, moreover, as cautious and dissimulating in the formation of his plans as he was bold in their execution. Confident of the support of the people, and peculiarly gifted with qualities for obtaining popularity, he waited long enough to become secure of his position, and then,

by a well-contrived *coup d'état*, overthrew the oligarchical government, and procured the ratification of a constitution which gave to the Crown almost absolute power.

Reign and Assassination of Gustavus III.—For a considerable time Gustavus discharged the duties thus incurred without infringing the limits of his authority. But, like so many other of his contemporaries, he fell into extravagancies very incommensurate with the resources of his country. His hold upon the people was further weakened by indulgence in certain whimsical regulations, for which he betrayed a taste as he grew older; and he placed a very damaging strain on his authority by embarking on a bootless war with Russia in complete disregard of the constitutional conditions prescribed for such a step. The discontent thus provoked drove him to resort to another *coup d'état*, which left him a perfectly absolute king, and deprived the nobles of their chief remaining privileges. His fantastic project of engaging in war with the French revolutionary government brought matters to a climax. This time it was the nobles who dealt the blow. Gustavus had neglected to conciliate the order as sound policy dictated, and he had of necessity increased its disaffection by injuring its interests in his efforts to improve the condition of the people. He also kept it in fear of another assault on its position, while his chivalrous crazes and warlike enterprises opened up an indefinite prospect of troubles for the state. A conspiracy was formed against him, and he was shot at a masked ball. He was succeeded by his son, in whom his better qualities were absent and his eccentricities and rashness exaggerated. Thus it came about that the Crown which he had vested with supreme power passed in the end to a French adventurer and his family. But neither did the old evils return, nor did the Swedes

require again to fortify the foundations of monarchy before adopting a more balanced system of government.

The Reign of Anarchy in Poland.—To confirm the lesson afforded by the history of the Scandinavian states, only a converse example was required. If events in Sweden and Denmark demonstrated with distinctness the nature of that combat which lent relevance to the existence of monarchical institutions, an instance of the calamities resulting from the non-intervention of a powerful crown at the proper juncture in the life of a state, was alone necessary to corroborate the conclusion that kings were in their time very valuable functionaries. And it happened that when Sweden was extricated from the toils of a traitorous oligarchy by submitting to the high-handed rule of a single man, there came to pass the most awful catastrophe which in modern history has overtaken a nation in revenge for obstinate persistence in systematic anarchy. Then occurred in Poland the *reductio ad absurdum* of aristocratic insubordination and turbulence. To assure Polish independence in the presence of vigorous and encroaching neighbours, it was imperative to maintain a sound social organization, and to concentrate the country's resources in the hands of a political superior. But here the magnates of the community were most powerful, unrestrained, and self-seeking; here the life of the peasantry most nearly approached brute existence; here swarms of inferior nobles filled the retinues of the magnates and lived upon the society without contributing anything to the common stock; and here, in consequence, there was no room for free and honourable industry. The only bond of union in the land was an intolerant Catholicism. The Crown was merely an inflammatory fiction, an apple of discord; the aristocratic republican assemblies were but gatherings of strife and disorder. The electiveness of the

monarchy, the disabilities imposed on every king at his election, the *liberum veto*, and the right of armed confederation, were the never-failing sources of disorganization and tumult. While other countries had been preparing themselves to enter upon the modern stage of European social development, Poland had been sinking deeper and deeper into the extremes of serfage and baronial licence. Here was wanting every constituent of true patriotism. Here was absent or perverted every influence which usually strengthens and protects the lives of nations. The very valour of the Poles was spent on wild civil conflicts; their talents stood them in best stead for intrigue; their love of freedom vented itself in lawless individualism. Nothing in them conformed to the laws of sound existence.

Consequent Partitions of Poland, 1772–95.—And this rule of the abnormal vitiated even their participation in the time's enlightenment. True, the party, to whom experience and instruction from abroad had suggested fundamental reform, was so far in harmony with the regular conditions of things as to single out, for the first step towards improvement, the conversion of the elective sovereignty, with its brawls, intrigues, and debility, into a stable hereditary monarchy. But it stultified this aspiration by relying on the most fatal of all means for the achievement of the change, to wit, the help of Russia. On the death of Augustus III., the Saxon King of Poland, this misguided reform party appealed to Catherine II. for help to enable it to place on the throne one of its own candidates. She readily accepted the invitation to meddle with the affairs of the distracted state. She provided the men and money necessary to secure a unanimous election on the field of Vola. But the successful candidate was one of her old lovers, the weak and irresolute Stanislaus Poniatowski.

At the same time, under the guise of protector of Poland's constitution and liberty, she prohibited all attempts to abolish the main causes of anarchy—a perfidious policy, in which she was countenanced by Austria, and abetted by Prussia. Poland was thus finally reduced to a condition of impotent confusion. Violence and guile from without completed the work for which dissension and anarchy had long prepared within. The time was come for the fulfilment of John Casimir's prophecy; the scheme often broached in secret was now openly realized. The three neighbouring monarchies stepped in and seized portions of the Polish territory. A few years passed, and the Poles made a movement towards the regeneration of their state after the same hasty fashion which the French were then following in their revolution. But they were as unable to extricate themselves from the snares of their enemies as from their own follies and vices. In the name of order their reforming efforts were nullified and the second partition of the country took place. A little longer, and the kingdom of the Jagellons was entirely incorporated into the three military monarchies of Eastern Europe.

Aristocratic Government in England.—Even in our own country the cause of reform was not altogether dissociated from the action of monarchy and individual greatness. Notwithstanding the unique character of British constitutional progress, the political condition of England in the middle of the eighteenth century bore a certain degree of resemblance to that of continental states of the same period. In both cases a powerful aristocracy exercised great influence on society and the management of public affairs. In both cases, too, considerable evils were experienced through the corrupt practices and lax morality which

infected to a more or less extent all the upper classes of Europe at this time.

The Personal Influence of Pitt.—And the first event to remove from parliamentary government the dishonour which had fallen upon it in the classic land of its adoption was one entirely in agreement with the main tendency of the age. This was no other than the appearance from among the wealthy commoners of a great and commanding character. The efforts of the elder Pitt brought to England a splendid meed of military glory; but incomparably more memorable were the purer and nobler conceptions of political life, which render him pre-eminent among the statesmen of the century. He it was who hushed the mean squabblings of faction by the impassioned utterances of fervid patriotism, who put to shame sordid strife for lucre and position by personal indifference to dignities and emoluments, who vehemently strove to breathe into the nation and its rulers a lofty singleness of purpose, and to found government on the confidence of the people. His example, precepts, and legislation were to England what reforming monarchy was to contemporaneous Europe. He first raised that protest against oligarchical rule which ultimately issued in a radical reform of the Commons. He first vindicated the true principles of representative government in the face of an obdurate parliament. He, first among states-men, hailed the birth of the great American Republic with eloquent traditions of British constitutional freedom. He first discerned the awakening political capacity of the English people, and promoted that national life which has since distinguished it among the nations. Before his time opposition to the vices of the govern-ment had been but the artifice of those worsted in their use. To his generous and statesmanlike views must

primarily be traced the greater part of the improvements which have since been incorporated into the English constitution.

Accession of George III., 1760.—But while it was England's privilege to receive these lessons of the time through the person of William Pitt, it was also its misfortune to be afflicted with a sovereign who represented in a limited sense the wilfulness of the continental type of monarch, and invaded with disastrous effects the spirit and forms of the polity established by the Revolution. George III. ascended the throne at a crisis which demanded the most sincere and adroit exercise of the royal prerogative in behalf of sound constitutional government. To the neglect and abuse of the powers of the Crown had chiefly been owing the degradation of the parliamentary system; by their judicious application it seemed that the sources of evil might be stopped, and the national policy of Pitt imposed upon the ruling classes. Now the new king was in many respects qualified to contend with the evils from which England suffered. He set a conspicuous example of purity and simplicity in living; he possessed a strong feeling of duty, and a will so firm that under the influence of temper it degenerated into immovable obstinacy; he was conspicuously courageous, kind-hearted, and hard-working; he was remarkably clear-sighted so far as his vision extended; and he came to the throne glorying in the name of Briton, or, to be textually exact, of Britain. Nevertheless, his reign, viewed with regard to the action of the Crown, is the record of a long series of corrupt dealings, deplorable failures, and reprehensible misdeeds.

Growth of Liberalism in the English Parliament.—But there is another aspect of the reign more deserving of recognition. There is a point of view from

which George III. appears as an ally of the people against the aristocratic oligarchy. The resolute self-assertion of the king raised up a new Tory party, which was dominated by intense devotion to the reigning sovereign, and by reverence for the royal prerogative. The fears aroused by the sight of the French Revolution confirmed it in its monarchical views, filled it with a craven dread of all change, and brought it many additional recruits. The possession of a leader, though hardly a representative, in the younger Pitt, gave it further preponderance. The Tory party became supreme, and long continued to wield the chief power in the state. Meanwhile a new Whig party had been formed. Overwhelmed in the Upper House by George's servile levies, beaten in the Commons by the immense influence of the king and his friends, doggedly opposed by the clergy in their efforts to recover the ground lost in former reigns, the traditional guardians of the acquisitions of the Revolution were forced to seek assistance by appealing to liberal and popular principles. The lower sections of the middle class, and even the lowest orders, thus found representation in the unreformed parliament. The upper portion of the industrial world was emboldened by the increasing force of public opinion, by the publication of debates, by the great influence of the press, by the institution of public meetings, and by the talents of the Whig leaders, to pay less regard to courtly honours and preferment, and to rally round the party to which it was by nature more closely allied than to the supporters of despotism and obscurantism. Hence the revival of monarchical rule in England, which necessarily produced an anomalous deadlock in the government, and occasioned a serious pause in the political progress of the nation, was not altogether void of the general results achieved

by absolutism in the century. By the power of the Crown the factious rule of aristocracy was crushed, and the traditional upholders of freedom were forced to espouse the cause of popular liberty.

Degeneracy of the French Monarchy.—In France alone, amid a host of evils, monarchy did nothing to earn respect or gratitude. When in other states it was playing a great national *rôle*, here, where it had reached its earliest and most imposing development, it became an object of contempt and disgust. When Louis XV. died, hope, if not confidence, was restored to the throne. His grandson was free from vices, and disposed to take interest in the welfare of the nation. Unfortunately, Louis XVI. was without firmness of character or consistency of purpose. He allowed his frivolous queen and wayward court to countervail his good intentions, their intrigues to thwart his plans, and the clamours of a mob to shake his confidence in his ministers. He could offer no resistance to the downward course of the monarchy. Passively he was borne along, the luckless victim of its decadence.

Turgot's Ministry of Reform.—But France could not be the only civilized nation whose rulers were heedless of French ideas of reform. Even in the reign of Louis XV., something of the new spirit had found expression in the ruling circles; and more than one capable administrator had fallen in attempts to remove abuses and introduce improvements. But evil had to grow yet stronger before power was given to a man qualified to cope with the great and complex dangers which surrounded the state. Turgot was not entrusted with the ministry of finance till the situation had become so desperate, that only the most drastic measures could prevent a speedy collapse of the monarchical fabric. Thoroughly instructed by his memorable

administration of Limousin, Turgot was fully aware of the circumstances under which he entered office. No man of his day knew better the strength of traditional institutions, and the intimate connection of the present with the past. He, at any rate, is free from the blame so often imputed to unsuccessful reformers, the reproach of hasty, ill-considered innovation. With calm instructed vision he contemplated the evils which afflicted France. Following the conclusions of the economical school which he adorned, he drew up, in conjunction with Malesherbes, the only possible scheme for saving the country. The plan in its entire form comprised nearly every change, which, after years of turmoil, produced modern France. Among the projects of this reforming ministry were provincial self-government, popular education, freedom of the press, and the admission of the burgher class to all public offices; the abolition of the road *corvée*, and of guilds, and hindrances to agriculture; the equable distribution of taxation, the liberation of trade, and the reorganization of justice, police, and finance; the commutation of feudal burdens and seignorial rights; reduction of the royal expenditure; disuse of *lettres de cachet;* and through the minister of war, St. Germain, improvement of discipline, and the recognition of merit in the army.

Adequacy of Turgot's Scheme of Reform.—There was in truth no reason to discredit the ability of Turgot's ministry to save the state, far on the road to destruction as that state had gone. The means employed would certainly have amounted to a revolution; but they would have been applied with judgment, and with prudent consideration for the sacrifices and derangements necessarily involved in such a process. The trite assertion that France was not to be purged by anything short of a consuming fever is nothing but the

commonplace of a careless historical optimism. To condemn the offending classes as corrupt matter, to be destroyed at all costs, is possible only through gross misapprehension of their motives and disposition. The most fortunate members of the old order were not monsters past all reform, and the most pernicious institutions might have been abolished without immolating the individuals whom they harboured. The changes contemplated by Turgot would have rendered needless a series of spasmodic revolutions, following no fixed principle, owning no guides, and submitting to no laws of politics or morality. To execute them, however, power was required to control the influential, the ignorant, and the base.

Incapacity of Louis XVI.—The power was not available. Though Turgot won the entire approval of the king for his plans of removing hardship and abuse, and the good Louis was persuaded that only he and his minister cared for the people, the contemplated reforms were hardly commenced when it became evident that the royal authority would shrink from engaging with the furious opposition aroused in all conservative quarters. It is a never-failing consequence of human nature that the most virtuous will offer violent resistance when they believe their interests to be imperilled, even though the change be clearly for the public good. The strong arm of the majority, or of some other political superior, is always necessary to compel acquiescence from those who would recoil in their calmer moments from wilful injury to society. But Louis had no sense for the arbitrary element in personal government. He could not comprehend that pure monarchies possess the essential disadvantage of wittingly or unwittingly nurturing anachronisms and abuses, and that to redress the social balance the discretionary power of despotism

must occasionally be exercised. He clung too closely to the dictates of domestic morality and the law for private persons to be able to understand that monarchs must sometimes defy the law, ignore individuals, and disregard tumult, if they are to preserve the health of their states.

Fall of Turgot's Ministry, 1776.—On the decree of the first and most urgent reform, namely, the emancipation of the corn trade from absurd regulations, he displayed an entire lack of firmness to withstand the uproar which interested and prejudiced opponents excited by vulgar fallacy and suborning arts. And though he was induced to overcome the resistance of the parliament of Paris to following edicts of great moment by the recognized act of a *lit de justice*, his reluctance to support his ministers in their policy became so embarrassing that it was evident that they soon would have no alternative but resignation. Moreover, Louis became as suspicious of his servants as they of him. While anxious to adopt their suggestions for the purification of the state, he shrank from their schemes for reconstructing it. Turgot, staunch monarchist though he was, hesitated not to lay before him demands for fundamental changes in the French constitution. That Louis was wrong in supposing that France might be saved by mere amendments is certain; that Turgot, perhaps impatient to sound at once the full depth of the king's confidence, submitted too abruptly a revolutionary project, seems equally clear. Possibly further intercourse with one another might have brought king and minister into accord if at this juncture the enmity of the court to the ministry had not culminated in a personal intrigue against Turgot and Vergennes. At any rate, the king came to the conclusion that the ministerial policy was dangerous, and that the discontent

it aroused was unendurable. Reproached by queen and court for parsimony towards their enjoyments, and injustice towards their favourites; summoned by clergy, nobility, and lawyers to prevent the disturbance of feudal institutions, Louis XVI. made up his mind to discard all heroic measures. Turgot, Malesherbes, and St. Germain were dismissed from his service, and France resumed the road to blind revolution.

Inevitableness of the French Revolution.—Within a few years of Turgot's fall the catastrophe happened. Seldom does the same generation, which wilfully and selfishly obstructs amendment, live to suffer retributive evil; rarely do the members of unyielding classes expiate in their own persons the social ills which they have deliberately made their own. But in this instance a terrible vengeance overtook those who had conspired to defeat timely reform. Nor did this Nemesis confine itself to France. It reached forth over the whole face of Europe, and spared not the realm of the most enlightened monarch. With measured justice the Revolution passed from country to country. Imposed from without or generated from within, it brought to judgment the work of personal governments. While visiting their crimes and shortcomings, it extended their reforms into a new phase of social progress. The reforming monarchs failed very grievously to exempt their states from incursions of the Revolution. Their work was valuable, and their lives notable, so far as they succeeded in anticipating its dispensations. But they were far too vain and corrupt, far too much entangled in feudal evils, far too contemptuous of the people, to forestall in their short allotted time the main changes which made Europe modern.

The unnecessary character of the Revolution.—On the other hand, if Turgot had succeeded in saving

the French monarchy; if for another generation sovereigns or their ministers, free from imputations of anarchy, had been permitted to experiment and reform; if England, unscared by revolutionary tragedies, had been allowed to lead the world without intermission in its course of political progress and industrial development; if the new industry, the new mechanics, the new economics, the new humanity, had not been hindered in their beneficent extension by the ruin of war and the stupor of reaction; if, indeed, the whole French Revolution had never happened—then the Europe of to-day would be the Europe of a century hence, and the tale of sorrow, war, and struggle, which will form the sequel to this book, would have been a narrative of progress timely but not premature, of changes wholesome but rarely cruel, of war dread as an arbitrament but invigorating as an effort, of plenty spreading with the increase of wealth, of content diffused along with every political, industrial, and spiritual advance. But Turgot failed; and historians, perhaps wisely, perhaps stupidly, holding to the actual, pronounce the Revolution to have been all along as necessary as it was then inevitable.

CHAPTER III

THE ADVENT OF THE REVOLUTION

"Es erben sich Gesetz' und Rechte
Wie eine ew'ge Krankheit fort;
Sie schleppen von Geschlecht sich zum Geschlechte,
Und rücken sacht von Ort zu Ort.
Vernunft wird Unsinn, Wohlthat Plage;
Weh dir, dass du ein Enkel bist!
Vom Rechte, das mit uns geboren ist,
Von dem ist, leider! nie die Frage."

GOETHE.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident:—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; and whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter and abolish it, and to institute a new government; laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."—*American Declaration of Independence.*

"Leicht bei einander wohnen die Gedanken,
Doch hart im Raume stossen sich die Dinge."

SCHILLER.

Decline of Monarchy's Moral Reputation. — If monarchy in the eighteenth century may be studied as a reformer, no less appropriately may it be treated as a scandal. In France the intense feeling of confidence in the crown was gradually changed by painful experience into utter weariness of its vice and incompetence. Among the minor German potentates prevailed

depravity and oppression only distinguishable from that of Versailles by greater grossness and absurdity. Even at courts, where claims to something better must be allowed, conduct was frequently in vogue which could not but impair love and reverence for the throne. About this period, too, many disputed successions had lowered the royal authority in public estimation. Hence sprang up feelings of hostility against monarchical institutions, feelings which enervated in every breast the sentiments of loyalty, though they preponderated only in the most impatient minds. Along with nobles and ecclesiastics, kings came to be suspected as traitors to the public weal. As yet the advantages of placing monarchical power on a new footing, by uniting it to a constitution, were understood by few. The services of despotism were too recent and patent for the multitude consciously to contemplate its subversion. The halcyon days of kings were ended, but their remembrance still illumined royalty in the popular imagination.*

The Philosophers attack Monarchical Authority.—Parallel with this change of feeling occurred a similar but independent change in the doctrines of the social theorists, which encouraged the growing disrespect for princes, and was in its turn rendered more extreme by

* The iconoclasts felt this keenly. "Des préjugés non moins dangereux, ont aveuglé les hommes sur leurs gouvernemens. Les nations ne connurent point les vrais fondemens de l'autorité ; elles n'osèrent exiger le bonheur de ces Rois, chargés de le leur procurer ; elles crurent que les souverains, travestis en Dieux, recevoient en naissant le droit de commander au reste des mortels, pouvoient disposer à leur gré de la félicité des peuples, et n'étoient point comptables des malheureux qu'ils faisoient. Par une suite nécessaire de ces opinions, la politique dégénéra dans l'art fatal de sacrifier la félicité de tous au caprice d'un seul, ou de quelques méchans privilégiés."—Holbach's *Système de la Nature*, i., p. 339.

The copy of this famous book in the Bodleian Library is from a pirated edition, and is incorrectly printed, to the detriment of the language. Both editions profess to have been printed in London, 1770, though the genuine one was probably produced in Amsterdam.

monarchy's ill-repute. Logically viewed, the change was an easy one. The current sensational philosophy readily transformed itself into materialism and atheism, or in other words, into naturalism of a somewhat low type. From such a creed no hierarchical scheme of society could receive sanction. Gradations of rank were repugnant to its vaunted simplicity, and were dismissed as the inventions of craft and despotism. They obtained no recognition from its crude utilitarian ethics. A fantastic uniformity was attributed to the natural order, and was prescribed for the ideal society. The strictures of rationalism were violently enforced. The Church, the nobles, and the feudal evils were condemned. Finally, and in due sequence, kings were denounced as charlatans, impostors, and oppressors. The rule of reason alone was declared legitimate; and by reason was meant obedience within certain limits of social reciprocity to the unsophisticated inclinations of the individual. At present, said Holbach, "L'état de société est un état de guerre du souverain contre tous, et de chacun des membres les uns contre les autres. L'homme est méchant, non parcequ'il est né méchant, mais parcèqu'on le rend tel; les grands, les puissants écrasent impunément les indigents, les malheureux." "Frémissez donc, Rois cruels, qui plongez vos sujets dans la misère et les larmes, qui ravagez les nations, qui changez la terre en un cimitière aride; frémissez des traits de sang sous lesquels l'histoire irritée vous peindra pour les races futures; ni vos monumens somptueux, ni vos victoires imposantes, ni vos armées innombrables n'empêcheront la postérité d'insulter vos mânes odieux; et de venger ses ayeux de vos éclatants forfaits!"

Rousseau's Theory of Natural Society.—More subversive than this line of argument were the writings

of a man who in many senses was a reactionist. Like the more extreme apostles of enlightenment, J. J. Rousseau glorified the order of nature and vindicated the democratic constitution of society. But he treated with scorn their passionate belief in the beneficent influence of the arts and sciences. He opposed to the enthusiasm for scientific and social advance a sentimental yearning for return to primæval simplicity. He found the salvation of society not in the false wisdom of the cultured, but in the healthy instincts of the unlettered. He awoke among the fine ladies and gentlemen of the rococo time a taste for the charms of humble life, and a sense for the first duties of human existence. He placed the nurture and rearing of the young in a new light. With him homely functions and family cares were winning privileges. Under his spell the daily toil of the country grew sweet; labour became dignified, and poverty admirable.

Rousseau's Doctrine of Politics.—On the other hand, Rousseau furnished a text-book for the democratic party in his *Contrat Social.* He who had formerly inveighed against society as the creature of imposture and fraud, who had declared property to be the source of all social evils and disturbance, came to compose a theory of the social structure in which the rights of property were taken for granted, many possible benefits were asserted of the social state, and all misfortunes were traced to the abnormal character of political institutions. Society, he taught, was founded on a contract between its members. Therefore the sovereign power resided in the people. The sovereignty, moreover, was inalienable. Under all circumstances the people might resume any authority they had delegated.*

* The right of a people to rebel against its rulers, was not unknown among the monarchies of Europe. Till the beginning of the century it was

Society, in short, was a brotherhood, in which all were citizens and equals, acting individually as subjects and collectively as the sovereign. This view of the body politic, proclaimed by the most popular writer of the day, in terse formulæ, and with much show of mathematical precision, opened every mind to the idea of revolution by and for the people. It persuaded of its lawfulness many who were shocked by the tirades of materialist philosophers, or were disinclined to study the speculations of severer thinkers. The doctrine of fraternity dealt a mortal blow at the atomism of French society. It redeemed the sense of nationality and citizenship from subjection to the class and individualistic feelings which were at once the basis and the danger of the French monarchy. From being the most minutely divided yet homogeneous nation, France grew since this time to be the most united and patriotic people of the continent.

Rousseau's Republican Ideas.—For practical politics Rousseau gave little instruction. Excepting approval of a dictatorship, as the cure for inveterate social disorders, and a proposal to banish the members of an unsocial creed, and to punish with death any one who, having recognized the dogmas of civil religion, acted as if he did not believe them—suggestions which were destined to be to France a very Pandora's box of woes—no maxims for immediate application were discoverable in his work. One form of government, however, was distinctly recommended, and this was republican. Indeed, a republic of some kind, a republic on a small scale and peculiarly sensitive to popular

recognized by the King of Hungary, in his coronation oath, as a legal proceeding, after the fashion of Poland ; and Voltaire had erroneously stated in *Le Siècle de Louis Quinze*, that it had been revived on the accession of Maria Theresa.

passions, was the only polity consistent with the inalienable sovereignty of the people. This conclusion eventually produced the most momentous consequences; but at the time of publication, though supported by the general tenor of the current theories, it had to contend with the grave disfavour into which contemporary republican institutions had fallen.

Disrepute of Republican Government.—In the first place, though the Polish republic was but a transparent travesty of a commonwealth, its impending wreck lent for the undiscriminating spectator very sinister associations to every polity not founded on a monarchical basis.* Then Holland, the most glorious champion in civilized Europe of popular right against despotism, seemed to have lost the virtues and forms of a republic, together with the wealth and influence which freedom and energy had bestowed. In Switzerland, again, republican government had lost much reputation. Here oligarchies had followed the example and instigation of Louis XIV. by usurping power where it had belonged to the people, or by illiberally consolidating it where their pre-eminence had always been recognized. And when rebellion resisted their supremacy in one canton, the lords of others came to the rescue. Only in Geneva had concessions been wrung from them by determined agitation. In Italy the republican survivals from the Middle Ages were republics only in name; and the tiny state of San Marino alone preserved in its village life the best traditions of primitive self-government. Hence it was a coincidence of most serious import, that within a few years of the appearance

* The character of the Polish republic was long a source of illusion to the ill-informed. In 1792 one of the Gironde classed the Polish with the English, Anglo-American, Helvetic, and Dutch nations as the only representatives of freedom with whom the French Republic should deign to make alliances.

of Rousseau's book, there was founded by deliberate design the greatest republic of the world's history, and that this was achieved after a successful conflict with a European king, with the help of the French nation, and to the augmentation of the embarrassments surrounding the French monarchy.

France and the American Republic.—But even then republicanism was not regarded with real trust or approval. America itself, trained and biassed though it was in that direction, did not approach a republican form of government with entire confidence. It would be little wide of the truth to say that Americans, like the Netherlanders in the age of the Reformation, adopted such a polity only because they could not do otherwise. After the successful issue of the conflict and the erection of the Union's constitution, misgivings became less obstinate. The new republic had not had time to demonstrate its stability and efficiency, and its conditions rendered it far from an apposite example for a European state; but belief in its kind of constitution became a perfectly tenable position. Once again in the history of man were encouraged hopes of genuine self-government by highly civilized communities. Though far from converting old France to the extreme consequences of the theory of the social contract, the event gave additional force and circulation to the floating democratic ideas, and familiarized the densest minds with the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, and the lawfulness of rebellion.

Difficulties of the French Government.—These results were deep, enduring, and possessed of a power of rapid growth. Against them the French monarchy had only the ephemeral prestige of a victorious war to oppose. There immediately followed the financial crisis to which the government had so long been hurrying.

After the dismissal of Turgot, matters went from bad to worse. The respectable Necker, though he did something towards bringing order into the accounts, relied chiefly on credit to save the bankrupt state. After him the light-hearted Calonne strove to give the government the semblance of buoyancy by a great display of extravagance. But still the annual deficit and the load of debt increased, and both statesmen found themselves forced to recur to the plans of Turgot. To Necker this yielding to the inevitable brought dismissal, as it had to his great predecessor. Calonne's fall, however, was accompanied with peculiar circumstances. When his fatuous policy of reckless expenditure became no longer possible, and fundamental reform was imperative, he shrank from employing the doubtful services of royal edicts, and advised the king to convoke an assembly of notables, a device not unknown to history since the decay of the States-General.

Conduct of the Notables.—This body, composed for the most part of members of the privileged classes, though it contained a liberal element, proved captious and unmanageable. It refused to be the medium of reforms, or to relieve the king of any responsibility in his perilous dilemma. But it gave decided expression to a feeling which had been gaining strength for some time. It declared itself to be no representative of the nation, being only a collection of the king's nominees, and therefore without the power to authorize new taxes. By implication the States-General were declared the proper dispensers of extraordinary supplies.

Conduct of the Parliaments.—Disappointed by the restiveness of his assembly, and hated by the court for his tergiversation, Calonne retired from office. His successor abandoned his experiment, and returned to the old method of taxation with the sanction of the

parliaments. In June, 1787, five edicts were submitted to the parliament of Paris for registration, two of which imposed new taxes, while the remaining three provided for the commutation of forced labour, free trade in grain, and the establishment of provincial assemblies throughout the country, with ramifications in the district and village. These latter were registered, and thus in all the innocence of blind inexperience the Revolution was inaugurated in the provinces. Over the two first a heated struggle ensued. The parliament remonstrated in the language of the philosophers, thinly disguised by citations from history. The dispute was promptly taken up by the remaining twelve parliaments of France, and elicited from them the same kind of response. The king then exiled the Paris magistracy to Troyes. Finally, he issued edicts which virtually suppressed all the parliaments of the realm by decreeing a judicial reform similar, in many respects, to the improvements in the administration of justice afterwards secured by the Revolution. And now was reiterated in determined accents a demand for the summoning of the States-General. At last the king was obliged to give way to his recalcitrant magistrates. His edicts and ministers were abandoned at the same time that the parliaments were reinstated, and a definite promise was given to convoke the national council of old.

Union of the Orders in Dauphiny.—The incident which hurried the king to give this pledge and to renounce arbitrary measures, was very portentous for the immediate future. In Dauphiny the three orders of nobility, priesthood, and commons met together, declared themselves the estates of the province, which had long been suspended, and passed resolutions demanding that their provincial constitution should be restored with double representation of the commons. Their mere

discontent differed not from the complaints expressed by the separate orders all over the country at this time of general excitement. Everywhere the nobles were in the forefront of seditious agitation, everywhere the clergy gave their sanction to treasonable utterances, everywhere the citizens took part with those who resisted the king, everywhere, in short, the government met with hostile demonstrations. But this spontaneous fusion of the three orders showed that the old power of the Crown was on the brink of destruction. Though the French monarchy had been greatly aided in its rise to autocracy by inventing a standing army, it had never reposed on a military basis. Neither the police nor the soldiery—if we except the foreign mercenaries—afforded it independent support. They were instruments pertaining to the peculiar social order from which the monarchy derived power. They were constantly useful in suppressing brigandage and bread riots, but they did not form an independent source of authority. They ever remained a part of French society, and contained within themselves the same divisions and discontents that vexed the nation. The monarchy's real foundations were formed by the conflicting interests and unequable organization of its subjects. If, for a common purpose, these subjects forgot their antagonism, and together withstood its decrees, the ground was cut from beneath it, and its whole structure tottered. Hence the eagerness of the government to avoid giving further incentives to coalitions like that in Dauphiny.

General Hostility towards the Government.—And, indeed, the situation demanded the utmost prudence. During the recent events, aversion to the government had become an unreasoning passion. The assembly of notables was loudly applauded for resisting

the king's proposals, though these were wholly in favour of the people. The parliaments had won immense popularity in their endeavours to thwart the beneficent schemes of the Crown. Redress of grievances was forgotten in a feverish desire to place the state on a new and sounder basis. The doctrine of the sovereignty of the people was discussed and developed in all directions with an impetuosity which defied the Censure. Nothing is more difficult than to estimate the influence of ideas on a community. Like motives in the individual, they can only be measured by results; like all mental processes, they develop in secret, as if by unconscious cerebration. They constantly belie the most careful estimate of their logical significance. When all possible weight has been granted to the French intellectual movement of the eighteenth century, and every aggravating circumstance has been taken into consideration, historians can only account for this antimonarchical ebullition by lame references to latent feelings of suspicion which protracted misgovernment had generated in the minds of the people.

The Revolution not due to the Misery of the People.—The glib explanation which wholly attributes the outburst of the French Revolution to the misery of the people is as near a falsehood as a partial and inadequate explanation can be. In point of fact, the French masses were not worse off than their brethren in other continental countries. In many respects they were exceptionally well situated. In general, it will be found that their advantages were powerful causes in kindling the Revolution, and that the movement most readily gained admittance wherever in Europe the greatest immunity from hardship was enjoyed. It cannot be too often repeated that the French Revolution was not a convulsive struggle of a people tortured beyond endurance.

It was the collapse of an outworn social order; and it happened to be French only because in France maturity had most nearly approached decay. And this implies that, on the whole, the lot of the French people was preferable to that of the more backward nations, that the French peasant had become more free from the constraints and obligations of feudalism than were the peasantry on the rest of the Continent.*

Feudal Burdens of the French Peasantry.—Yet the vexations of the multitude were grievous enough to be a grave danger to the state. Notwithstanding the virtual extinction of serfage, the almost total abolition of seignorial authority, and the limitation of forced services and dues, the peasantry of France smarted under a number of evils which were none the less exasperating because they were but the shadows of their original forms, and could be seen in far harsher shapes elsewhere. Though the lord of the manor no longer resided among them as an hereditary governor, they were still often obliged to tolerate the ravages of his pigeons and game; to bring their corn to his mill, their grapes to his wine-press, and their dough to his oven; to pay toll at his bridges, to give heavy fees on the transfer of property, and to submit to a variety of minor exactions. Further, though a great number owned the land they cultivated, they were unable to put themselves beyond the reach of the charges adhering to it, or to escape the requisitions of the Church. The absence of the seignors threw the collection of these payments and dues into the hands of agents or lessees, destitute of the

* En résumé, dit un contemporain, "l'oppression était moins forte en France qu'en Espagne, qu'en Portugal, qu'en Autriche, qu'en Prusse, qu'en Turquie; cependant ces contrées sont restées fort tranquilles, et la France a fait sa révolution." C'est précisément pour cela qu'elle la fit.—*Albert Sorel, quoting Adrien Lezay*, 1797.

feudal sentiment, and anxious only to secure the highest returns.*

Pressure of Taxation on the Peasantry.—But it was from the central government that the most crushing demands came. Through the intendants, the districts were loaded with a certain weight of taxation, a certain levy for the militia, and a certain quantity of forced labour on the roads and other works. In themselves sufficiently injurious to the prosperity of the country, these exactions were distributed and imposed in such a manner that they could not fail to cripple industry and mock honest effort. By three ways they impoverished the people. They discouraged self-help by putting a premium on squalor and indigence; aided by the local tolls and customs, they hampered labour and exchange; and they directly deprived the labourer of a preposterously large portion of his earnings. Yet only a fraction of these imposts reached the king's exchequer. Many of the taxes were collected through farmers, who secured a handsome profit, while all the imposts were levied by very expensive machinery.† But the worst part of the system was the scale of exemptions, which protected from the fisc those who could best pay. Vauban, for example, in his unpalatable representations to Louis XIV., counted eighteen classes exempt from the *taille*. It was this evil which blocked the way to every

* So precarious and invidious was the right to levy such tolls that they could be bought for ten years' purchase, while land was worth thirty years' purchase and upwards.

† The only gainers by the expensive, unequal, arbitrary, and intricate method of levying the taxes, said Hume, "are the *Finançiers*, a race of men rather odious to the nobility and the whole kingdom. If a prince or minister, therefore, should arise, endowed with sufficient discernment to know his own and the public interest, and with sufficient force of mind to break through the ancient customs, we might expect to see these abuses remedied; in which case, the differences between that absolute government and our free one, would not appear so considerable as at present."

adequate reform, and rendered nugatory all other improvements in the financial administration. As long as all the nobles, officials, and clergy, and many independent citizens, evaded a fair share of contribution to the revenue of the state, no fiscal scheme could be other than a systematic tyranny to the poor man.

Condition of the Peasant Proprietors.—One industrial passion alone this unhopeful lot failed to quench in the breast of the French rustic. His longing to possess a bit of the soil remained as a motive to thrift and exertion. In order to become the owner of a patch of ground he would toil and hoard with invincible pertinacity. But when a landowner he was still unable to lift his head. He lacked more than ever incentives to enterprise and industry now that unprivileged proprietorship marked him as the special victim of feudal charges and the royal fisc. His farming, we are continually told, was unskilful in management and starved by want of capital; his condition beggarly and degraded. But the truth is that his want of skill was simply want of education and of opportunity to enjoy the fair reward of intelligent exertion. His dearth of capital, at a time when agricultural operations were conducted exclusively by means of rural labour, was nothing more than insufficiency of produce left him by his superiors to sustain strength and a cheerful spirit of toil, to form a fund against the calamities of bad seasons, to pay the country craftsmen for proper tools, and to keep the necessary proportion of live stock on his farm.* He purposely assumed a

* This last point especially manifested the ignorance of penury. "An advantageous rotation of crops," said Young, "and that arrangement of a farm which makes cattle necessary to corn, and corn necessary to cattle, on which the profit from arable land much depends, is what the French have hardly an idea of. In their practice it is never seen, and in their books it is never to be read." "In Normandy, the Bas Poitou, Limousin, Quercy, and Guienne, the importance of cattle is pretty well understood;

general appearance of brutish destitution in order to evade the taxes arbitrarily assessed on all kinds of property. It was, indeed, a horrifying revelation to Rousseau when, having strayed into French territory, he found a hospitable peasant obliged to enjoy furtively the better rewards of his industry. Since that time the small French landowners have greatly increased, both through the seizures and confiscations at the Revolution, and through normal means. Hence their circumstances are frequently referred to for information respecting the merits of a peasant proprietary. But seldom is it remembered that the indispensable conditions on which such a class can long remain prosperous—a hearty spirit of neighbourly co-operation and frank dealing, the ready acceptance of all available improvements—were in many parts precluded for generations by the habits of suspicion and ignorance engendered under the ancient *régime*.

Diversity of conditions in France.—This sombre account is, of course, but a rough generalization which may serve to indicate one of the chief conditions of the Revolution. In a country of so varied a character as France possessed at this period, every assertion, to be quite exact, would require interminable qualifications and restrictions. Composed of a number of provinces acquired at different times and under different circumstances, the realm contained a multitude of dissimilar institutions, tenures, and customs, by which the influences of feudal tradition and the central government were variously modified. It would be possible to draw examples of notable prosperity as well as of appalling misery by confining attention to Languedoc on the one hand, and to Auvergne and Dauphiny on the other.

> in some districts very well. In all the rest of the kingdom . . . there would in eighteen-twentieths of it be scarcely any cattle at all, were it not for the practice of ploughing with them."

But on the whole it appears that, manifold as were their grievances, the French peasantry had not lost all patience, as they certainly had not lost all spirit. The initiative to their insurrection is not to be found in their hardships, though these provided ample incitement to anarchy and revenge when once resignation and habit had been disturbed from without. In all probability they would have waited quietly for relief till reform had made way in the administration.

French Peasants incited to discontent.—Reform, however, stumbled fatally, and the long-suffering spirit was prematurely unsettled. Though separated by a great distance from the upper classes, the peasants did not escape the contagion of the reigning discontent. They did not fail to understand somewhat of the new ideas which were discussed wherever any mental activity existed. As the philanthropic notions became accepted, they were frequently addressed by their superiors on the iniquitous injustice to which they were a prey. So long had it been since the people had taken part in national affairs, that only here and there did any one suspect that perhaps the unfortunate masses might put to dangerous use the arguments of indiscreet innovators. In the preambles to the edicts of the king were sometimes drawn up elaborate indictments against the privileged and capitalist classes. The wrongs of the poor became a favourite weapon in the disputes between public functionaries.

Disturbing Effect of Administrative Changes.—When, therefore, the industrial reforms of Turgot were promulgated, only to be partially withdrawn, and the relations of employers and employed became seriously dislocated, the people were prepared to infer the possibility and need of change to their behoof. Later, when the edict for the reconstitution of provincial government

was enforced, the interference with the old order was so far-reaching that the minds of all were quite unbalanced. Many evidences of active dislike to wealth and rank appeared in the experiment of introducing a large measure of self-government in a nation where numberless distinctions and privileges at once forbade social harmony and administrative uniformity. The evils of inequality before the law and the fisc were never more prominent than in this attempt to bestow public freedom on men who could not form a parish meeting without including a variety of conditions which defeated all schemes for a just apportionment of burdens, and excluded all chances of fair-minded discussion. If Frenchmen have since that critical time shown themselves more eager for equality than freedom, they can at least plead their terrible experience of an unequable dispensation. They can at least point to the obstacles then opposed to their assumption of liberty, as palliatives to their impatient attitude towards the real nature of things.

Character of the Vices of the French Nobility.—And while the condition of the peasantry is not to be hastily pronounced irremediable by regular means, the character of the nobility is not to be unreservedly condemned. The nobles were not, as we have said, monsters of oppression. They were not cruel by nature, though their extravagances and social habits made them hard landlords. They reluctantly tendered total submission to the monarchy, though they made their appointed homage to the throne as pleasurable as possible. They were careless of their territorial duties since they had been deprived of political influence. They were absorbed in courtly vanities since they had been compelled to flock around their master. Thus, without being much worse than their fellow-men, they were engulfed in a

vortex of fatuities and dissipation. They were profligates and prodigals, but they were not miscreants. They exacted the last farthing from their dependants, they made enormous demands on the public funds, they monopolized all lucrative offices and sinecures, they perpetually turned the government into a mere plaything of favouritism, corruption, and intrigue ; but their natures never lost common generosity, though their sense of duty was obscured by the methodized frivolity of their lives. The vices of the order were, in fact, more dangerous to the monarchy, which had corrupted it, than damning to the persons who possessed them. The history of its demoralization is a conspicuous illustration of one aspect of Montesquieu's dictum, "La monarchie se perd, lorsque le prince, rapportant tout uniquement à lui, appelle l'état à sa capitale, la capitale à sa cour, et la cour à sa seule personne."

The Nobility and the Revolutionary Ideas.—Accordingly, it was only natural that with a turn of fashion the French nobles took keen interest in scientific discovery, granted the savant a high social position, then came to be less exclusive and more simple in their manners, and finally embraced the democratic theories. Without their conversion, the revolutionary principles would hardly have ripened in time to interfere at the state's financial crisis. It mattered little that the doctrines were their natural foes. Long separation from public affairs had made them incapable of detecting the true tendencies of social movements. They knew that their novel diversion menaced the power of the monarchy, and they were well content that it should do so ; but they heeded not the accompanying consequences to themselves. Nor was this blindness peculiar to them. The same want of vision was one of the most remarkable features of the transactions which introduced the

Revolution. It characterized all classes at this time, when rapid social changes had not, as now, trained men to forecast, perhaps too nervously, the drift of events in relation to their personal interests. So they cherished their perilous notions in as good faith as the rest of the society. As the day of reckoning approached, they became more and more awake to the opportunities for good which they possessed. On the eve of the Revolution they were sincerely casting about for means to benefit the people, and to satisfy their new-born feelings of humanity, which were none the less sincere because they were accompanied with much idyllic nonsense. It seems strange that they should fall just when they were growing more worthy of their position. But stranger still is it, that one of the chief proximate causes of their ruin was this very improvement itself.

Decay of the Old Aristocracy.—Unfitted to save themselves, they could claim no assistance from others. Many of the old families were destitute, and all were deep in debt. In vain had they contrived numberless modes of taxing the state. The original aristocracy sank lower and lower, and forfeited all the consideration which might otherwise have remained to it. The ranks of the nobility were filled with recruits from the middle classes, who had purchased titles and privileges belonging to the thousands of vendible offices retailed by the impecunious state. Nobility thus became distinguished by immunities from taxation instead of by ancient lineage. It became therefore a point of honour, rather than of avarice, for the class to avoid contributing to the support of the government. When this fraudulent perversion of an aristocratic institution became established, all its claims to respect vanished. The invidious elements of rank alone remained. Want of true dignity was supplied by arrogance, want of real influence by

offensive insistence on unjust privileges and distinctions. The middle classes felt acutely aggrieved by the disdain of ennobled parvenus, and rebelled against paying for their immunities. The mulcted peasant had not fallen so low as to suffer unresented the contemptuous demeanour of his unprofitable superiors. After the publication of Necker's *compte rendu*—a somewhat unique document received with immense curiosity—they also knew whom they had to thank for the great weight of taxation and the constant suspension of payment of the state's debts. Rossbach had already shown them that the plea of military service was a sorry apology for the existence of a dissolute noblesse.

Importance of the Middle Classes.—The middle classes were, moreover, growing conscious of new importance, and they daily aspired to become something more than mere drudges in the government of the country that they enriched. In the last half of the eighteenth century, trade and industry advanced with a rapidity till then unknown. Plebeian wealth accumulated faster than saleable titles could corrupt it. Though the administration of the state was dependent on the middle class for capable men of business, the nobles pertinaciously barred the way to the more honourable positions. In the mean time the spirit of independence, which the Jansenist parliaments had once opposed to despotism and Jesuistry, broke forth and flooded an immensely wider area than the corporations of hereditary magistrates. All who were engaged in manufactures, commerce, estate management, finance, law, medicine, and the civil service, together with the whole of the ill-used lower clergy, shook off their indifference to political affairs, and under the name of the Third Estate began to set up claims for a share in the government.

Formidable Character of the Dangerous Classes.—

Such being the political attitude of the different classes in the state, it was inevitable that some great organic change would take place spontaneously as the infirmities of the monarchy became destructive of all government. Many dangers are inseparable from such moments; but there existed a peculiar source of instability to French society at this time. Owing to the obstacles surrounding sober industry, to oppressive game laws, and to the countless temptations held out to illicit dealing by the trading regulations spread over old France, there existed an enormous number of vagabonds, poachers, and smugglers, who formed a serious menace against order in a time of scarcity. The country, since it was divested of its more substantial inhabitants by the attractions of the towns and the disadvantages attending agricultural life, was unable of itself to cope with mendicancy or to suppress vagrancy. Hence there was always quartered at large on society a vast army of ruffians, which the most energetic efforts of the government—and very energetic efforts had not been wanting—failed entirely to disperse.

Paris the Centre of National Life.—But brigandage might have prevailed in the country, and riot in the towns, without shaking the state, if the government had not been confined to a centre which was also a favourite resort of the dangerous classes. Paris, unfortunately, was by that time not only the seat of government and public opinion, but the magazine of a large quantity of the material from which mobs are made. The administration, though it worked through many subordinates, was very highly centralized. The provinces were accustomed to look to the supreme head for all initiative, and seldom ventured to act on their own responsibility. Such was the result of the monarchy's systematic suppression of all provincial independence; such was the

most instructive and painful example of another aspect of Montesquieu's aphorism.

Paris the Resort of the Dangerous Classes.—The capital was also by far the most important industrial town. Its trade in articles of luxury and taste, which almost monopolized the European market, afforded employment to an immense number of artisans, who were further attracted by a freedom from restraints not to be found elsewhere in the kingdom. This large manufacturing population had repeatedly shown itself prone to turbulence when industry was disordered, and filled with the dangerous conviction that from the king proceeded all weal and woe. Here, then, was a congenial retreat for all the starving ruffians of the country round; here thronged outlaws from other countries, professional criminals, and all who cadged for a livelihood in a rich and extensive town; here was congregated a rabble glad to follow any one who would lead them to plunder; here dwelt thousands of ignorant toilers, ready to listen to the sophisms and temptings of demagogues at the first pinch of distress. By ill chance the perturbation attending the summons of the States-General was aggravated by great scarcity of food. In July, 1788, a terrible tempest destroyed the crops in a great part of France, and especially in the districts round Paris. The following winter was of unequalled severity. Very inadequate supplies were obtainable from abroad, owing to recent short harvests and the demands made by the war in Eastern Europe. The people suffered great privations, and in Paris the distress was particularly severe. The disaster elicited great largesses from the rich, but the populace of the capital indulged in sanguinary bread riots, and, mindful of the *pacte de l'famine*, attributed the dearth to the nefarious schemes of the court and monopolists.

Widespread Disturbance.—As the time for the meeting of the States-General approached, ominous indications of anarchy appeared in the provinces. In the parish and the district the whole system of taxation had been brought under discussion, and a statement of grievances had been debated at the request of the assembly of the province. Finally, a similar statement had to be drawn up by the command of the king for the instruction of the coming national parliament. A belief in the speedy redress of wrongs was thus engendered, just when famine was inflicting the worst pangs of a stinted subsistence. Hence spontaneous anarchy throughout nearly all France. Storehouses of grain were plundered, corn dealers were robbed and murdered, game preserves were invaded, and dues of all kinds were repudiated. In the capital the disturbances speedily took the form of political tumults. Against such universal turbulence the police were impotent, and military force was necessary to overcome the rioters. But at first the army was very sparingly employed. Anarchy was allowed to gather strength till only the most determined onslaughts of the military could have restored order. By that time the soldiers had been seduced from their duty, and either rendered neutral or enrolled among the insurgents.

Reforming Character of the States-General.—On May 5, 1789, the States-General met at Versailles. Suddenly awakened from a slumber of two centuries, they appeared clothed in much of their mediæval apparel. As of old, they came divided into three bodies, representing the nobles, clergy, and commons, and each body brought with it the *cahiers*, or instructions, which were to guide it in the discharge of its trust. But in his heart every member was meditating on the dreams of a new era, and the *cahiers* were filled with schemes

of revolution. The old forms were merely vehicles of a demand for an entire reconstruction of the state. Even the nobility, while strongly insisting on its honorary distinctions, recommended radical reforms in pursuance of the inalienable rights of man, and offered suggestions for liberating the lower classes from inequitable burdens, personal indignities, and involuntary ignorance.

Initial Disagreement between the Orders.—According to ancient usage, the three orders should have deliberated and voted separately, but every one felt that the times were gone by when the third estate could be placed at the mercy of a coalition of the nobles with the clergy. In point of fact, the government had doubled the representatives of the commons, a provision which would have been meaningless if they had intended the assembly to vote by orders and not *per capita*. Necker, who had been recalled on the dismissal of Lomenie de Brienne, advised this measure, but he hesitated to announce authoritatively to the clergy and nobles that they must abandon their former advantageous position. Unfortunately the nobles and higher clergy regarded with great repugnance any plan of treating on terms of equality with their inferiors. The pride of rank grew yet more exclusive when brought face to face with the plebian throng. Many of the *Tiers État* were no better than the pettifogging lawyers who swarmed around the minutely articulated social structure. Very few of them were men of proved capacity: hardly any of the government's many able servants had a seat. Some men of conspicuous ability were among them, but these were for the most part without political experience. Before this motley crowd the nobles would renounce none of their prescriptive advantages. Hence, instead of proceeding to consider measures for the

immediate relief of the government, the States-General rushed into a dispute concerning the adaptation of its ancient forms to present conditions.

The National Assembly Declared, June 17, 1789.—The struggle over the constitutional question proved fatal to the constitution itself. Left to themselves, the commons opposed for a time a passive resistance to the pretensions of the clergy and nobles, and then declared themselves the National Assembly. Three days later, having been prevented from entering their hall, they retired to a neighbouring tennis court, and there swore not to separate till they had created a new constitution. From a committee of ways and means the states were thus turned into a Constituent Assembly. The conduct of the commons was precisely in accordance with the wishes of the public, and many of the other orders felt bound to follow it. Out of the clergy there deserted to them the *curés*, whose wrongs and feelings were almost identical with those of the *Tiers État*, together with the more politic of the bishops; and from the nobles many of the more enlightened aristocracy and a few seekers after popular influence. The king, however, while expressing his willingness to place in the hands of the States-General the affairs of the monarchy, decreed the separation of the orders. In other words, he acknowledged the supremacy of the states, but prohibited the National Assembly. He practically resigned his power at the same time that he declared war against the only body which could assume it. Yet he would not resort to force, and he left the rebellious assembly at battle with its antagonists, who were from this time royalists.

Insurrection in Paris and the Provinces.—This manœuvre disastrously sharpened the hostility between the people and the Crown. The consignment of the

royal claims to the charge of those who desired to retain the last fragments of feudalism, involved a change of ministry and a change of policy. Though compelled to sink for the time its main contention, and to join the National Assembly, the feudal party made use of its alliance with the king to give him new ministers inclined to adopt more spirited measures for the maintenance of the royal authority and the old *régime*. But its acquisition of power was too late to allow it to do more than irritate the people against the monarchy. The army had grown insubordinate, the mob supreme. The assembly had to proceed to its task of making a constitution amid a storm of popular excitement and tumultuous outbreaks. Paris was given up to brutal riots. The Bastille was destroyed, depôts of arms were sacked, provision stores were plundered, and unpopular personages murdered. In the country the disturbances took the form of veritable Jacqueries. Throughout almost all the land chateaux were blazing, nobles and gentry were robbed or killed, government officers and tax-gatherers were put to flight. The people, rendered wild by the sudden relaxation of constraint and obligations, impatiently anticipated the decisions of its representatives by plunging into a frenzy of barbarous reprisal.

The Assembly coerced by the Mob.—Nor did the National Assembly prove much less hasty than the nation. On the night of August 4, at the suggestion of the liberal nobles, almost every vestige of feudalism was swept away. A few sittings were spent in putting into form of law this counterpart to the havoc in the provinces, and then a declaration of the rights of man was discussed and adopted, which recognized the claims of the people to interfere in the business of government to a degree suicidal for a legislative body sitting in the

vicinity of a host of excited insurgents. Next was planned a parliament of one chamber, founded on a very low franchise, and subject only to a suspensive veto of the king for the space of two sessions. By this time the general anarchy had invaded the assembly, and, by swaying its counsels, was gaining strength and diffusion. The debates were held in Paris, after the mob had taken Louis captive on the occasion of a panic produced by rumours of military violence. There the august body was constrained and brow-beaten by an organized system of threats and uproar. Side by side with the constituent legislature, stormed and declaimed gatherings of the rabble and orators of the mob. The action of clubs, not unknown in the later years of the absolute monarchy, now became of the first importance. The Jacobins, acquiring their dread name with the removal to Paris, had recruited an obedient though undisciplined army in the metropolis. Besides being the most powerful association at the seat of the political contest, they soon possessed in all parts of France affiliated societies which implicitly followed the word transmitted from headquarters. In the name of the sovereign people and the rights of man, all that was worthless and homeless in the city conspired to coerce the moderate party. No forms of decency protected the dignity of the body, no efficient police guarded the safety of its members. With revolting frankness the ragged band brought terrorism to bear on the counsels which were to determine the future of the French state, and the immediate guidance of the nation.

Impotence of Conservative Opinion.—This kind of policy proved eminently successful. Before long, most of the aristocracy—hunted, threatened, and despoiled—ever in fear of murder—fled beyond the frontier. In the Constituent Assembly itself the apologists

for the old order gradually slunk away; the voice of those who knew what was worth retaining from the past became hushed. Hence legislation which was hasty, crude, and imprudent to the last degree. With many drastic correctives for traditional abuse went violent provocatives of civil and religious schism, and pitifully imperfect provisions for the maintenance of order.

Persistence of Anarchy.—On the completion of the constitution, France found itself at a crisis immeasurably more perilous than the financial difficulties which had opened the way for revolution. In addition to bankruptcy, there now threatened intestine strife, foreign war, and general disruption of all social bonds. The new system of taxation, vitiated by excessive burdens on land, had neither got into working order nor secured respect by moral or physical means; the sales of confiscated property had not covered the liabilities, as had been expected, and many claims for compensation to individuals had been incurred by the new changes; while the reckless multiplication of *assignats*, though they levied indirectly and disastrously on industry a tax which in some sense indemnified the revenue for the evasion of the proper imposts, was rapidly exhausting its own resources. The wanton overthrow of the Church, the confiscation of its possessions, the dissolution and sale of the monasteries, and the ecclesiastical constitution ordained instead, had brought the country to the brink of civil war. The greater part of the clergy, who had hitherto been trusty promoters of the Revolution, rebelled against the secular management of ecclesiastical affairs, and preferred suspension to swearing allegiance to the new dispensation; while the peasantry, terrified by their warnings against sacraments from spurious authority, recoiled from the unhallowed ministrations of constitutional intruders,

and took up arms to defend the persons and functions of their non-juring pastors. Meanwhile the partisans of anarchy incited the peasants to renew at intervals their attacks on property and rank. Provincial towns were often mastered by the mob, and sometimes even involved in open war with one another. In the capital the expense of feeding and quieting the populace had grown so insupportable that it became necessary to disperse those who lounged in the national workshops, to the great exasperation of the more worthless portion of the inhabitants and its unruly leaders.

Fear of Foreign Invasion.—Abroad, the perils of the royal family, the representations of the *emigrés*, and an instinctive antipathy to the deeds and principles of the movement, had produced the deepest enmity towards the new government, and manifold designs for its forcible destruction. Paris and the whole country were ever in terror of the onslaught of some resistless coalition, to be followed by the restoration of the old *régime*, and the proscription of those who had taken a prominent part in the establishment of the new order. Whenever the monarchs of Europe were reported to have formed projects of invasion, the revolutionary leaders trembled for their lives, buyers of confiscated land saw their purchases in jeopardy, and those who had been relieved of burdens and exactions dreaded their reimposition.

Ascendency of the Enemies of the New Constitution.—The futile flight of the king turned these fears against the throne. The court was viewed with the greatest suspicion. When, in September, 1791, Louis accepted the constitution, the recent declaration of Pillnitz had struck fresh apprehension of foreign arms and distrust of the royal purposes into the heart of the nation. By this time, too, the more sober classes had grown weary of political tumult, and were well content

with the acquisitions they had obtained. The new elections showed that the interest of the citizens in public affairs had greatly cooled. But so much the more violent and successful were the few adventurous politicians who used without scruple all the arts of cajolery and intimidation. As the main part of the nation became calm and disinclined to make the enormous sacrifices of time and energy demanded by the new constitution, the extreme minority became more busy and more determined to maintain its hold on public affairs by converting revolution into chaos. Its tactics were triumphant from the first. In the new assembly the moderate party, though numerous and supported by a general desire for repose, was unable to form a compact and courageous opposition against the violent agitators. Everything pointed to a renewal of confusion; and nothing was more calculated to precipitate a catastrophe than the tension of a foreign war.

The Girondists promote the Jacobin Cause.—Curiously enough, the wildest enemies of the constitution regarded war as fatal to their interests. They feared the eventual establishment of a military dictatorship, which would crush their seditions and schisms into one dead level of obedience to armed and organized authority. It was a party less criminal in its designs which made war its first object. This was the Girondist party, which nearly made common cause with the Jacobins, though perhaps it cannot justly be charged with a deliberate intention of doing more than bringing the constitutional monarchy within the definition of a republic. By the eloquence and ability of its parliamentary leaders, and the craft and energy of less conspicuous supporters, the Gironde immediately gained pre-eminence in the assembly, and set in motion anew the forces of destruction. Nor were more sinister

excitements wanting to anarchical legislation. The intrusion of the rabble into debates and the intimidation of members became daily more frequent and violent. The Gironde was too respectable to fraternize with the representatives of ochlocracy, or to ingratiate itself with the *canaille*; yet in the pursuit of its own intemperate ends, and to the satisfaction of its short-sighted jealousies, it persistently played into the hands of those who sought to prey upon the industrious majority by means of a few thousand ruffians. Thus it prepared the way for the overthrow of the assembly, the murder of the king, and its own destruction; for the supremacy of the Commune of Paris, and thereby of the ruffian band; for the September massacres, and the pillage of the propertied; for the Reign of Terror, and for twenty years of European carnage.

Outbreak of the Revolutionary War.—But the consequences of the first step in this direction, the embroilment of France with Germany, far transcended in lasting importance the licence of the Jacobin faction or the horrors peculiar to war. From the day when Lafayette grafted the Bourbon white on the red-and-blue colours of the city of Paris, and declared that this tricolour would travel round the world, the spirit of the Revolution had grown more proselytizing. Hence one cause of the hostility of monarchs to the movement, hence one cause of the Revolution's readiness to attack the monarchies. Now, when the chidings and threats of the continental powers had offended the pride and excited the apprehension of the French, when the asylum granted in the empire to the army of *emigrés* had made Germany the ally of the country's traitors, when the Emperor himself, notwithstanding his pacific desires, obstinately retained a domineering tone, war for the sake of the rights of man and the liberty of peoples

found little genuine disfavour in the nation. Although deference was paid to the letter of international law by the dispersion of the *emigrés*, and the manifestoes of the enemy proclaimed their own emptiness, the war party was easily able to find an acceptable pretext for the declaration of hostilities. Leopold II. refused to abandon his demand for compensation to the pope, who had been despoiled by the annexation to France of Avignon and the Venaissin, and to the German princes, who had been injured by the abolition of feudal rights in Alsace. More unendurably still, he insisted upon the French adopting a form of government less incompatible with the comfort of monarchs. The Gironde summed up its charges, real and imaginary, against Austria, and war was constitutionally declared by the king, who had been reluctantly compelled to choose a ministry from the dominant party.

Tyranny of the Revolutionary Governments.—Callous to its own sufferings, France went forth to impose on other nations the blessings of its new polity. The Revolution, quitting the home where it was disgraced by the sanguinary strife of factions, advanced to take Europe by storm. Meanwhile the French people endured the worst torments of oligarchical tyranny. In the name of the Demos—for it soon became impossible to plead the authority of the nation—they were subjected to the despotism of a savage *sansculotterie*. They experienced all the evils of a rule usurped by the fanatical, the ignorant, and the base. Deliverance was brought by the self-destructive elements inherent in such an extravagance of unreason, but it was impossible for the nation to recover at once from the trial. The apathy of reaction is not to be shaken off, nor are the vices of anarchy to be overcome, in a moment. France had to undergo the ordeal of military despotism before

it could find absolution for the crimes and excesses of those terrible days. It had to submit to the usurpation of one, in order to atone for surrendering itself to the passions of a few.

Triumph of the Revolutionary Armies.—The conditions of our purpose forbid us to follow the events which filled the interval between the declaration of war and the assumption of the whole civil and military power by Napoleon Bonaparte. In this interval happened incidents of the most astounding character. Though overwhelmed at home with murder and rapine, France provoked and sustained a conflict with all Europe. While the war of principles was on both sides converted into a war of conquest, the wretched levies of the Republic were permitted by the sordid disputes of the military monarchies to develop into monster citizen armies, which the pitiless exertions of the new executive raised and drove to victory. Throughout the contest the right of the strong to despoil the weak, of the conquerors to annul engagements and plunder the vanquished, was asserted with all the assurance of barbarous times. The era of popular government was introduced by enormities compared with which the sins of the late arbitrary monarchs were venial. At the same time, in the transactions attending the partitioning of Poland, and the collusive negotiations with the triumphant Republic, the rottenness of the European state-system was betrayed in its worst light. The coming fall of absolutism was ushered in by a display of its meanest faults. And all the while the French, under the guise of national liberators, upset the governments of every country they invaded, and strove to bring all life and property under requisition by raising to power any Jacobinical faction which they or any other circumstances had created.

The Despotism of Bonaparte.—But these events were entirely transformed within the following decade. Much of real consequence was achieved in the midst of wars, tumults, and conspiracies, but not till the establishment of Bonaparte's dictatorship did the Revolution familiarize the people in bondage with the justice and unity which were to be its most lasting and precious boons to mankind. Not till his ruthless ambition had pulverized the worst anomalies of the traditional system was the basis of the modern political order firmly laid. Hence the eclectic method of this narrative, while it passes over the interval occupied by the first revolutionary war, calls for some separate notice of the sequence of events in Europe during the consulate and the empire.

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER IV

THE NAPOLEONIC DESPOTISM

Τρόπον τινὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔκ τε ὀλιγαρχίας δημοκρατία γίγνεται καὶ ἐκ δημοκρατίας τύραννις.—PLATO.

"Die bestimmten Lehrbuchseelen wurden so sehr vertauscht und vermischt, dass kein Teufel sie mehr erkennen konnte. . . . Die alten Könige bekamem neue Uniformen, neue Königthümer wurden gebacken und hatten Absatz wie frische Semmel, manche Potentaten hingegen wurden von Haus und Hof gejagt, und mussten auf andere Art ihr Brod zu verdienen suchen."

"Es war eine sonnig marmorne Hand, eine mächtige Hand, eine von den beiden Händen die das vielköpfige Ungeheuer der Anarchie gebändigt und den Völkerzweikampf geordnet hatten."—HEINE.

"Ce qui avilit et dégrade trente millions d'hommes ne saurait être durable."—NAPOLÉON BONAPARTE.

Coup d'état, Brumaire 18, 1799.—Nearly eleven years had elapsed since the États-Généraux had given the initiative to revolution, when France was mastered by a man capable of ordering the chaos which had borne him. War had justified the fears of Robespierre, and what had successively been dreaded of Lafayette, Dumouriez, Custine, and Hoche, was now at last accomplished by Napoleon Bonaparte. A triumphant soldier had seized the helm of the state, and the constitution of the Year VIII. had invested him with a virtual dictatorship under the title of First Consul.

Bonaparte's Character and Policy.—When France

was rescued from foreign foes and domestic disorders by its most successful general, it adopted something more than a heroic remedy for its misfortunes. It had, in truth, entered on a new stage of its revolution. It had brought to an end the turbulent phase of the movement, and had commenced that of consolidation. The man who now became its absolute ruler was neither a political sectary nor a partisan of any faction. A Jacobin only when it was unsafe to be anything else, he followed throughout his career with immovable singleness of purpose the principle of personal aggrandisement. For him this motive was such a passion that, paradoxical as it may sound, it took an abstract, almost impersonal, form. To satisfy it, he seized every occasion without regard for any other consideration, and was at once the first and the most successful opportunist in a century which knew few other tactics. He assumed the consular office with profuse avowals of disinterested patriotism, and thrilling assurances that all feuds and party strife were at an end. He proclaimed the homogeneity of the nation, and recognized merit as the sole distinction among Frenchmen. Under the one condition of implicit obedience to himself, he inaugurated a new and catholic creed of citizenship. Thus he repealed most of the laws which had been levelled against the royalists, and adopted in their stead conciliatory measures. Every effort was made to convince the country that it had at last obtained a stable and efficient polity without sacrificing the benefits of the new social order. The civil functions of government were discharged with great energy and ability; the finances were put on a sound footing; the administration was invested with unity and vigour far transcending the misshapen centralization of the monarchy; and the work of legislation was resumed in an active and judicial spirit.

But while Bonaparte strove to conceal from men the fact that France had fallen under the despotism of a military adventurer, he did not forswear the vices which tend to disfigure the best forms of such a political type. In war he had won the allegiance of the French, and he was not the man to seek another basis for his authority. Though he excited the hopes of the exhausted country by pacific protestations, he untiringly prepared in secret for the continuation of war—war which was to issue in Marengo, Hohenlinden, and the peace of Lunéville.

Peace of Lunéville. The German Diet at Regensburg, 1802-3.—The time was now come for the Revolution to complete the ruin of the Holy Roman Empire. Pursuant to the treaty of Lunéville, the German Diet met at Regensburg to discuss a scheme of compensation for the rulers dispossessed by its provisions. Virtually the meeting was a renewal of the congress of Rastadt. Almost the same business was its object, and only a more pronounced profligacy of method distinguished it from the earlier assembly. After much debate a committee of eight members was appointed "to settle in conjunction with the French government the details reserved in the Peace of Lunéville for special agreement;" but its functions were even more formal than those of the futile congress. At Rastadt the incoherence and disintegration of the venerable empire had become painfully apparent. The feud of the Reformation had at once loosened its members and made them more monarchical and ambitious. Since then its want of solidarity had been steadily increased by the jealousy between the new Prussian state and the ancient House of Austria, and by the apprehension constantly felt by the smaller states lest they should fall victims to either of these

great monarchies. When, therefore, the traitorous conduct of the Emperor at Campo Formio was disclosed at Rastadt—when it was known that the head of the nation, who had guaranteed the integrity of the empire in the preliminaries of Leoben, and had renewed the assurance when he convoked the assembly, had in truth betrayed to the stranger nearly all the left bank of the Rhine,—the German rulers greedily hastened to secure every possible trifle in the scramble of redistribution. The slow and wearisome debates were supplemented by intrigues of the most degraded nature. Conscious that the French consul could give a casting vote on any disputed question, the princes found no indignity too shameful, no trick too base, to obtain his favour.

Competition of the German States. Bonaparte's Settlement of Germany, 1803.—With the peace of Lunéville these proceedings were renewed, and while Regensburg was the seat of the ostensible debate, Paris was the real theatre of contention. So little did Bonaparte's repeated conquests awaken the patriotic apprehensions and personal suspicions of the German rulers, that the pause which had given him new victories and fresh opportunities for exaction, only imparted to the shameful traffic additional briskness. Nor were the princes alone in being well pleased to make profit out of the misfortunes of the Fatherland by means of French intervention. Their subjects were also generally desirous of pursuing the same policy. They thought it good to court the great man of the age. Deceived by those diabolical half-truths, as Treitschke calls them, which Bonaparte could so well manipulate, the people sanctioned, as plainly as they usually expressed themselves on political matters, the unprincipled and short-sighted conduct of their rulers.

The First Consul, on his side, prosecuted with a duplicity and address, heretofore unequalled, the traditional policy of France in German affairs. Never weary of declaring his disinterestedness, his zeal for the well-being of Germany, and his sincere desire for peace and concord, he brought the suppliant princes to separate treaties with France; and by territorial adjustments formed of them powers which were no powers without him, and gave them ambitions which he alone could satisfy. In a word, he made of them duteous vassals to himself. Feigning to take into his counsels the young Tsar, Alexander, whose convenient friendship was thus easily obtained on account of his family connections with the German courts, he drew up a scheme of indemnification, and presented it to the Diet for endorsement. In due time a servile assent was given to every point which concerned the two autocrats. By this settlement, Austria and Prussia were more equally balanced against one another, the former being deprived of influence in Western Germany, and the latter finding in more convenient situations a rich recompense for its cessions on the Rhine; while the middle states, Bavaria, Baden, and Würtemberg, received very considerable accessions of territory.

Suppression of the Free Cities and Ecclesiastical States.—But if Bonaparte dislocated yet further the political structure of Germany, he was at least instrumental in removing the worst of the anachronisms which stifled the development of improved institutions among a large division of its people. The same measure which brought German separatism to a climax also extinguished the ecclesiastical sovereignties and nearly all the free cities. That these strongholds of priestly obscurantism and bourgeois apathy would some day be invaded by their more ambitious and active

neighbours had long been apparent. Such a change was, in fact, an integral condition of the process which was imparting increased energy and sense to German public life. Till an end was made of the worldly citadels of Catholicism, it was impossible for the Protestants legally to affirm in the affairs of the empire the influence to which their numbers, civilization, and power entitled them. Till the misrule of priestly principalities—a kind of principality which, Machiavelli declared, "si acquistano o per virtù o per fortuna, e senza l'una e l'altra si mantengono"—was exchanged for the government of a secular state, the sustained introduction of modern reform was denied to many a German district. Till the bishoprics and free cities had sacrificed the monotonous routine of their petty independence by participating in the interests and anxieties of a modern polity, national spirit and a worthy conception of citizenship were not to be looked for among many of the mercantile and professional classes.

Concordat between Bonaparte and Pius VII.—With equal directness and vigour Bonaparte developed in France his policy of making every remedial measure, every instrument of government, every active force, an emanation from his own will. He instituted the Legion of Honour to reward those who most industriously served him; his sycophants caused the consulship to be assured to him for life; and the irresponsible functions of the office were so increased by changes in the constitution that only a formal declaration of the sacred and hereditary nature of his dignity was wanted to vest in him imperial power. Most significant was his settlement of the religious schism which by this time, like every other passion of the Revolution, had spent all its original fury. Restoring to the Catholic priesthood the position of a

national church, he organized it into a hierarchy, strictly subordinate to himself, yet exercising all the influence of the clergy of Rome. The character of the new pope greatly facilitated the introduction of such a measure. Though the successor of Pius VI., who had been persecuted by the Republic, and had died in exile and duress, Pius VII. had displayed both as bishop of Imola and as pope extraordinary toleration of the Revolution. Now that the movement seemed to be approaching a settled issue, he showed much anxiety to re-establish the papal power in harmony with the new conditions. With him Bonaparte concluded a concordat by which the Free Constitutional Church of France was suppressed, and the papal authority was made absolute, while the nomination of the bishops was given to the First Consul, and all decrees from the court of Rome were subjected to the censure of the government. This arrangement persisted through seven changes of *régime* in France, and endured till December 31, 1905.

Bonaparte's Attitude towards the Churches.—The Concordat was based on the proposition, "La religion catholique est la religion de la grande majorité du peuple français." Hence the French Protestants feared that their numerical inferiority might be held to deprive of protection the religious freedom which they had recently enjoyed. Bonaparte, however, was inclined to treat them with favour, and gave them a satisfactory constitutional status. The result was that, owing to the tolerant spirit proceeding from the indifference of reaction, a remarkable cordiality subsisted between all religious confessions in France during his rule. In Germany, too, where men had already been diverted from attaching much importance to dogmatic theology, Bonaparte helped to induce a more tolerant feeling than

had prevailed since the Peace of Westphalia by proclaiming in the act of the Rheinbund the civil equality of both creeds. On the other hand, he took care to get the utmost from his bargain with the pope. He lost no opportunity of using his authority to convert the priesthood into apostles of his own despotic cult. His servile clergy unblushingly declared the sacred nature of his mission; they consented to the ludicrous blasphemy of his imperial catechism, and taught that submission to his taxes and conscription was almost co-extensive with the whole duty of man.

Sources of Modern Ultramontanism.—To the papacy, however, these dealings with Bonaparte brought for the present nothing but mortification and distress. In a subsequent epoch the pontifical influence was vastly increased by the ultramontane sacerdotalism which, as commonly happens in such cases, was evoked by the humiliation of the clergy in France, and the extinction of the ecclesiastical foundations in Germany.*

* The great revolt against ultramontanism in Germany in the eighteenth century had terminated in a decided failure mainly through the fear of the bishops, lest they might be placed at the mercy of their immediate superiors. When Joseph II. came to the throne, and attacked the Papal power and ecclesiastical independence, the German archbishops proposed to carry out a scheme, which for some years they had been contemplating. In 1763, Nicholas von Hontheim, who had been privy councillor to the Archbishop of Trier, and was then his suffragan, had published, under the name of Febronius, his famous treatise demonstrating that the pseudo-Isidorian false decretals—(the prefix applies only to the unknown writer)—were the principal support of the later pretensions of Rome. In 1786, in the celebrated "Emser Punktation," the Archbishops of Trier, Köln, Mainz, and Salzburg asserted that the pope, though possessing a supervisionary power, had no right to supplant the bishops in administrative matters, nor claim to appropriate Peter's pence, etc.; but that such affairs, and the business of ecclesiastical discipline, should be placed in the hands of a national synod. Joseph, however, though implacable towards conventualism, intolerance, and the civil authority of the papacy, would not consent to such changes till the bishops gave in their adherence; and as these suspected that a reproduction in Germany of the Gallican Church would make them too

Then the concessions of Bonaparte to Pius VII. became sources of new power to Rome, and greatly helped to prop up the principle of ecclesiastical authority which the progress of European development appeared to have overthrown. But while Bonaparte presided over the execution of the compact, nought but bitter disappointment and brutal misusage rewarded the pope's repeated and undignified efforts to appease the new Charlemagne.

The Code Napoléon, published 1804.—To a somewhat different category belongs the Civil Code. Though Bonaparte undoubtedly regarded the legislator's renown as a necessary component of his authority, his codification of the law was free from those sinister distortions which marred too many of his undertakings. The reckless fiscal policy of his predecessors had inclined people to be strongly prepossessed in favour of any ruler who assumed the aspect of a severe financier. "Plusieurs de ses portraits d'alors," says Michelet, "sont ceux qu'on imaginerait pour un avare." In the same way the chaotic state of the French law had raised a general demand for its systematization, and Bonaparte perceived that its immediate satisfaction would bring him great accession of confidence and prestige. Indeed, Voltaire had been able to say that a traveller through France changed his laws as often as he changed his post-horses; and the Constituent Assembly, the Convention, and the Directory had all in turn taken steps towards the formation of a code. The completion of the task Bonaparte secured by appointing a commission of trained lawyers to throw into shape the different chapters, which were then discussed by the Council of

dependent on the ecclesiastical princes, they refused to acquiesce in resistance to the papal pretensions, notwithstanding the spurious nature of many of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals. For a lively, but regrettably incomplete, notice of this incident in German ecclesiastical history, see Fisher, *Napoleonic Statesmanship*, p. 10.

State, the Tribunate, and the Legislative Body. As one among others Bonaparte diligently criticized and amended, as head of the state, he published, the law-book thus compiled; but never with others would he share the honour of giving to France a system of practical jurisprudence. When he became emperor, and was beyond reach of the claims of his colleagues, he formally adopted the work as his own by changing its name of the Code Civil into that of the Code Napoléon. Nor did he err in seeking by this means to find a place in the memory of posterity. Succeeding generations, even when made aware that his pretensions were excessive, have consented to tolerate the ambition of the great soldier for legislative fame, and have continued to call the code, which he fathered, by the name he chose for a lasting memorial to himself.

Character of the Code.—The substance of the code consists partly of Roman law, partly of customary law, and partly of the ordinances of the kings and of the laws of the Revolution. Haste and insufficient erudition diminished its efficiency; want of definitions of technical terms, absence of a method of distinction, omission to enunciate the broad principles underlying its details, gave it a fallacious brevity; neglect to provide for the incorporation of judiciary law prevented it from meeting the demands of experience and of time; but its shortcomings have not prevented it from being of immense practical service to the peoples of Europe, and a very instructive example to all who consider the problems of codification. From the point of view of general history it has been yet more illustrious. It was founded on the principle of the equality of all men before the law—the grand truth enunciated once for all by the Revolution. Carried wherever the French armies penetrated, it was often retained when they were driven away. Thus the

equitable code was at once the most potent evangelist of the Revolution, and the most lasting benefit conferred by France on the subject nations.

Bonaparte made Emperor, 1804.—In 1804 a futile Bourbon conspiracy afforded a pretext for Bonaparte's obedient creatures in the senate to propose that France should be protected from further political catastrophes by conversion of the consulate into a hereditary throne. So completely had he subdued the different bodies of the original constitution, and the whole official hierarchy; so much popularity had both peace and war given him; so implicitly was he believed to have bestowed glory and prosperity on France; that he found it unnecessary to incur the odium of another usurpation. Giving manifold indications of the aim he had in view, he was content to leave the initiative to men like Fouché, and the decision to that part of the people which his bureaucracy permitted to personate the nation. None the less, however, did he emphasize the autocratic character of his rule. At his coronation the world was studiously reminded that on that day an emperor indeed was enthroned. The last semblances of democratic government vanished. The republican calendar was abandoned, a new nobility was created, the old aristocracy was welcomed back, and all the ceremonial observances of an imperial court were instituted. The press, which had been grievously reduced by the consular government, was deprived of all connection with public opinion. Individuals were more than ever prohibited from discussing matters of state; and those studies, which form the best part of a liberal culture were proscribed alike in the *salons*, the schools, and the Institute.

Third Coalition War, 1805.—Yet in the following year Napoleon put to hazard all this late-won power in

a conflict with the greater part of Europe. Pitt had concluded offensive alliances with Russia, Austria, and Sweden, though Prussia obstinately remained neutral. Thus came about the third coalition war of 1805, which men of the English race remember by the death of Pitt, and the death of Nelson.

Campaign of Austerlitz.—The allies sought to veil the genesis of their coalition in secrecy. It was with great discomfiture that they saw the army, till then destined to conquer England, the efficiency of which has probably never been surpassed in modern times, move with the utmost precision and speed into Germany. But though Napoleon was prepared betimes to change his plan of operations, he did not avoid jeopardizing his fleet as if the invasion were really to be carried out. The battle of Cape Trafalgar crushed for good his maritime power. England was rendered safe from direct attack; and the world in due time received the greatest of its object-lessons on the influence of sea-power. The campaign on land, however, made Napoleon master of Central Europe. Bringing the Austrian army in Germany to an inglorious capitulation at Ulm, he marched through Vienna, and, with inferior forces, won in his best style the battle of Austerlitz against the troops of Francis and Alexander. The action was decisive. The allies thought not of renewing the war with the relays of troops which were hurrying up from north and south. Russian and Austrian alike wished to be rid of their ill-fated connection. The Emperor Alexander silently returned home, pursued only by Napoleon's flattering tokens of esteem.

Peace of Presburg, December, 1805.—The Emperor Francis accepted the peace of Presburg, which deprived his house of the ill-gotten Venetian States, Tyrol, and its more distant possessions in Western Germany. The

King of Prussia, who had been on the point of joining the coalition with a large army if his mediation were unsuccessful, was committed to an alliance with the conqueror by his terrified negotiator. And well did Napoleon appear to make the fruits of victory compensate France for its exertions. The empire was not made more unwieldy in bulk, but its dependants, Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden, received considerable accessions of territory. The two first were raised to the rank of kingdoms; while the Emperor's Italian principality, which he had already turned into a kingdom of Italy to the great disgust of Austria, was increased by the addition of the ceded Venetian lands.

The Rheinbund, 1806.—But the full depth of Europe's humiliation was not experienced till the two following years. In 1806 an act of federation was signed by the Kings of Bavaria and Würtemberg, the Elector of Baden, and thirteen minor princes, which united them into a league under the protection of the French Emperor. The objects of this confederacy, known as the Rheinbund, were defence against foreign aggression, and the exercise of complete autonomy at home. The first of these was obtained by an alliance with Napoleon, in exchange for which they agreed to support him in all his wars, and to place their troops at his disposal; the second was achieved by a declared secession from the empire, and the annexation of those petty principalities which, hitherto immediately dependent on the imperial constitution, abounded in great numbers throughout Germany. Already the consequences of the Peace of Lunéville had induced the ruling Hapsburg to assure his equality with the sovereigns of France and Russia by taking the imperial title in his own right; and before the confederation of the Rhine was made public he formally renounced his

office of elective emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, and released from allegiance to him all the states and princes of the Reich. The triumph of the German policy of the consulate was complete.

Overthrow of Prussia, October, 1806.—The one German power which remained to dispute Napoleon's supremacy in Central Europe was now crushed with every extreme of contumely. Prussia, treated alternately with contempt and friendly importunity, had at one time almost yielded to the bribe of Hanover as the price of an offensive alliance with France. It was only after a long series of deceptions on Napoleon's part, and disappointments on Prussia's part, that Frederick William decided to abandon all hope of receiving an illegitimate accession of territory. He set on foot preparations for war, obtained the promise of assistance from the Tsar, and sent an ultimatum to Paris. But there was only time to obtain by force a Saxon contingent before Prussia had to meet its swift and mighty adversary. The Prussian army was deficient in everything requisite for the new warfare. Sixty-five years earlier it had established its reputation at the battle of Molwitz by the extraordinary rapidity of its fire and the precision of its manœuvres. Now it was stricken with all the infirmities of age, in system, equipment, and officers. The unobservant world, however, believed it to be still a perfect engine of its type. Great, therefore, was the amazement when it was completely out-manœuvred by the French Emperor, and as completely defeated at Jena and Auerstadt on the same day.

Panic in Prussia. Prussia fell to the ground. The moral feebleness of the administration seemed to have spread through the army and nation. The people—all sense of patriotism merged in their sense of class-

division, filled with hatred of the insolent and licentious nobility and soldiery—appeared to care little for their army's destruction, and complacently witnessed Napoleon's administration of the country he had conquered. And in the army, wherever responsibility lay, there the incapacity and cowardice of old age was almost uniformly manifested. The fortresses, which might have detained the enemy till the Russian army arrived, vied with each other in their promptness to capitulate at the presence of the French. The panic of the garrisons caused the conqueror to insist on such ruinous terms that Frederick William despairingly determined to let Alexander's troops contest the small portion of territory remaining to him. The climate and roads of East Prussia being very unfavourable to Napoleon's rapid strategy, no decisive action redeemed the bloody repulse at Eylau till the battle of Friedland in June, 1807. Hereupon an armistice followed, and then a peace—a peace only less pernicious and sensational than war itself.

Submission of the Tsar.—Within a fortnight of his defeat Alexander forgot his devotion to Frederick William, and repented of having incurred disasters like Austerlitz and Friedland in the quarrels of others. Nay, he surrendered himself to the fascination of Napoleon, and abandoned Prussia to its fate. Granted two interviews on a raft moored in the middle of the Memel, he was induced to desert the cause of Europe, and become a party to Napoleon's schemes of universal conquest. Tilsit was chosen for the theatre of a debate on an immediate peace; and the bargain struck on the Memel was there pursued to its remotest consequences.

Peace of Tilsit, July, 1807.—With the seduction of the Tsar, Napoleon seemed to have vanquished all resistance in continental Europe. In truth, however,

the Peace of Tilsit was the most fatal of his victories. Till then the tenor of his ambition, though poised with uncertain balance between the bold and the visionary, had never actually abandoned the region of the practicable, or forsaken the path of deliberate calculation. Till then his challenges had been directed at monarchs who could be cajoled in misfortune and appeased in success, to governments as capable of treason to themselves as they were sordid in their conscious aims. Never had he defied implacable resentment or enduring opposition; never had he provoked the hate of peoples, or aroused the rebellion of nations. But now, having brought every power to ignominious terms, and having converted the most formidable and inaccessible of his foes into a tame abettor of his plans, he yielded to the chimeras of his imagination. Without any sense of anachronism he proceeded to use his victory, as if the days of the Cæsars were to be reproduced. To Prussia he vouched a curtailed existence as a compliment to Alexander. "Par égard," ran the fourth article of this extraordinary treaty, "par égard pour S.M. l'empereur de toutes les Russies et voulant donner une preuve du désir sincère qu'l a d'unir les deux nations par les liens d'une confiance et d'une amitié inaltérables," he consented to restore to Frederick William about half his territory. Out of the remainder he formed a kingdom of Westphalia for his brother Jerome. A small portion of Prussian Poland he transferred to Russia; the rest he bestowed, as the Grand-Duchy of Warsaw, on the Elector of Saxony, now granted the title of king, who had become one of his vassals of the Rheinbund after the first defeats of Prussia. By the same treaty he procured the recognition of Joseph Bonaparte as king of Naples, and of Louis Bonaparte as king of Holland. Finally, in secret articles Napoleon pledged Alexander

to support him in his quarrel with England by giving Russia permission to seize Finland and the Danubian provinces of the Porte.

The Continental System, 1806–13.—It was from this secret understanding that flowed the many woes which shortly overtook Europe. Assured of his position of dictator in Germany and Italy, Napoleon hastened to array the Continent against England. To this end he continued to trample upon the integrity of states; he attacked personal property and liberty, and involved countless individuals in the miseries of poverty and war. In retaliation against a very extended blockade, which the British Government had declared, he had issued from Berlin his famous decree, which ostracized England from the pale of European intercourse. The British Isles were henceforth to be utterly shunned by all friends of France; every person and thing connected with England, even the merchandise in the possession of continental traders, was to be confiscated; no neutral vessels which had touched at a British port were to be admitted into harbour. The paper blockade was met by a paper outlawry. Thus arose the continental system. At Tilsit, Russia and Prussia undertook to enforce it in their territories; in 1808 Austria did likewise, and the system extended with every increase of Napoleon's dominion.

Feeling towards England's Maritime Policy.—Great efforts were made to produce within the empire all that was required to meet the wants of modern life; but beyond laying the basis of the manufacture of beetroot sugar, and giving a dangerous stimulus to unsuitable industries, little was accomplished to compensate the people for the loss of supplies from abroad. On the other hand, England's overbearing conduct in maritime warfare had long been a matter of complaint

among powers who were in no position to contest British supremacy on the sea. But never had it excited so much bitterness as during the war with revolutionary France.* Hence France was inclined to endorse the Emperor's message to the senate when the Berlin decree was issued. "It has cost us dear," he said, "to return, after so many years of civilization, to the principles which characterize the barbarism of the earlier ages of nations; but we have been constrained to oppose the common enemy with the same weapons which he used against us."† Hence the readiness of the Baltic powers to seize six hundred British ships and cargoes, delayed by contrary winds, when the system was at its height in 1810. And it is certain that if Napoleon had risen above the vulgar fallacies of the mercantile system, and had attacked England's food supply from abroad, instead of trying to destroy its money-making commerce, the "Blocus" would have vanquished the heroic resistance of our ancestors.‡

* The general resentment against England's maritime policy at this time found lasting expression in Schiller's poem, *Der Antritt des Neuen Jahrhunderts*—

"Seine Handelsflotten streckt der Britte
Gierig wie Polypenarme aus,
Und das Reich der freien Amphitrite
Will er schliessen, wie sein eignes Haus.
Zu des Südpols nie erblickten Sternen
Dringt sein rastlos ungehemmter Lauf;
Alle Inseln spürt er, alle fernen
Kusten—nur das Paradies nicht auf."

† Neither the blockade, the conscription, nor the weight of taxation, were able to prevent the growth of affluence, or to excite acute discontent in the absence of all public discussion. The comfort and content of the middle classes are significantly recorded in the inscriptions in the *Grand Livre*. While in 1798, when the annual rente was 25,111,785 francs, there were but 24,791 holders of stock; in 1810, when the rente was 56,730,583 francs, it was held by 145,663 persons; whereas in 1820, only 199,697 persons owned 172,784,838 francs of rente, and in 1830, no more than 195,370 investors were found for 204,696,459 francs of rente.

‡ When Professor Cunningham apologizes for the mercantile system by

Misrule of Godoy in Spain.—From 1796 Spain had served France, and since 1800 it had obeyed Napoleon. Its king was a cipher; its court was divided by the queen's hatred of her son, the Prince of Asturias; and its government was in the hands of Manuel Godoy, who was at once the paramour of the queen and the favourite of the royal pair. Godoy's policy consisted in a simple-minded purpose to seek his own aggrandisement by the help of Napoleon; and he heedlessly sacrificed the country in order to earn the French potentate's favour. On this account Spain had renounced Louisiana, paid tribute, and supplied ships and men to France. On this account it had suffered the destruction of its commerce, the discomfiture of its fleet, and the loss of colonies. Through Godoy's avarice and incapacity the finances, army, and navy had reached the last stage of confusion and decay. The administration was inconceivably defective and corrupt. These causes, combined with recent bad harvests, had reduced the people to great material distress and political discontent. By 1806 Godoy had come to think that he was subjecting Spain to a bootless servitude; and he made preparations for passing over to the enemies of France. He even called the nation to arms against some unspecified foe when Prussia entered into war. But on the news of Jena he repented of his treason, and deprecated Napoleon's vengeance by palpable falsehoods. Desirous of deferring a rupture with Spain, Napoleon accepted his explanations, demanding only the use of some of the troops raised to attack him.

the logic of events, saying that by its means "the power of England was so maintained that Wellington won the battle of Waterloo and Napoleon went to St. Helena," the answer is—only because Napoleon was a more convinced mercantilist than any Englishman of his time. It was Napoleon's mercantilism, not England's, which led him to St. Helena. In 1788 our imports of corn began permanently to exceed our exports.

Nevertheless, at Tilsit the overthrow of the Spanish Bourbons was provided for.

Napoleon Invades Spain, 1808.—But Spain was no divided Germany, it was no inchoate Italy. Notwithstanding its strong provincial feelings, it was a united nation, with great common national memories. For its liberty and national integrity it rose to fight to the death. The ignorance, barbarism, and bigotry of the people only contributed to their fierce self-devotion and determination. The very faults of the nation co-operated with its virtues to expose the monstrous nature of the Napoleonic despotism.

The Spanish Insurrection. Alliance of England with Spain.—Of this Napoleon anticipated nothing. To his cold, calculating understanding, all that is generously impulsive in human nature was strange. Countries full of monks, he said, are easy to subjugate. He sent his generals to quiet the country with as much assurance as if the task before them were a mere police measure. He as little apprehended that his efforts to subdue the Spanish people would be endless as he had expected the instantaneous accord which united against their common foe the newly-risen Spanish people and the long-resistant English nation. In a moment the ancient hatred between the two races was cast into abeyance by a consciousness that they were both fighting for the rights of peoples against the caprices of unscrupulous autocracy. "From the moment of the rising of the people of the Pyrenean peninsula," said Wordsworth in the most eloquent of his prose works, "there was a mighty change; we were instantaneously animated; and, from that moment, the contest assumed the dignity which it is not in the power of anything but hope to bestow." The people of England rushed to the aid of the Spanish patriots with stores, munitions,

money, and troops; and soon Napoleon had reason to know that nations in alliance were not, like their rulers, to be easily divided by jealousy and misfortune.*

Franco-Austrian War, 1809.—But it was the Franco-Austrian war of 1809 which first showed that Napoleon was, by repulsion, educating Europe up to those virtues of self-respect which were England's and Spain's by instinct. Though a contest avowedly undertaken to retrieve Austria's losses by the Peace of Presburg, it was the outcome of entirely different motives from those which had so long gambled away the lives and resources of the monarchy's subjects. The obstinate Thugut, the subtle Cobenzl, and their system of greedy and unprincipled annexation had been brought into disrepute by the criticism of facts and the preferences of Napoleon. In their stead ruled Count von Stadion, who cared as little for the indiscriminate territorial aggrandisement of the Hapsburgs as he cared much for the independence of Germany. But since the Peace of Tilsit it had become evident that Napoleon's schemes endangered the very existence of Austria and Prussia; and Stadion, in common with all who regarded the situation from a patriotic point of view, desired to attack and thwart them on the first favourable occasion. The Spanish insurrection offered an opportunity and an inspiriting example. It suggested to Germany, after the late years of distress, the worth of national exertions and the community of national interests. Ancient

* The first object of Napoleon in subduing Portugal and Spain was to injure more effectually British commerce. In this he showed great want of foresight. As soon as the Portuguese government was driven to the Brazils, it necessarily opened them to English trade; and when the Spanish monarchy was overthrown, its colonies revolted from the control of the mother country, and admitted English goods. Hence a new South American trade was created for England by Napoleon himself, just in time to countervail the great falling off of exports to the United States in consequence of their strained relations with Great Britain.

animosities were sunk in a common feeling of woe. The miserable Prussia was no longer the object of jealous dislike. The populations of the Rheinbund were looked upon as brethren in misfortune. The prestige of the dynasties had received a grievous shock from the parvenu who claimed to be the sole fountain of princely power. Hopes of a national liberation through national action began to animate the bolder spirits; and Stadion's war was as much a response to these feelings as it was a last venture to repair the fortunes of the Austrian empire.

Peace of Vienna, 1809.—Nevertheless the time was not yet come for a national insurrection. The Tyrolese, brave, with "a few strong instincts and a few plain rules," flew to arms at the first signal; the Black Brunswickers showed how private enterprise might fight for public freedom; the desperate attempts of Schill and Dörnberg proved the hardihood of the prevailing disaffection; but these were isolated efforts, which brought no other result than death or exile to those engaged in them. The real conflict was, as heretofore, between the regular armies of the two belligerent powers. In this sphere, however, the new spirit was not without influence. The Austrian army was reorganized and a Landwehr instituted with more than customary regard for individual worth and rational method; while the notorious dilatoriness of Vienna officialism gave way to an energy which succeeded in outstripping the vigilance of the French Emperor. For once the army of the Hapsburgs was in the field before the foe; for once it seized a considerable advantage by the celerity and sagacity of its movements. Nevertheless, the battle of Wagram closed the desperately contested campaign, and left Austria as powerless as Prussia after Jena to escape the worst penalties of defeat.

Wellington in Portugal.—At this time Wellington alone retained confidence in the cause of freedom. He had only too good reason to think little of the Spanish armies, and he underrated, with all the professional prejudice of the British regular soldier, the effectiveness of the guerilla warfare which the Spanish peasantry waged with furious zeal and sanguinary effect. Yet when the Emperor sent such vast reinforcements into the peninsula that Andalusia, the soul of the insurrection, was reduced early in 1810, and Cadiz alone resisted with success, he refused to participate in the dejected mood of his countrymen. It was Wellington alone who dared to relieve the Perceval cabinet from acquiescing in the faint-hearted demands of the commercial public by taking upon himself the responsibility of contesting to the last the English foothold in Portugal. His conviction was that, if Great Britain persistently disputed the French occupation of Spain, some great misadventure to the empire would eventually afford an opportunity of assuming the offensive against France itself. Supported by this prescient hope, he was content to renounce the glory of attack whenever the enemy's strength made action hazardous. Rather than risk a disabling defeat, he surrendered the ground won in the hardships of the field, and, combating the foe with the manœuvres of retreat, repulsed him with starvation before the impregnable lines of Torres Vedras.

Meanwhile the infatuation of Napoleon rapidly induced the crisis for which Wellington waited. Intent on new gratifications to his ambition, the Emperor left the conduct of the Peninsular war to his generals, and devoted himself to preparations for engaging in the most stupendous and dangerous military enterprise of modern times.

Napoleon's Russian Campaign, 1812.—The

European war, which commenced with the invasion of Russia, summed up and balanced the strength and weakness of the Napoleonic empire. When the campaign opened Napoleon commanded more than half a million men of different nations and languages. His numerous vassals had obediently sent large contingents. Austria had acquiesced in the logical consequences of the matrimonial alliance into which it had been forced by the war of 1809; Prussia had been compelled to furnish its quota of troops together with an enormous quantity of supplies. Alexander, on the other hand, though he had bought peace from the Porte by renouncing part of the booty assigned to him at Tilsit, and had purchased the alliance of Sweden by the promise of Norway, was able to muster less than half this number of men, very insufficiently equipped. But the inexplicable delays of his enemy, the climate and roads of his inhospitable land, the Fabian tactics of Barclay de Tolly, and the resolute temper of the fanatical Muscovite, eventually reduced the two armies to a like level of misery. When the fragments of the Grand Army recrossed the Niemen, Napoleon's immediately available forces were but little superior to the jaded remnants of the pursuing Russians.

Insurrectionary Spirit in Germany.—One of the most misleading fallacies of popular history is the belief that the retreat from Moscow necessarily involved the destruction of the empire. Heavy as was the blow which the campaign dealt at his fortunes, Napoleon's strategic genius and reserve forces, especially in officers, left him still the most formidable power in Europe; and he prepared to take the field again in defence of an intact, though weakened, empire. This aspect of the situation was fully understood by continental statesmen at the time. Alexander himself hesitated to carry the

war into the enemy's country, and many of his advisers counselled an unheroic policy of petty aggrandisement. Nor in all probability would he have assumed the part of a general liberator, unless he had been urged by German patriots to initiate a rebellion against the French yoke. For at this crisis Napoleon found himself threatened in the rear by an insurrection which had never entered into his calculations when he disposed his garrisons among the subject people. Fortresses, numerous and costly, he had been compelled to hold, for his rule had ignored the truth, "la miglior fortezza che sia, è non essere odiato dal popolo." The outlay proved to be waste, and the waste proved to be fatal to that final preponderance of force on which the Napoleonic strategy ever depended for the infliction of decisive defeat. Yet the rebellion, which was to turn a military disaster into a catastrophe, and was to convert threats of English invasion and menaces of Russian Cossacks into triumphant attacks on the French empire, differed greatly from the common type of popular risings. Napoleon's contempt for the German people as a national body was no failure of his usual sagacity. The Germans were hardly more capable of spontaneous and united action than when they were fettered by the authority of some three hundred potentates; and they lac[illegible] the passionate instincts of national life as completely as they had lost the forms of an independent national existence. But among those who had been trained to follow spirited and able leaders, the ennobling influence of the nation's natural chiefs had induced a resolute spirit of self-assertion, which common suffering directed towards a common object.

Intellectual Revival in Germany.—Long before this time the desolation of the Thirty Years' War had begun to pass away; and returning prosperity had

enabled the more fortunate members of the German people to move beyond the sordid cares of daily life. More than half a century had elapsed since Lessing had laid the foundation on which was reared the splendid fabric of modern German thought and poetry. Since then, literature had supplied a centre round which the middle classes rallied in brotherly communion. Without calling up any vivid sense of unity, this intercourse gradually diffused a vague feeling of civic toleration which was the first step towards national concord. But, what was of more immediate benefit, the intellectual revival braced the German mind by repudiating that habitual deference to foreign dogmatism which had oppressed native talent, and thwarted indigenous energy. Though escape from the pseudo-classicism of the stranger was achieved only by passing under the spell of another nation's genius, the close kinship between the English and German mind caused the change of school to be equivalent to an act of self-assertion. The citizens, who had been taught by tradition that French taste and authority were the supreme arbiters of intellectual and artistic excellence, were conveyed directly to the tremendous conclusion that, notwithstanding their divisions, notwithstanding their language, Germans might yet possess of their very own the substance and form of a literature worthy of a great nation.

Birth of German Patriotism.—It was now that an eager discontent, a nobly misdirected striving, seized the more impulsive youth. The *Sturm und Drang* episode spent its undisciplined forces. And men arose who were fit to be masters at such a time. Kant engaged the intellects of the thinkers and teachers by his critical philosophy, and thence led them to an ethical creed as exalted and severe as that of the Roman stoics. In

imaginative literature the themes of freedom and independence received fervid celebration; and the way was prepared for those warlike lyrics of Arndt, Rückert, and Körner, which, as even Goethe admitted, had some effect in uniting together Germans at the moment of battle. Fichte, Kant's successor in philosophy, and Schleiermacher, the theologian, proclaimed the worth of patriotic enthusiasm and national integrity; while gymnastics, lately conspicuous among the novelties of pedagogic reformers, were fanatically commended by old Jahn as a strengthener alike of the muscles and character.

Leadership of the Prussian State.—A long distance, however, separates nascent aspiration from mature effort. Literary culture is not only slow to diffuse itself through the masses of a nation, but in itself it possesses no political content. Tradition hands down from the rough shifts of expediency the different political types which modern societies develop according to their necessities and measures of culture. And in Germany at this time there existed only the monarchical form of government from which renewed mental activity could draw political initiative and guidance. Here it was that Napoleon had most deeply injured the German nation. With one exception he had denationalized—the expression occurred in one of his *Lettres inédites*—every monarchy. The exception, too, he had degraded as low as conquest could reduce, without annihilating, a state. Not content with driving Prussia into a corner of North-Eastern Europe, he had kept it fast in the bonds of affliction by exacting an indemnity too heavy for the impoverished country to bear; he had plundered its daily sustenance to feed the Grand Army; he had forbidden it to raise a military force of any strength; he had forced it to take arms against its intimate, Russia;

he had obliged Frederick William to submit ignominiously to his dictation in matters of domestic government. Nevertheless, stricken as it was from without, and degenerate as it was within, the Prussian monarchy had not fallen so low as to be incapable of vindicating, on a favourable opportunity, its right to be the champion of independence in Germany.

This prerogative was Prussia's by virtue of its achievement of forming from among Germans one independent European power. Its capacity for a heroic effort of recovery was assured by the history of its development. Raised to a commanding position by the severe discipline of able rulers, it was prepared to make great sacrifices at the instance of trusted leaders. Its service had attracted from other parts of Germany talent which could not find worthier employment than that afforded by the Hohenzollerns. It is true that the monarchy had suffered much from the blunders of incapacity. But this was due partly to adventitious causes, and partly to the confusion which Frederick the Great's method of personal government had necessarily produced when weaker men tried to conduct by it the affairs of an enlarged state.

Reform of the Prussian Army.—Still Prussia was nothing if not military; and Napoleon appeared to have effectually consigned it to insignificance when he insisted that its army should be limited to 42,000 men.* More fatal, however, were the shortcomings of the service

* By a convention at Paris, September 8, 1808. The number was the same as that of the Prussian army which attempted to invade France in 1792, and was repulsed by the cannonade of Valmy. The erroneous number, 40,000, to be found in English books, even so lately as volume xi. of the *Political History of England*, seems to have originated in a mistake in Schlosser's History, though Schlosser's authority is good only for what he experienced himself, especially in the intellectual and moral spheres.

itself. Before Jena the army had been composed of slaves drilled into machines, of patrician dunces martialized by arrogance and vice, and of commanders stricken with years and decrepit in understanding. By legal and social distinctions it was severed from the mass of the nation ; and so offensive was the demeanour of its members, so alien to civic life were its tone and constitution, that the Prussian burghers contemplated with positive satisfaction the overthrow of the soldiery kept for their defence and control. Prussia, therefore, continuing to follow in its fallen condition the main law of its existence, accomplished the work of military reform with a thoroughness and severity which gave it again the foremost place among the monarchies of the sword. Nay, the repetition extended yet further. As its old professional army had been the highest development of what had originally been invented by France, so now its new military system was but the full application of the principle of citizen armies, first realized by the Republic. An important difference, however, distinguished Prussia's share in this second transaction. Its earlier contributions to military science merely carried to an extreme result a system which had already wrought great political changes. This later step in army organization converted the desperate expedient of a troubled period into a regular institution of the state; and thus directly and definitively incorporated into the life of Europe one of the most deep-reaching innovations of the Revolution.

Introduction of the Short Service System.—The necessity of placing the Prussian army on a broader basis gave authority to a few distinguished officers, who were anxious to entrust the defence of the country to the people as Stein had entrusted the economy of production and exchange. One of these, Gneisenau, had

made memorable one of the few heroic episodes in the late war by leading the citizens with his soldiers to the defence of Kolberg. Together with Clausewitz, the well-known writer on strategy, he assisted Scharnhorst to bring about the greatest military reform of modern times. Scharnhorst was the grandson of a Hanoverian peasant, and the son of a non-commissioned officer, and his fame has been bruited abroad by no loud feats of arms. Mortally wounded at Gross Görschen, he lived to witness only the uncertain commencement of the war for which he had devotedly prepared. The laurels of the campaign fell to fiery old Blücher and his mentor Gneïsenau. Outwardly, as an officer, Scharnhorst was far from being what we call smart and the Prussians called *Stramm*. Yet he was the presiding hero of the war of liberation. He it was who reiterated the principle that every native of a state is its born defender. This he said, not in imitation of the conscription in France, but in appeal to an ordinance of Frederick William I., which extravagant exemption had rendered almost nugatory. From him came the device of keeping the whole manhood trained to arms. Without infringing the letter of Napoleon's injunctions, or exceeding the resources of the state, he drafted the recruits into the reserve after a short period of service with the colours. He thus gave a new meaning to the principle of citizen armies. Heretofore conscription had simply meant a compulsory levy from among the citizens, such as the French Republic had first enforced in 1798 at the motion of Jourdan, when the danger of the country ceased to induce a sufficient influx of volunteers. Henceforth citizen armies were to be armed nations. The industrial type of nineteenth-century civilization was to assume a militant and monarchical aspect hardly less characteristic than that of the age when man's

status was determined by military service instead of by contract.*

Prussia turns against Napoleon, 1813.—Chief of the many difficulties which hindered Prussia from welcoming the arrival of the victorious Russians by an insurrection against the French, was the anomaly that the monarchy was technically at war with Alexander. More than one French garrison was overpowered by the people; but in this country of impassive discipline no general movement was possible till the word of command was given from headquarters. Yet such was the tension of the situation that York, the commander of Napoleon's Prussian contingent, was impelled to sacrifice an intense attachment to military subordination by concluding on his own responsibility a convention of neutrality with the Russian general. This loyal act of mutiny precipitated the inevitable rupture. Though the Prussian government repudiated the convention and apologized to Napoleon, it prepared to pass over to the enemy. Two months later all prudential reserve was abandoned, and the two monarchs concluded the treaty of Kalisch, with the purpose of together prosecuting the war till Prussia had recovered an equivalent to its lost territories.

Insurrection in Prussia.—Thus officially declared, the war of liberation was borne along with popular impetuosity. Already Stein had been enabled by the prevailing enthusiasm to organize the Landwehr in East Prussia. Volunteers flocked from all sides to the recruiting stations. The people were almost offended by the proclamation of conscription when voluntary

* At the time of their inception the new armies were suspected of directly encouraging democracy. Both Wellington and Alexander expressed fear that the monarchical authority in Prussia would be shaken by the citizen army acting as if it were a French national guard.

enlistment more than sufficed to fill the ranks. Contributions to the impoverished government were gladly yielded; and one still finds in Prussian families silver bearing evidence that it was returned from the abundance offered to the state at this time. Most eager for the fray were the students and educated classes, those who astonished the Parisians by thronging to the Louvre when victory had been won by sheer fighting. Yet none were too mean to participate in the joy of insurrection, none too poor to leave their homes for the war. Some even sold everything they possessed to arm themselves as volunteers. Supported by this enthusiasm, Scharnhorst's scheme rapidly organized the whole available manhood of the country. His *bourgeoisie armée*, as Napoleon contemptuously called it, soon counted a combatant for every seventeen inhabitants, exclusive of the reinforcements obtained during the war.

Battle of Leipzig, October 16–19, 1813.—It was fitting, therefore, that the campaign which ensued, marked as it was by many vicissitudes, should at last culminate in the battle of Leipzig, the *völkerschlacht*, the battle between a man and the nations, when by mere weight of numbers the French were completely defeated.

Deposition of Napoleon, 1814.—Again Napoleon returned to Paris to collect a new army; again the allies strove to arrange a durable peace. The combined monarchs were not of stout heart, and their interests were far from identical. They only agreed in wishing to make Napoleon yield enough of his conquests to bring Europe into a tolerable state of equilibrium. But the child of fortune received their advances only to gain time. With marvellous obstinacy he held to the belief in his own invincibility. He preferred the risks of a perilously unequal campaign to the assured results

of an advantageous compromise. Nevertheless, though favoured by the reluctance of Austria to consent to his overthrow and the consequent purposeless movements of the allies, though he handled his raw conscripts with masterly skill, though he won victories and extorted from the divided monarch more offers of peace, he was at last reduced to acquiesce in the utter collapse of his fortunes by accepting Elba for a kingdom, four hundred of his guardsmen for an army, and two million francs (which were never paid) for a revenue.

The Hundred Days. March–June, 1815.—Governed by such a temperament, relying with such good reason on discord among his conquerors, Napoleon only followed the law of his existence when he returned to France at the earliest possible opportunity. None the less, however, was the moment chosen unfavourable to his venture. Aware that the powers had fallen into dissensions at the Congress of Vienna, persuaded that the Bourbons had made themselves unpopular, he forgot that France was exhausted and weary of war, and he failed to realize that the allies were still at one with regard to him. But his was not the nature to wait till the armies of his enemies were reduced, till the terror of his name had diminished, till the folly of the Bourbons had made them intolerable to their subjects. Less than a year after his banishment he landed near Cannes with a few hundred trusty followers. His presence frightened Louis, first into liberal concessions, and then into ignominious flight. Once more he occupied the imperial throne. Heedful, however, of men's leanings towards constitutionalism, he promulgated an additional act to the constitution of the empire, and convoked the *Champ de Mai* to show that the period of absolutism had ceased. Naturally his declarations met with little faith; nor were his peaceful professions more

successful. The monarchs refused to receive his despatches; they denounced as an outlaw Napoleon Bonaparte, as they called the man whom they had expressly permitted to retain the title of emperor. At first they declared against him as a traitor by promising Louis help to quell rebellion.

Napoleon's Last Campaign.—Willingly, and yet unwillingly, Napoleon left Paris for his last campaign. Gladly he escaped from the obligation of personally submitting to democratic opinion and constitutional institutions; eagerly he hoped to return in victory to crush the wanton element beneath his former yoke. But it was with some apprehension that he entered into a new war with Europe. His army, though composed for the most part of veterans returned from garrison duty and foreign captivity, was less perfectly organized and staffed than formerly, and it was far too small to cope with the united forces of his opponents. Revolution, too, at home was, he knew, imminent in case of reverse. Owing to illness, moreover, he retained only a portion of the decision and energy which had subdued the Continent. Yet his immediate overthrow was not achieved by force of numbers, nor were his rapid movements without success. Both Wellington and Blücher were disconcerted by his sudden onset; and at Waterloo he launched forth his legions in startling combinations after the bold and direct fashion which in late years had especially characterized his tactics. In numerical strength he was not taken at a disadvantage till the Prussian attack, which decided his last field. Throughout the campaign, however, he under-estimated the foe he had to deal with. His losses in those few days were enormous, as Professor Oman has recently shown. Blücher's rally after Ligny, and his courageous advance from Wavre to Wellington's help, never came

within his calculations; and assuredly he would not have delayed, on account of the wetness of the ground for his guns, the attack on Wellington's army if he had suspected that the English would hold their ground against the charges of his veterans, and that the Prussians would elude Grouchy and arrive on the field of battle. Met by the shock of a stubborn resistance, his army was shattered beyond the possibility of an orderly retreat, and his last venture terminated in a wild flight before the hosts of Austria and Russia had been able to take part in the war.

Thenceforward this mightiest of history's instruments remained dead to the world in an irksome captivity till, on May 5, 1821, disease freed him from a life of pain and discontent.

Second Return of the Bourbons. Reaction in France.—The warning of the Hundred Days sufficed not to prevent the Bourbons from continuing to commit blunders of perversity and incapacity; but circumstances condoned their faults till Louis XVIII. was incontestably seated on the throne of France. They even enjoyed the benefit of a great revulsion of public feeling in their favour. This reaction, expressing as it did a partial reversion of the national mind to the old monarchical system after twenty-five years of blind experiment, containing as it did the numerous and diverse elements which these years of change had irrevocably incorporated into French life, surrounded as it was by fundamental consequences of the Revolution which the researches of historians alone have been able to reveal fully by contrast with the old order, actuated as it was more by a weariness of war than by a love of peace,—this reaction, with all its attendant illusions, anomalies, and animosities, formed for better or worse the groundwork of modern France.

Congress of Vienna, 1814–15.—A resettlement of Europe was provided for by the first Peace of Paris, and a congress of the powers met at Vienna in November of the following year to determine its details. The occasion was naturally one of great display and festivity. When, after wars protracted and extended beyond any recorded in authentic history, all the great ones of Europe, the rulers and plenipotentiaries of every state except Turkey, met to agree upon the conditions of a general pacification, a welcome opportunity was afforded to rank and wealth to celebrate with profuse indulgence the return of peace to the harassed peoples. The occasion also invited serious consideration of the weal of nations. Never before had rulers been given a better opportunity for arriving in unison at plans for the better discharge of their trust; never before had European society been in such a plastic condition; never had more enlightened statesmanship been at the command of law-givers and diplomatists. But the time when reforms came from above was past. Now princes were to be either executors of the people's mandates or jealous guardians of their own dynastic interests.

The Principle of Legitimacy.—Fitly enough did they meet in the capital of the Hapsburgs. Here, as guests of a dynasty which had risen to the proudest rank by trafficking in diverse races, they surveyed the wreck of the fallen empire, and disputed with one another over the fragments at disposal without regard to national needs and feelings. "At Vienna," laments Gervinus, "there was a statistical, but no national, committee." Yet this policy wanted not a principle. The princes pleaded their titles by the grace of God, though some wore crowns by the favour of Napoleon. Thence they supported their claims by the argument which Talleyrand dignified with the name of "legitimacy."

Fouché hoped that the new catchword would be less productive of woe than "equality" had been; and at one stage of the debate it seemed that Europe's troubles would be immediately renewed by the principle's adherents themselves. But the congress escaped from a violent disruption to bring forth in due time its fully matured fruit of conflict and distress. It dispersed, leaving its most authoritative decisions to be cancelled within sixty years by the sufferings of the peoples whose victory it had assembled to convert into a lasting peace.

Decisions of the Congress.—Russia—France—Prussia.—Hence the great democratic movement came to strengthen temporarily the chief absolute monarchies. Russia not only kept Finland and Bessarabia, with the part of Moldavia it had conquered from Turkey, but it succeeded in getting most of the Duchy of Warsaw. Regard for the balance of power caused France to be left nearly as strong as formerly. This decision was only arrived at after a lively controversy. But most dangerously provocative of contention were the demands of Prussia. This state had been promised a restoration of power which should make it equal to what it had been before the Peace of Tilsit, but it considered that its deeds in the War of Liberation entitled it to an accession of strength. Its statesmen then forgot, and its historians do not perceive now, how contemptible it appeared to the world from the beginning of the revolutionary wars to the insurrection of 1813, and how slightly its fortunate effort was appreciated by contemporaries in consequence. Its demand for the whole of Saxony accordingly encountered all the hostility which jealousy and conflicting interests could engender, without enlisting any impartial support. The position of Saxony was dubious. Its king had insisted upon

adhering to the cause of Napoleon till he had been taken prisoner by the Allies after Leipzig. As a German state, Saxony was guilty of treason against the German nation; but then it was doubtful whether there was a German nation against which treason could be committed. To other states independence had been guaranteed late in the war; and if Saxony had a sovereign right to wage war as it chose, there seemed no reason why its king should not retain with the rest his Divinely delegated commission after having atoned for his defeat. In the end, Prussia got the larger but more thinly populated half of Saxony, which with various additions and some restorations gave it a larger population, though not so large an area of territory, than before. It was divided into two portions of unequal size with insecure frontiers, but it was much more compact than after the last partition of Poland, and its population, though two-fifths Catholic and three-fifths Protestant, was now almost entirely German.

Austria and Italy. Sardinia.—If Prussia thus unwittingly laid the foundation of a future German Empire, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy was believed by Metternich to be invested with permanent supremacy in Central Europe and the Italian peninsula. So profitably had this wily minister preyed upon the necessities of the allies before consenting to join them in the war of 1813, that the state, which had done least to win the common victory, emerged from its misfortunes with some millions of subjects more than it possessed in 1792. While it renounced its former troublesome province of Belgium and its positions in South-West Germany, it received back all that Napoleon had taken from it, together with the old Venetian states, except the Ionian Islands. Italy was so parcelled out that everything was favourable to Austrian influence except the return of the King

of Sardinia to the continent, who received besides Piedmont, Savoy, and Nice, the former republic of Genoa.

Germany.—In the settlement of Germany, Metternich's tactics were also successful. As a condition of Austrian support in the late war, he had obliged the allies to engage to respect the independence of the Rheinbund states. Germany's political institutions thus came to number two military monarchies, four kingdoms, one electorate, six grand-duchies, fourteen duchies and principalities, and the four free towns, Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck, and Frankfurt-on-Main. This distribution of sovereign power represented a great advance in organization since the pre-revolutionary epoch, but it afforded no practicable basis for the erection of a sound national polity. Such a substitute for the old empire was well adapted to Metternich's purposes. Austria's diplomatic position assured it the advantage over its rival in unconstrained dealing with the smaller states. With them it envied and dreaded the aggrandisement of the Hohenzollerns; with them it sought to restrain Prussian encroachment by fortifying the independence of the minor princes.

Proposals of reactionary enthusiasts for a restoration of the Holy Roman Empire were readily disposed of by the unwillingness of Austria and every one else to submit to its unprofitable obligations and restraints. Schemes like Stein's for the subjection of the states to a supreme national parliament were decisively negatived by the spirit which induced Würtemberg and Bavaria to declare that their peoples and Prussia's could never be assimilated into one nationality. After some months spent in useless discussion, a *Deutscher Bund* was formed for the purpose of preserving the security of Germany from without, and the integrity of the single states within. It was adorned with an ostensible

provision for popular representation in the government of the different states; but the worth of its disciplinary articles was made to depend on the authority of a Diet at Frankfurt-on-Main, presided over by the plenipotentiary of the Emperor of Austria.

Netherlands, Scandinavia, Switzerland.—With a view to erecting a barrier to France on the north, the Congress united Belgium and Holland into a kingdom for the Prince of Orange. He took the title of William I. of the United Netherlands; but the union was ill-assorted, and his kingdom contained from the first the elements of disruption. To Sweden was ceded Norway by the Danes. The frontiers of Spain, Portugal, and of Turkey since the peace of Bucharest were left untouched. Switzerland was found to require but little change in its constitution. Three cantons—Neuchâtel, Wallis, and Geneva—were added to the nineteen, and the whole number were united into a Swiss confederation.

Moral Gain of Great Britain.—From the dispensation which thus finally set out the territorial groundwork of modern Europe, England could only receive permission to retain Malta, Heligoland, the Cape of Good Hope, Guiana, Mauritius, and a few other of its conquests, while it was entrusted with the protection, or rather temporary dominion, of the republic of the Ionian Isles. But what material aggrandizement an insular character obliged it to forego was fully equalled by the prestige and moral influence which its fortitude and efforts had deservedly earned. Having entered into conflict with a reputation blemished by the mishaps of the latter part of the eighteenth century, Great Britain emerged as a heroic example for all continental peoples. It had won that respect which for long was to give weight to unarmed utterance.

British Measures against Piracy and the Slave

Trade.—Nevertheless, it is from this time that we must date that curious belief of continental peoples that the English are a race, made to puzzle, and destined to prevail. Before withdrawing from active participation in continental affairs, the English government sent its ships to break up the Algerian corsairs, though these prosperous free-booters had abstained from attacking British commerce in order to prey the more securely upon those marines which had been deprived of protection by the fortunes of naval war. Since the Peace of Utrecht, England had been the great slave-trader of the world. Indeed, the Assiento contract had been one of the few conditions of that peace which gave unqualified satisfaction in England. At the Congress of Vienna, as we read in the works of foreign historians, among the rewards seized by the grasping islanders for their obduracy against Napoleon, the general abandonment of the slave-trade was the one most valued, most undeniable, and most incomprehensible. Thus, touched to fine issues, first appeared in European politics that spirit of tenderness which had been evoked by the religious revival of Wesley among all grades of England's industrial society.

CHAPTER V

THE QUICKENING OF GERMANY, ITALY, AND SPAIN

"On reconnaît que le plus puissant des hommes a toujours été entraîné par quelque chose de plus puissant que lui, que la paix n'a jamais été entre ses mains, qu'un Dieu le poussait sans relâche, que presque tout l'univers est son complice."—QUINET.

Napoleon an Agent of the Revolution.—It is a very shortsighted opinion which pronounces Napoleon to be the negator of the Revolution, the avenger of the dishonoured and maltreated past. Though he was a scorner of democracy, an expounder of a ruthless creed of despotism and brute force, he was yet the most successful interpreter and most cogent enforcer of the "rights of man." Blood and deceit were his weapons, personal supremacy his aim, but he was compelled by what was true and inevitable in the Revolution to employ his power for the enfranchisement of peoples, to practise law and justice, and to dispense the blessings of equality, at the same time that he extorted the abject submission of the conquered. In spite of his evil self, he was the armed propagator of a more generous social order. Like Mephistopheles, he was—

"Ein Theil von jener Kraft,
Die stets das Böse will und stets das Gute schafft."

Without him it is doubtful whether France would have

embraced irrevocably the Revolution's maxims of natural equity and human freedom before submitting to a restoration ; without him it is certain that the peoples of Germany, Italy, and Spain would have travailed long ere they overcame their terror of the Revolution's excesses, and extricated themselves from what remained of the barbarism of the feudal ages.

Napoleon's Influence on Germany.—In no part of Europe did the empire's fall obliterate all the good that it had bestowed with the bad ; but in the states of the Rheinbund, Napoleon's influence left most effects of substantial value. These states, which he had consolidated and strengthened, became more ambitious to play a respectable part in the government of Europe. The crowns strove to overcome finally the feudal nobility, and in trying to exercise absolute sovereignty they approached the impartial rule of the Imperial system of administration. In some instances the efforts of a small principality to ape an empire were ludicrous, but in most the result was beneficial to subjects and rulers alike. Along with the torpor of government were removed the shackles of the people. The mediæval order was almost entirely repudiated. Serfage, privileges, petty tyranny, and perverted justice, were generally exchanged for the Code, equable taxation, and the common right of all to serve their state. Advantage, too, redounded to the German nation as a whole as well as to its divisions. French innovations destroyed incurious reverence for the existent. By summarily amalgamating electorates, free towns, and bishoprics, Napoleon forced Germans to abate somewhat of their hatreds and jealousies, and to regard one another as countrymen, at least in relation to foreigners. The War of Liberation banded them together for a moment in behalf of a common cause. Furthermore,

if it be true that to present clearly a question is to go halfway to its answer, his supremacy half solved the great problem of German politics in the nineteenth century. As long as the form of the old Empire remained, the conditions of a new and real one were obscured to common vision. With the destruction of the venerable shape, it became evident that what Germany wanted was a powerful leader of its own, who would force the smaller states to sink their rivalries in submission to the whole as represented by its greatest constituent.

Progress of the German States.—In different states the quickening movement varied in character and persistence. Bavaria, for example, presented the most advanced form of innovation. Würtemberg's king, on the other hand, imposed his reforms in such an arbitrary manner that, notwithstanding his ability and the need of change throughout his new kingdom, his subjects were at the time conscious only of his tyranny and the burdens of French suzerainty. The subjects of Jerome Bonaparte, king of Westphalia, suffered more than ordinary extortion from Napoleon, and also experienced all the evils which could be produced by the rule and favourites of the one Bonaparte, who was too vicious and careless to be worthy of a crown. In Baden, where devotion to French models was strongest, Charles Frederick contrived to obtain for the people an unusual proportion of benefit. In Saxony, on the contrary, the instincts of the king and his well-to-do burghers forbade any change; and in Mecklenburg, the stronghold of the feudal nobility, the representatives of the oldest sovereign house in the Western world were powerless to take advantage of the prevailing current of events. Where, too, the country had been brought directly under French administration,

as in Hanover and Kurhesse, the return of the old rulers was accompanied by determined efforts to efface the work of the usurpers; yet Prussia, though its jurisprudence was of Frederick's making, found reason to retain the Code Napoléon in its Rhenish Provinces. One special consequence of French domination, however, seems to have been more or less operative throughout Germany. The ease with which the new France trampled under foot the old empire, the old Austria, and the old Prussia, induced everywhere a disposition to regard hopefully any changes which promised to import a democratic element into government. The same fact called upon the rulers to compete with the semblance of popular institutions which the French introduced wherever they went. Hardenberg, Stein's successor, and in some ways his peer, could find no more plausible excuse for rashly pledging the Prussian crown to a national representation than the expediency of distancing the dangerous Westphalian neighbour in the estimation of public opinion.* Hence the solemn acknowledgment of Germany's debt to France, which many of its sovereigns made when they bid for the support of their subjects in the War of Liberation by promises of constitutional government. Hence the famous thirteenth article of the *Bundesacte*, "In allen Bundesstaaten wird eine landesständische Verfassung Statt finden."

Regeneration of Prussia. Edict of Emancipation, 1807,—At the same time that this metamorphosis of

* Influenced by the same idea, as we learn from a letter of Napoleon's to Jerome, quoted by Mr. Fisher, the Emperor insisted that a liberal government would separate Westphalia from Prussia more effectively than the Elbe, or fortresses, or French protection. "What people would wish to revert to Prussian despotism after once tasting the benefits of a wise and liberal government?" But the Westphalians seem to have most appreciated fighting in Napoleon's campaigns.

an aggregate of states was preparing the groundwork for a united Germany, the regeneration of a single monarchy provided for the future erection of a German empire. It was after the Peace of Tilsit, when a large French army was quartered on what was left of its territory, and an enormous indemnity was being levied on its people, that Prussia shook off its lethargy and entered the path of reform, which was to lead it to the headship of the nation. To rescue the state from succumbing in the fierce struggle for existence, by which the Revolution was improving the type of all surviving institutions, the Freiherr vom Stein was invested with very great discretionary powers. Versed in the doctrines of Adam Smith and the lessons of English history, Stein and his colleagues first sought to improve the social and economical condition of Prussia by conferring on its inhabitants a just measure of individual liberty. A commission of Hardenberg's had nearly completed the draft of an Edict of Emancipation when Stein entered office; and it was the Freiherr's merit to have suffered not a week's delay before making it law. Prior to its publication, villeinage, based originally on the manorial system of conferring on the squires judiciary and police functions, ranging from absolute servitude to a more usual system of recognized services and dues from the peasant to his lord, was the condition of the workers of the soil in the Prussian monarchy. On this point the edict decreed that from Martinmas, 1810, every remaining form of villeinage shall cease, and from that date there shall be none but freemen in the Prussian dominions. Formerly, too, the land had been divided into portions confined to the nobles, burghers, and peasants respectively; land and people went together, both being carefully distinguished into lots, and kept in separate categories. The edict decreed that

every inhabitant is, as far as the state is concerned, henceforth free to acquire and own landed property of every kind and description; that every noble, without derogation from his rank, is henceforth free to exercise the trades and callings of a burgher, while the burgher may become peasant, the peasant burgher.

Prussian Municipal Reform. — The Edict of Emancipation was no more than was necessary to remove the worst anachronisms which the stiff military *régime* of the Prussian monarchy had involved and maintained. More truly in advance was Stein's scheme for introducing a limited local self-government which should culminate in a kind of national representation. Of this he was able to realize only that part which related to the towns. At one time the German cities had been strongholds of burgher independence and freedom, but from various causes, of which war and the rise of military absolutism were chief, this healthy feeling had forsaken all the centres of industry except a few free towns. Bureaucratic servitude, with all its concomitant apathy, was now the political condition of most citizens. In the late war, the infantine helplessness of the Prussian towns had strikingly been exhibited when defeat had smitten with paralysis the mechanical officialism on which they were accustomed to rely. By Stein's municipal reform the citizens were entrusted with the care of their schools, public works, and poor. At first the torpid towns were shy of their new responsibilities; but when the War of Liberation threw the burghers on their own resources, and forcibly introduced them to the invigorating experience of self-help, a great awakening overtook Prussian civic life. A wholesome public feeling was aroused, and an instructive precedent was supplied to other German states for reviving in the towns the freer forms of the past.

Reform of the Central Administration by Stein.—On the other hand, Stein was equally determined to "give to the administration of affairs the greatest possible unity, energy, and activity; to cause it to converge to the highest point; and, in the simplest and most convenient manner, to place at its disposal all the powers of the nation and the individual." The decrees which were to effect this change in the central and provincial administration failed to embody all that he contemplated. Since then other alterations have considerably modified what he did accomplish. But still it is his work which fashioned anew the most excellent bureaucracy which ever served the cause of monarchy.

Hardenberg's Legislation.—Although Stein's reforms were violently opposed by the aristocracy, his successor continued to carry out a similar policy. Some of Hardenberg's measures were futile and ill-advised; some were defeated by popular indifference, the hostility of the Junkerthum, or his own personal foibles; but many were reforms of permanent value. The Jews were emancipated, and the guilds were abolished. Following the precedent by which, soon after their liberation, the serfs of the royal domains had been transformed into free proprietors, an edict for the regulation of the relations between lords of the manor and their peasants was issued. The Edict of Emancipation had left the freeman still subject to all obligations flowing from the possession of land. It was now enacted that all tenants of hereditary holdings shall become the absolute proprietors of their holdings after paying to the landlord an indemnity and surrendering their former claims on him.

Retrograde Policy of Austria.—At first little was known of the step which Prussia had taken towards fitting itself for a civilizing *rôle*. Nor, when peace left

this monarchy almost wholly German, abutting in one direction on aggressive France and in the other on the Russian empire, did men understand that its interests must be those of the German nation. But the old suspicion and dislike remained as rife as before. The dynasties were not less jealous of their sovereignty now that it had become more important. The presence of Austria encouraged these feelings. Though the idea that the nucleus of a united Germany could ever be found in the House of Hapsburg existed only in the fancy of a few romanticists, yet its rivalry deprived Prussia of the moral weight which a claim to national leadership required. More adversely, the whole tenor of Austrian statesmanship was to maintain the principle of legitimacy against the pretensions of nationality, whether raised by discontented peoples or espoused by ambitious monarchies. When Naples was transferred to the Bourbons, Ferdinand was bound by a secret treaty to tolerate no constitution or innovation repugnant to the old monarchical system or the principles of Austrian administration in Lombardy. The reaction against the abortive reforms of Joseph and the pitiful conservatism of Francis himself had effectually resisted everything pertaining to the Revolution except its armies. Even the enthusiasm of the War of Liberation had failed to elicit any response from the state whose monarch hoped to see his grandchild, the titular King of Rome, step into the inheritance of the Napoleonic Empire. Agitators against the French after the retreat from Moscow were arrested and banished by the Austrian government. Austria's standard of culture withheld its German subjects from spiritual communion with the rest of their race. Its press regulations were so constricting that the educated people of Vienna had to thank the French occupation in 1809 for much access

to the German national literature. Naturally disposed to pleasure and ease, dispirited by the burdens of war and a terrible financial catastrophe, the Germans of Austria patiently accepted the intellectual pittance afforded by police, priests, and smugglers. And all the time their government studied to keep peoples submissive to their princes, and princes unmoved by national aspirations

Political Attitude of the German People.—Great, then, as was Germany's gain from this period, it did not amount to more than a groundwork for subsequent development. For the present, no spontaneous popular force existed to remedy the faults of the political settlement. In some quarters the remembrance of the War of Liberation and the national and constitutional hopes born of that time lingered to suggest a more worthy fate for the German race. But the burgher population, the classes who in England and France were about to assert supremacy, were still lacking in the first qualities of effective citizens. Their sufferings from war, their difficulties when commerce resumed its proper channels, served to increase their lassitude. Their condition was in many most important respects greatly improved, but the great reward of their travail was to be reaped by another generation.

Italy's Need of Autonomy.—Like Germany, Italy dates the quickening of its national life from the dominion of Napoleon, and, like Germany, its period of fruition was long deferred. But while in these and other respects the development of the two nations presents many points of resemblance, the essential conditions of the two processes varied in one important particular. Germany's protracted disintegration was principally due to the stubbornness of constituent elements; Italy's mainly to foreign servitude, and only secondarily to want of solidarity of feeling. At Vienna,

German powers virtually controlled German affairs; but Italy was surrendered to its old rulers by a congress of strangers, before which, as a nation, it was entirely unrepresented.* The Italians had much to learn before they could be masters of themselves; they had more to do before they could become their own rulers. Whereas Germany's prime need was unity, Italy's was autonomy; and this characteristic difference broadly distinguished the course of their development.

Influence of Napoleon's Rule on Italy.—When the Revolution was still distant, Italian literature began to throw off the craven spirit of dependence which centuries of degradation had induced in every department of life. In the more serious branches of thought arose writers of European fame; and in the lighter functions of literature, talent protested in behalf of a more manly and moral conception of personal and social life. Parini initiated in style a return to reality, and chastened with delicate irony the prevailing vices and follies of the upper classes. Goldoni redeemed comedy from the slavery of imitation and the reproach of absurdity with plays which owed their attractiveness as much to their conformity with the national character and manners as to the invention, gaiety, and humour of their author. Then came the fervid patriotism and passion for independence of Alfieri and Ugo Foscolo. Hence, when Bonaparte established the Cispadane Republic, there were among the many, who could unintelligently ejaculate the

* Admirers of the Italian struggle for independence will recall that three hundred years earlier Machiavelli had written, "Volendo conoscere la virtù di uno spirito italiano, era necessario che l'Italia si riducesse nel termine ch' ell' è di presente, e che la fusse più schiava che gli Ebrei, più serva che i Persi, più dispersa che gli Ateniesi, senza capo, senz' ordine, battuta, spogliata, lacera, corsa, ed avesse sopportato di ogni sorta rovine."

revolutionary phrases, a few eager patriots to whom the words made the dream of Italian independence a vivid idea. And when the great conqueror extended his rule over the whole peninsula, his kinship, and the extermination of the strange rulers, suggested the thought of Italian independence and unity in quarters where the ideal possesses little power. Under the banners of the Emperor conscripts from every part of Italy fought side by side, and together won renown against the nations of Europe. Under his protection the citizens enjoyed the same code of law, the same system of administration, taxation, and instruction. While the nation gained confidence in itself, it buried not a few of the jealousies bequeathed to it by the Middle Ages. While it learnt to prize civic equality, it rejoiced in the fancy of liberty. The weight of the French yoke lost much of its power to gall when feudal privileges availed no more and burdens were equally distributed. It is true that of thirty thousand Italians who fought in Spain hardly nine thousand returned, and that of the twenty-seven thousand who entered Russia, scarcely one thousand reached home. But the people were accustomed to hardships, and though they dwelt upon them more than did spirited and ambitious members of the upper classes, their discontent did not invalidate the hopes which the leaders of public opinion discovered in the Napoleonic despotism.*

References to Italian Independence.—Before these young national aspirations were outlawed by the Restoration, fortune enabled them to be recorded by the combined testimony of friend and foe. The

* Writing in 1825, Colletta said, "Se la intolleranza della servitù è un supplicio presente, ma un bene certo e futuro de' popoli, dêssa viene agl' Italiani dal dominio di Buonaparte, arbitrario, violento, ma pieno di effetti e di speranze."

ill-fated venture of Murat on the return of Napoleon from Elba is numbered by an historian of Italian independence as the first effort in its behalf. When the King of Naples issued his proclamation to the Italian nation, "from the Alps to the Straits of Scylla echoed one cry alone—Indipendenza d'Italia—this cry, which later, in 1848–49 and in 1859–60, moved millions of Italians, drew thousands and thousands around the banner on which was written—Gloria, Dovere, Amor di patria." Nor could his enemy afford to disregard his war-cry. The Emperor of Austria had declared that the Lombards must forget that they were Italians, and that his Italian provinces required to be united only by the bond of obedience to their emperor. Metternich openly plotted to quench the spirit of Italian liberty and union by disorganizing the Italian army and repressing the name and institutions of the kingdom of Italy. But when the Austrian general, Bellegarde, was threatened by Murat and his inflammatory promises, a proclamation was issued to the Lombards, avowing that "the Emperor, firm in his partiality to his Italian states, has determined upon the erection of a Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, as a peculiar crown land, whereby his Italian subjects will preserve their nationality, which they with reason esteem so highly;" and an imperial patent announced that a viceroy would represent the Emperor with a regular constitution. This blast and counterblast, though the one was only instrumental in uniting an inconsiderable auxiliary force to the Neapolitan army, and causing some disturbance in Romagna, and the other was uttered only to be forgotten for thirty-two years, betrayed the commencement of a new epoch in Italian history, the course of which no decisions of the powers could arrest.

The Restoration in Italy.—Nevertheless, the

restored governments insisted on presuming otherwise. Tuscany was the only place of importance where the reaction did not bring great misfortunes. This was chiefly because the Grand-Duke Leopold had been there before the French, and had left few abuses to be attacked or restored. But in Rome, while the wise Consalvi watched the interests of the Papacy at Vienna, the returned ecclesiastics, under the leadership of Rivarola and Pacca, wreaked vengeance on all French innovations. The whole antiquated system of justice, police, and trade was revived; the Inquisition and the Jesuits were again called into existence; the very lighting of the streets was discontinued; all political writings were placed under ban, and hundreds of impeachments for heresy were instituted; the sales of Church property were declared void without compensation, and eighteen hundred monasteries, and six hundred nunneries, which Napoleon had abolished, were re-established. In the legations a like policy was pursued. The benevolence of Piedmont's king did not save this state from an equally violent reaction. All that had happened since 1798 was cancelled; the chaotic laws of 1770 were proclaimed, and all judicial decisions made during the sixteen years of French administration were declared inoperative; all offices were commanded to be filled up according to the state calendar of 1798; Napoleon's bridge over the Po narrowly escaped destruction, even the plants placed by the French in the botanical gardens were uprooted; only Napoleon's officers could not at first be dispensed with. Modena experienced much the same treatment as Piedmont. Napoleon's Austrian consort, however, remained true to the French order in Parma, and won the regard of her subjects. And in Naples the reaction was much less extreme than in Rome and Piedmont. Austria, while it approved

and instigated this reactionary violence, and countenanced only by treacherous proclamations the aspirations of its Lombardo-Venetian subjects, buried the feelings of good fellowship, which formerly subsisted between the Hapsburgs and their Italian provinces, in a hateful system of espionage and denationalization.

The Italian Secret Societies.—The apprehensions of Austria were not unfounded. The Italian restoration was, in truth, reared on an unstable soil. From this time the fabric of Italian society was tunnelled in all directions by secret societies, chief of which was that of the Carbonari. It is not unlikely that if the restoration had been conducted in a judicious manner, little more would have been heard of the *sette;* but the aggravating circumstances attending that event, and the disbandment of thousands of officers, at once inflamed their revolutionary temper, and greatly promoted their wide extension. Thanks to retrograde infatuation, conspiracy was to contend with despotism to hinder the attainment of the fair ideal which the empire's discipline had vouchsafed to Italian patriotism.

The Revolution in Spain. Joseph's rule.—While it was Napoleon's function to promote union among the members of Germany and Italy, in Spain his chief unwitting service was to split dull unity into active discord. When he assumed the right to change the sovereign dynasty, he proposed to give the country a new constitution. For this purpose, immediately after the abdication of the Bourbon family, he convoked a body of Spanish notables. This assembly was of its kind most imperfect. Owing to the instantaneous insurrection of the people, elections to it were practicable only in districts already occupied by French troops; and the greater number of its members, therefore, were persons of degree who happened to be within reach. To such spurious

representation of the Spanish people Napoleon tendered his kingdom and constitution. From this fortuitous knot of Spaniards, gathered beyond the reach of the rebellion of their countrymen, and filled with favourable expectations by the well-spoken Joseph and the promised reforms of French rule, he secured a fictitious assent to both proposals. But by the nation itself his scheme was viewed with abhorrence. To its pride a foreign yoke was intolerable; to its bigotry ameliorations at the hands of the irreligious French were maddening scourges. Though eventually the good sense of Joseph Bonaparte sometimes succeeded in moderating repugnance to his rule, yet "if he had been an angel from heaven the result would have been the same." The nation, as a whole, could in no measure be conciliated by wholesome reform or improved administration.

Assembly of the Spanish Cortes, 1810.—The Spaniards, on their side, endeavoured to invest their efforts with some coherence by forming a central Junta out of representatives from the provincial Juntas, which had spontaneously arisen on the outbreak of the insurrection. This irregular body proved so incapable that in 1809 it had to promise to convoke by the following year the Cortes, or national parliament. But when the time came for the election of the Cortes, the advance of the French had driven the central government into Cadiz. Now, of all Spanish towns Cadiz enjoyed, by reason of its commercial intercourse, greatest immunity from bigotry and prejudice. This city shared, in truth, the revolutionary tendencies which existed in Portugal at this time, though temporarily repressed by the efforts of war and the presence of the English. Here now congregated all the candidates for political power; here assembled thousands of fugitives from the mainland laden with questions which the Junta's announcement of

the Cortes had raised. Long before the invasion, as long back, indeed, as the first half of the eighteenth century, when Father Feyjoó soberly introduced Spaniards to the scientific knowledge of Europe, a movement in behalf of intellectual culture had been initiated; and in the late reign a few enlightened men had encountered the enormities of the government by temperate demands. But the perversity of the people and the tyranny of Godoy had crushed their occasional remonstrances. In the central Junta this party had found representation, and its views had been upheld judiciously by Jovellanos, the wisest and most trusted of the Liberal band. But the ascendency which the talents and virtues of this leader might have given him over the assembly had been greatly diminished by physical ailments contracted during a cruel imprisonment in the previous reign. On the other hand, the remembrance of persecution, indignation at the official corruption and incapacity, which in these days of trial everywhere stultified the patriotism of the people, excited among the Liberals feelings which demanded firmer control than the enfeebled Jovellanos could exert.

Character of the Cortes.—Thus it came about that a very revolutionary Cortes was elected principally from the tumultuous throng within Cadiz itself, for many provinces, which were prevented from holding elections by the presence of the French, were represented by members chosen by those of their inhabitants who had fled within the walls of the town. Supported by hopeful anticipations of the people (who had come to conceive an indistinct idea that their misfortunes were due to the degradation of the Cortes in the last three hundred years), uncontrolled by any traditional rules or authoritative instructions, the national parliament undertook with small misgiving the task of saving Spain from

immediate bondage and future misgovernment. In zeal and industry, in unsuspected talent, in *naïve* inexperience, in distrust of Bourbon rule, in attachment to abstract principles, the new Cortes resembled the National Assembly of France without profiting by its example.

Spanish Constitution of 1812.—Like its French prototype, the Cortes exhibited all its many failings when it came to form a constitution for Spain. After much violent controversy, the Liberal party overpowered the Clerical and Conservative opposition; and the Cortes put forth the famous constitution of 1812, which, as Wellington said in a letter to Bathurst, it had constructed very much on the principle that an artist paints a picture, viz. to be looked at. In this fabrication the two prevailing ideas of the Spanish reformers appeared. In order to render the royal power harmless, the monarch was surrounded by checks and limitations; in order to prevent it from corrupting members, ministers were prohibited from sitting in the house, and a general election every two years was ordained, with the provision that old members were disqualified from serving again. To replace the debased monarchy, a phantom crown, a totally inexperienced parliament, and a secluded executive were devised.

Precarious Position of the Cortes.—Assuring as seemed this advantage over the monarchy within the walls of Cadiz, the Cortes was far from possessing a sound basis of authority over the country. It had failed to arrest disaster or assuage woe, and novelty no longer gave it the support of hope. In the town its policy and misfortunes had created many enemies, and the strength of the Conservatives began to appear in the conduct of the government. When the advance of Wellington opened the way for it to make a reality of its paper constitution,

the nation was found to be in no mood to welcome political experiments. Compared with the late troubles, the last reign seemed pleasant enough.

Return of Ferdinand VII., 1813.—Nevertheless, by the folly of their opponents and their own ability, the Liberals again got the upper hand in the new Cortes, which was duly elected in 1813. When the former Prince of Asturias, now Ferdinand VII., was released from his captivity at Valençay, the Cortes prescribed the route of his return to Madrid, and ordered his movements to be controlled till he had taken the oath appointed by the new constitution. But while the Cortes had arranged that Ferdinand should proceed by Reus to Valencia, he turned aside at the petition of Palafox to visit Saragossa. Joyous as his reception had been to this point, the king here experienced for the first time the full force of that enthusiastic loyalty with which the Spanish people were still filled. Those who surrounded him, and wished to restore the old Spain, now conceived the design of annulling the constitution. At Daroca, such a course was openly proposed to him. The irresolute Ferdinand hesitated to take such a step; but his reception at Valencia increased his confidence to such a degree that he ventured to show, by his behaviour to a deputation from the Cortes, unmistakable repugnance to the new order. Hereupon the Conservatives renewed their exertions, and the power of the Liberals rapidly declined. In Madrid, now the seat of the Cortes, the Liberal party was overwhelmed with popular execration. In the rest of the towns the constitution was denounced as the work of traitors and heathens. From the legislative assembly itself the opposition sent to the king a memorial stigmatizing with all the distortion of falsehood the deeds of the Cortes as factious treason. Still Ferdinand hesitated

to take the decisive steps which his advisers recommended. But at last his craven nature gathered courage for a *coup d'état*. On the night of May 10, some thirty of the foremost Liberals in Madrid were thrown into prison, and the Cortes was ordered to be closed. At the same time a manifesto promised a mild, just, and liberal government, but annulled the work of the Cortes, and threatened with death all who attempted to support it. The mob quickly took the hint, and the royal outrage was speedily sanctioned by popular excesses.

Inevitableness of Revolution in Spain.—But though the people conspired with their prince to effect a restoration, it was no more possible for Spain than it was for Germany or Italy to bring back the old order. Of all European countries it could least plead exemption from reform. Having been touched by the leaven of the revolution, neither passionate loyalty nor arrogant prejudice could arrest the progress of social ferment. Spain might defer, but it could not escape, revolution; and its refusal to accept the ordeal during the age of wars entailed a bitter experience of civil strife and foreign intervention in the era of peace.

CHAPTER VI

MOVEMENTS IN RUSSIA, SCANDINAVIA, AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

"Hereditary bondsmen! Know ye not
Who would be free themselves must strike the blow?
By their right arms the conquest must be wrought?
Will Gaul or Muscovite redress ye? No!
True, they may lay your proud despoilers low,
But not for you will freedom's altars flame."

BYRON.

Character of Alexander I.—From more than one point of view the reign of Alexander I. was an important period in the history of Russia. The wars and policy of Napoleon enabled him to play in the affairs of the Western world a far more imposing part than the most sanguine of his predecessors had contemplated; peace left him with a large share of his enemy's dictatorial power, and the Restoration brought his territories into closest connection with Central Europe. These consequences were in a large measure due to external circumstances—to the situation, extent, and climate of the country; to the character of its inhabitants, and the necessities of neighbouring states. But it was through Alexander's personal nature that the civilizing tendencies of this fruitful age penetrated into the land. Naturally susceptible to the calls of humanity, he had been educated according to the commands of his grandmother, Catherine II., by a number of preceptors, of whom the most influential was the liberal Laharpe, a pupil of

Basedow, the pedagogic reformer. Agreeably to the tenor of Rousseau's doctrines, his imaginative disposition had been disciplined by no course of rigorous application. Hence he came to the throne filled with generous desires to ameliorate the condition of his people. Hence his proneness to rest content with imagining an end achieved rather than to exert himself over the necessary means. In his youth, moreover, want of information and experience prevented him from possessing any conception of the difficulties lying between him and his objects. Consequently, his attempted reforms, mainly falling as they did within his less mature years, resulted almost uniformly in failure; and his memory is as equally chequered by the evil he caused as by the good he pursued. Nevertheless, his career imparted into Russian despotism a new element. He introduced into it the spirit of the philanthropical movement, and gave to his country as much of the revolution as the dreary, backward land could receive.

Alexander's Efforts to reduce Serfage.—Gradually ridding himself of the circle which had murdered his father, the young Tsar gathered about him the coterie of congenial youths with whom he had associated as a prince. With them he discussed the reform of his empire according to the dictates of humanitarianism. Though taking little account of the economical aspect of serfage and agrarian restrictions, Alexander earnestly desired the liberation of the people and their lands from all oppressive conditions. In his eyes, such institutions were incompatible with happy and noble manhood, and he felt that their abolition was indispensable for a regeneration of Russian society. One of his first acts, therefore, was to grant the merchant class the power of acquiring land without serfs, and to the peasants on the Crown lands a similar privilege. He also prohibited alienation of the royal domains; for it was held, rightly

or wrongly, that the denizens of Crown lands were peasants and not serfs. A million roubles a year were also set aside for the purchase of land by the Crown, and the conversion of the accompanying serfs into demesne peasants. In February, 1803, the advertisement of single serfs without land for sale in the newspapers was prohibited; and later, such sales themselves were interdicted. The example of the court naturally secured some imitation from nobles, who were either anxious for the welfare of the people or desirous of attracting favour. Thus voluntary contracts of liberation between owners and serfs came to be legalized, though unfortunately with little ulterior result.

Alexander's Early Reforms.—Next to attract Alexander's concern was education. Early in his reign an elaborate scheme of primary and higher instruction was drawn up and set in motion. Much attention was also paid to the development of trade and industry. An imperial ordinance threw open the first guild of the mercantile class to the nobles without prejudice to their privileges. At the same time an attempt was made to improve the efficiency of the central administration by increasing the powers of the senate, and by superseding the colleges of Peter the Great with ministries of Western pattern. And a commission was appointed to bring order into the chaos of laws, which principally consisted of seventy thousand ukazes of equal authority issued by the Tsars since the time of Alexey Michailowitsch.

Alexander's Disappointments.—But at the end of his first reforming period, which extended to the Peace of Tilsit, Alexander found that his intention to reconstitute Russian society was far from being realized. As he learned more exactly the state of the nation, he grew more desponding of success. His aspiration to be

emperor of a free people was foiled by dogged resistance from the nobles. Those innovations which he ventured to make were constantly thwarted by evasion and incapable administration. For example, an auction mart for serfs continued to exist close to the imperial palace. Notwithstanding active co-operation on the part of some of the clergy and nobility, the educational project was wrecked by want of qualified teachers and the impenetrable stupidity of the popular mind. The endeavour to improve the administration miscarried on account of imperfect demarcation of its different departments, want of able servants, and the Tsar's own autocratic foibles. Codification of the law was found to be so far beyond the capacity of Russian jurists that the charge of the work was given to a Livonian named Rosenkampff, who was equally ignorant of the Russian language and Russian law. Hence mistrust soon caused Alexander to withhold confidence from the incapable counsellors of his youth. The corruption and shamelessness of his officials led him to doubt the possibility of honest service. In bitter reality he compassed the dismal circle in which great questions move in Russia. In bitter truth he discovered that, for a great political change, all classes of the people were neither intellectually, morally, nor politically prepared, and that such preparation can never be brought about without some great administrative revolution.

Speranski's Administrative Reform.—Thus, when Alexander allied himself with Napoleon, he was quite ready to dismiss his advisers, who were in favour of English models and an English alliance, and to seek for new help which should be at once more practical and more congruous with his changed foreign policy. Such help he found in Speranski—the Russian Turgot, as Stern calls him—a man of great energy and mental

power, who had acquired extensive practical experience while raising himself from a very humble station. To this man Alexander transferred his entire confidence. With him alone he debated the reform of his empire, and from him alone he sought means for carrying it out. Speranski, who was not unacquainted with the doctrines of Adam Smith, and was helped by two others holding similar views, was convinced that only straightforward economy and taxation could redeem the calamitously depreciated paper currency, and that free trade alone could improve the resources of the people. Though no trained financier, Speranski might have succeeded by force of his natural abilities in placing the Russian exchequer on a firm basis if he had continued in power for a few years. But it is very doubtful whether his want of juristic training would ever have allowed him to give a thoroughly serviceable code of laws to the Russian people. Yet he rigorously applied himself to this task. Rosenkampff's commission was broken up into sections, and Speranski set to work to evolve from the results of their labours a law-book founded on general principles. Like every clever layman of liberal tendencies in those days, he was full of admiration for the Code Napoléon, and he naturally sought advice by corresponding with French lawyers. Consequently, when the first part of his work was laid before the government, it was found to be very remotely related to Russian authoritative sources, and to possess a strong resemblance to the French code. That Russia was not sufficiently advanced for such a scheme of legislation can hardly be doubted; yet even an unsuitable code seemed preferable to the chaotic jurisprudence which opened the way to boundless bribery of judges, and actually allowed an impudent pleader to stultify a supreme court by citing imaginary ukazes.

But these considerations obtained little weight at the time. It sufficed to accuse the author of an intention to palm off on the Russian people a bad translation of Napoleon's law-book.

Fall of Speranski, March, 1812.—From the first the alliance with France had been disliked by the country. The wars against the French in behalf of strangers had been unpopular, but more so was their inglorious termination. This dissatisfaction increased as the true nature of the connection with Napoleon became more apparent. Moreover, the taste for French culture, imparted to the upper classes in Catherine's reign, had given place to solicitude for the integrity of the Russian national character. The Revolution had sent thousands of French exiles to Russia to seek a livelihood by teaching their language and accomplishments. At first welcomed as an opportune reinforcement to the staff of instructors, they soon incurred odium by their tendency to suppress the sense of nationality and independence in the Russian youth. The earlier satirical literature had been succeeded by imitations of the French sentimental writers in excellent harmony with the tone of Alexander's early government; but now both were superseded by a patriotic reaction, which grew more violent as the breach between the Tsar and Napoleon widened. The circumstances of Speranski's rise to power had erroneously marked him as an adherent of France, and had excited against him the animosity of the patriotic party. His tribute to the French code, published at a time when war with France was imminent, strengthened the attacks of his enemies. Already his determination to reform radically the country, his utterances concerning an impending emancipation of the serfs, his indifference to high society, had made him an object of detestation to the aristocracy

and old Russian party. Now patriotism leagued with conservatism and jealousy to discredit him in the eyes of the Tsar. For a short time Alexander's impressionable nature withstood these attacks, but gradually he lost faith in the man who had been his right hand. On the occasion of a comparatively unimportant indiscretion he yielded to the cries of treason, and hardly forbore from depriving his minister of life as well as office. In March, 1812, Speranski was suddenly banished from St. Petersburg, and his enemies celebrated what they called the first victory over the French.

Commencement of Alexander's Second Period.—After the War of Liberation Alexander returned home, filled with new views and prepossessions. To the ambition which had made him the abettor and conqueror of Napoleon, he had added indulgence in religious mysticism. During his sojourn in Western Europe he came under the influence of Christian charlatans and dreamers. When he reached home he was more a champion of the Holy Alliance than a servant to the cause of humanity.

Settlement of Scandinavia. Sweden under Bernadotte.—Like his predecessors, who had contributed to the civilization of Russia, Alexander considerably extended the limits of the empire, and he thus became instrumental in effecting the settlement of Scandinavia, which endured till yesterday. He seized Finland in 1808, and by the Peace of Friderikshamm, Sweden ceded its territory up to the river Tornea, together with the islands of Åland. The sturdy resistance of the Finns caused Alexander to confirm the liberal constitution which Gustavus III. had given them. Sweden's indemnity for this loss was more directly due to the vicissitudes of the revolutionary wars. Since Carl XIII., who was proclaimed king after the dethronement of

Gustavus IV., had no children, and the Danish prince who was elected to be his successor died suddenly under suspicious circumstances, the Swedes made Bernadotte, Prince of Ponte Corvo, heir to the throne. This marshal of Napoleon was a Gascon by birth, who had already abandoned the life of a lawyer for a military career, when the Revolution opened to his soldierly and administrative abilities a rapid advance to offices of distinction. During his administration of Hanover and the Hanse towns, he had gained much popularity; and by his treatment of the Swedish army on its retreat out of Lauenburg in the war with Prussia, he had won the regard of many Swedish officers. His appointment to be Sweden's future king was so far from being a work of Napoleon that, though he obtained a formally cordial permission to accept it, both parties felt the change to involve a total reversal of their relationship. Bernadotte renounced his French citizenship and embraced the Lutheran creed; he was adopted by Carl XIII. as a son, while he relieved the infirm king of the arduous business of government, and did all in his power to shield his new country from the tyranny of his former master. Napoleon, on the other hand, commenced a relentless persecution of Sweden from the time of his instalment in power. Still, Bernadotte was a typical product of the Revolution, and Sweden obtained an appropriate result from his services. From its own domestic revolution it had secured constitutional changes, which formed a wholesome modification of the monarchical innovations of Gustavus III. From its French ruler it received the much coveted possession of Norway. Bernadotte demanded this as the price of his assistance to Russia against France, notwithstanding the fact that peace with Denmark had been concluded long ago at Jönköping. The arbitrary nature of the

bargain did not prevent it from being ratified at Vienna.

Denmark loses Norway, 1814.—The sole offence which could be pleaded to justify this unprincipled dismemberment was Denmark's alliance with Napoleon. The fault, or rather misfortune, was common to most European countries at that time, and Denmark deserved retribution less than any other continental state. Under its regent, who became Frederick VI. in 1808, and his minister Bernstorff, it had striven to preserve a dignified neutrality throughout the revolutionary wars, and had made no small advance in civilization. Serfage had been abolished; the slave trade had been prohibited earlier than in any other state; education had been actively encouraged, and trade promoted. But the country had been twice attacked by England, once for expostulating against British maritime policy, once on suspicion that its fleet would fall a prey to Napoleon. It had thus finally been compelled to range itself on the side of France. It had also been obliged to maintain this alliance to the last in order to support its claim on Norway. But in the campaign of 1813, Bernadotte, who was anxious to do the French as little damage as possible, in view of the contingency of his being called upon to be Napoleon's successor, brought the Danes to a separate peace, and compelled them by the treaty of Kiel to cede Norway to Sweden in exchange for Swedish Pomerania and the Isle of Rügen.* In the following November Denmark purchased peace with England by

* This period is notable for another successful effort of the Swedes to disengage their peninsula from the influence of the Danes. By the completion of the Tröllhœta canal, which opened up navigation between Gothenburg and Lake Wener, a system of internal navigation between the Baltic and the Kattegat was made possible, and the Swedes were rendered independent of Denmark's command of the Sound and other natural channels out of the Baltic.

the cession of Heligoland. Further, Prussia completed its misfortunes by taking Swedish Pomerania and Rügen at the arbitrary valuation of Lauenburg and two million thalers, on the ground that it had fomented an insurrection in Norway against Swedish rule. The Norwegians, more akin in language and habits to the Danes, cherished a keen dislike of their neighbours over the mountains. When they heard of their transference to Sweden they declared themselves independent, formed an almost republican constitution, and elected a Danish prince to be their king. But Bernadotte entered their country before any adequate defence could be prepared, and they were compelled to bow to the new arrangement. Nevertheless, they succeeded in preserving their independent government, constitution, and laws. Their connection with Sweden, indeed, resulted in little more than allegiance to a common sovereign. But in our own time we have seen that even this bond has proved too irksome, and again a Danish prince has been chosen to be Norway's king.

Russian-Turkish War, 1806–12. Peace of Bucharest, May, 1812.—Towards Turkey Alexander pursued the traditional policy of his house with as much vigour as Western affairs would permit. But no war of conquest broke out till 1806, for Sultan Selim was ready to make many concessions rather than to interrupt his plans for internal reform by disturbing the peace of Jassy. This war dragged on till, after a few successes and many reverses, the Porte obtained in 1812 peace at the price of Bessarabia and part of Moldavia. Impending war with France induced Russia to be content with the boundary of the Pruth, and the road to Constantinople was left still too long and difficult for the comfort of Muscovite statesmen.

Decay of the Ottoman Empire.—This respite

belied the expectations which onlookers in the eighteenth century had formed of the fate of the Ottoman empire. Since the Peace of Carlowitz, in 1699, the Turks had been obliged to abandon that demeanour of scornful superiority which ignorance, religious arrogance, and military success had caused them to assume towards the Giaours. From that time the imperial system, which the sultans had founded on the word of the Koran, on contempt for infidels, and on prowess in war, was in full decline. How rapid was the subsequent decay of the Ottoman power in Europe, the Peace of Kainardji showed in 1774, when the Turks made to Russia concessions directly subversive of the integrity of their empire. At that time the final triumph of the cross over the crescent was regarded as merely a question of convenience to Austria and Russia—a question which Joseph and Catherine together came very near settling. Nor, when the accession of the wary Leopold to Joseph's troubled throne rid Turkey of one of its traditional enemies, was the ability of Russia alone to restore Christian worship in St. Sophia doubted by those who were cognisant of the state of Ottoman resources. The will, too, to undertake the enterprise single-handed was not wanting to Catherine; and it is notorious that the pacification of Jassy was only an armistice to enable the Empress to gather the ripe rewards of perfidy nearer home. But the death of Catherine saved the Porte from a renewal of her attack, and Turkey's next cession was to Alexander by the Peace of Bucharest.

Degeneracy of the Janissaries.—Though the impotence of the Turkish armies appeared to be the chief cause of the threatened collapse of the Ottoman empire, it was in itself only one consequence of a more general and fatal weakness. Founded upon conquest and organized after feudal fashion, the heritage of the

sultans retained its pristine power only so long as its rulers were extraordinarily able and vigorous men. But no really great potentate was produced by the House of Othman after Suleiman the Magnificent. From that time, in spite of occasional wise ministers and energetic sultans, the government of the Porte degenerated till it became a *régime* of feebleness, corruption, and imbecility, such as only an oriental despotism can keep in existence. At the end of the eighteenth century it had reached the lowest depths of abasement. The central administration was ignorant and vicious beyond belief; and the provincial governors, though nominally servants of the sultan, were in most cases rulers who rendered slight allegiance to their lord, and often withstood his mandates to the extremity of civil war. Long ago the janissaries, once the tribute and terror of Christendom, had become a privileged order of insolent Turkish militia, whose incapacity in the field was only equalled by pertinacity in preying upon the resources of the state and the earnings of the peasant. Fear of their insurrection fettered every sultan, for never yet had the government been able to oppose their determined demands. Their intolerance of every step towards reform was supported by the fanatical bigotry of the Moslem mob. It effectually prevented the Ottoman despots from discharging those functions of order and civilization which are the part of monarchs when feudal discipline has ceased to render tolerable the institutions of mediæval barbarism.

Accession of Selim III., 1789.—The nature of these evils and the history of other nations suggested a remedy to be immediately applied if the patrimony of the House of Othman was to be preserved from hostile dismemberment or spontaneous disintegration. In most European states there had recently been shown what

the advent of strong and enlightened monarchs could effect for national disorders, and in nearly every case it had been proved that a disciplined standing army was the indispensable instrument which such monarchs needed. Now, although the position of Turkish sovereigns was very weak, and not the rudiments of an efficient military force existed, it was conceivable that a sultan of strong character might find an opportunity to fortify himself against the rabble of Stamboul, and train an army capable of subduing rebellious pashas and discontented janissaries. It was, therefore, a coincidence of no little moment that, when Turkey was granted an intermission of foreign attack, a prince of no common calibre was reigning at Constantinople. Selim III. mounted the Turkish throne with a determination to root out abuse and introduce Western reforms; but he made all his efforts subsidiary to the creation of an efficient standing army. He found the Ottoman forces without uniformity of weapons or movements, with no condition of success except the desperate valour of the individual Turk. Perceiving the great superiority conferred by discipline and drill, he resolved to form a military force after the European pattern. A small body of disciplined soldiers was actually serviceable before Bonaparte invaded Egypt. This step was achieved by means of French help; and after the renewal of peace the hollow friendship of Napoleon continued to place at his disposal facilities for teaching his subjects to fight in Western fashion.

Fall of Selim III. Accession of Mahmoud II., 1808.—But Selim's measures against the insurgent janissaries of Servia had provoked much discontent among the order and among his Mohammedan subjects. When he proceeded to ordain that picked men from the irregular troops should be trained into regular

soldiers, the janissaries murdered his agents and attacked the new force. Finally, those of Constantinople, in league with the Mufti, Ulema, and Kaimakan, deposed him from his throne, and placed thereon Mustapha, the eldest son of Abdul Hamid. Bairactar, the loyal pasha of Rustchuk, attempted to restore Selim, but before he was able to force an entrance into the seraglio, the unfortunate ex-sultan had died by order of Mustapha. Mahmoud, Mustapha's brother and sole remaining Ottoman prince, after narrowly escaping a similar fate, was immediately raised to the throne by Bairactar, who assumed the office of grand vizier. But this government also fell in the endeavour to carry through Selim's abortive project, and the youthful Mahmoud was forced to acquiesce in the demand for a return to the old institutions. Without experience, powerless, and at war with Russia, the new sultan was long compelled to observe his agreement with the impracticable mob. The janissaries little suspected that in place of the mild Selim they had made sultan one whose grim renown was to be that of destroyer of their tribe. The world, too, failed to understand that the worst days of the Ottoman empire were drawing to a close. Yet in Selim's ill-fated efforts, in the inchoate plans which he communicated to his nephew when sharing his imprisonment, were the germs of a revival of the Ottoman despotism. Through them the revolution, too distant to purge Europe of Mussulman domination, succeeded in imparting such small impulse to improvement as was sufficient to prolong the life of the Ottoman empire. To them it is primarily due that the Turk still vexes South-Eastern Europe, and that a time has come when the West shudders at the prospect of his withdrawal.

New Phase of Revolt against Turkish Rule.—

But while these events foreshadowed a continuance of Turkish rule in Europe, others were tending to curtail its extent. The revolts of the Porte's Christian subjects, which hitherto had aimed only at helping foreign invaders, now became struggles of the subject nations to help themselves. During this period a struggle for independence was actually carried on with no little success by the Servian people, and silent preparations for a greater revolt were being undertaken by the Greeks.

Position of the Greeks in the Empire.—Among the Christian subjects of the Porte, the Greeks occupied a unique position. In numbers inferior only to the Wallachian and Sclavonian races, they possessed an ecclesiastical, official, and commercial status to which other Rayah populations could lay no claim. Over orthodox nations they exercised, of course, religious ascendency. And, together with spiritual functions, the Greek Church held in trust for the Turkish government extensive official authority.

In many districts the Greek laity took the place of a middle class. In some, notably in Wallachia and Moldavia, they were as supreme as the Turks were in Greece. In Constantinople they filled offices of responsibility in the government, and formed the wealthy quarter of the Phanar. But, though elevated in consideration of their own abilities, they did nothing to civilize the Ottoman government. Useful as they were to their masters, they brought no benefit to the people committed to their charge. As tax-gatherers and deputy-governors of the Turk, they were hated no less for falseness and rapacity than for the odious nature of their office. Nor did their advancement contribute much to the weal of their obscurer brethren. Instances did occur when an influential Greek used his power to

ameliorate the condition of a portion of his race, or to help a fellow in misfortune; but the fame of the Phanariots was bad, even among their own countrymen. Hence the advancement of individual Greeks did nothing to promote the growth of national feeling and patriotism; while disparity of condition, and the intense egoism and unscrupulousness of the Greek character conspired to perpetuate disunion.

Intellectual awakening of the Greeks.—Between the Greek mind and the enlightenment of the eighteenth century there existed a natural affinity. Possessed with a pedantic faith in the efficacy of learning, quick of comprehension yet shallow, encyclopædic but incapable of severe application, the Greeks readily participated in the intellectual movement which then passed over Europe. But from this source they could derive only unrest and a visionary philanthropy. Something more was required to invigorate and unify a people whose repute it was to be as jealous, false, and avaricious among themselves as they were servile towards the strong and piratical towards the defenceless. Some deeper and more national agency was necessary to rally round a common standard the ill-used peasantry and the privileged communes, the thriving traders and the rapacious satraps and officials, the patriotic clergy and the traitorous episcopacy. Now it was the fortune of the Greeks to possess a heritage capable of uniting all who spoke their tongue, and suggestive to all their race of the deeds which the heroes of antiquity achieved against the barbarians. In their most degraded days they had been the least unlettered of the nations, and never had they entirely lost sight of their reputed origin. As has recently been well said, they combine "two usually irreconcilable qualities—great aptitude for business and great love of book-learning."

Now, when the fashionable culture of Europe was pervaded with admiration for classical times, they eagerly studied the language and authors of ancient Hellas. That they excelled not in classical erudition, according to the standard of more cultivated nations, mattered no more to the efficacy of this, their centralizing medium, than did the want of permanent worth in the productions of the *Sturm und Drang* period affect the potency of that movement over the German people. The study alone touched the most patriotic chords of the nation, and united for once all sections in pursuit of a common object. Tangible proofs of result were afforded by the establishment of numerous Hellenic schools. Palpable indication of a deeper influence was given by the construction of a new modern language, intelligible in every province, neither confined to the learned, nor unequal to the wants of literary expression. Koräes, a native of Chios, was the guardian of this reform. He was the arbitrator between those who desired to retain unaltered the people's dialect and those who advocated a return to the classical language. But better known is Rhigas, the poet of the revolutionary aspirations which were kindled by the sight of the French Republic. His songs gained rapid and extensive currency, and he was one of the first to plot the liberation of Greece. He was, moreover, the first martyr for the national cause, being betrayed, in 1798, by the Austrian police to the Pasha of Belgrade. He died, it is said, with the prophecy on his lips that the nation must some day reap the fruits of the seed he had sown. From him dated the insurrectionary, as distinguished from the nationalizing, influence of the literary revival.

The Philomuse Society, 1812. Disregard of the Powers at Vienna,—It was inevitable that the energy

of intellectual progress should be diverted by mortifying reality into the path of revolutionary agitation. The grievous contrast between the ideal and the existent made it impossible for those who laboured for the one to remain patiently harassed by the other. Even the judicious and temperate Koräes was not averse to the methods of force if a favourable opportunity for their employment presented itself. The fiery Rhigas, deluded both as regards the readiness of the Greeks for rebellion and the succour which Bonaparte's oriental campaign might bring to the sultan's subjects, threw himself into the work of sedition with incautious ardour. A premature victim to the spirit of reaction, he nevertheless bequeathed to his countrymen the plan of secret combination which, though frustrated in the first instance by his death, furnished a model for later and more successful organizations. In 1812 and 1814 were established the two societies which have made memorable the abortive association of Rhigas. The first was the Philomuse Society, which was established at Athens for the ostensible purpose of encouraging literature and education, and, with special reference to Lord Elgin's late raid, of preserving the relics of ancient art; the second was the Philiké Hetairia, a secret society for the purpose of creating a rebellion against Turkey. But the conspirators for culture were no more able to avoid political action than were the conspirators for revolution. In their quiet way they probably did no less to produce the sanguinary outbreak which belongs to the history of a later period. They proceeded to the high court of nations at Vienna, and there stated the demand of Greece for freedom. They enlisted in their cause much sympathy, and had the satisfaction of seeing the inheritors of the present pay homage to their glorious namesakes of antiquity. They received into their ranks

the Tsar and other princes, and bestowed upon them and many ministers the ring of their order. Yet they gained nothing; and they left Vienna in the same capacity as the hired cooks and artists, as discarded amusers of the wealthy and noble.

The Philiké Hetairia, 1814.—Then the Greeks knew that they had nothing to expect from the powers in peace, and that they must win their independence by something more cogent than appeals to justice and sentiment. But the Philomuse society was not fit for a turbulent and belligerent work. It could only educate; it could not fight. Some different association was required to carry the matter to another stage. This was supplied by the Philiké Hetairia, which was established in Odessa by illiterate merchants filled with chagrin by the behaviour of the Congress. It existed at a time when secret societies were thought to be rife in Europe, and thus a fictitious importance has been reflected on it. But, in truth, it possessed no member nor characteristic to lift it above similar combinations of a vulgar order; and it abounded in the corruption and childishness natural to such organizations. Nevertheless, it represented the dominant tendency of the nation at the time; it was in the hands of men of action, if not of discretion; and, as it hailed from the land of the Tsar, it never scrupled to refer to the Russian autocrat as its abettor. Its deeds and follies belong to the tale of the Greek revolution itself, but its existence was as characteristic of Greek disgust at the policy of reaction as the *sette* were of Italy's disappointment.

Influence of Ali Pasha.—In the Ottoman empire there were seldom long wanting favourable opportunities for insurrection. In behalf of Servia, rebel pashas and janissaries paralyzed the sultan's power; to Greece a mutinous pasha and the disordered state of the

provincial militia afforded facilities for revolt. The pasha was Ali, the Albanian ruler of Janina, who arrived at the summit of his power during this period. In those days all the ferocity and disquietude of the Middle Ages survived in Albania, and Ali recommended himself to the Porte by his success in extirpating the lawless chieftains who disputed his supremacy. When leading his contingent against Pasvanoglu, the mighty pasha of Widdin, he discovered the rottenness of the Ottoman power, and he came to the conclusion that, by unsparing bloodshed and unfaltering guile, he could found a principality of his own before he died. A principality he did, indeed, win for himself, and in it he wielded that tyranny which suffers no iniquity but its own. He was—

> "Albania's chief, whose dread command
> Is lawless law; for with a bloody hand
> He sways a nation, turbulent and bold."

But his schemes miscarried when his authority seemed most firmly established. He hoped to form a Greek and Albanian kingdom, and renounce all allegiance to the Porte. Ignorant of the formidable character of Sultan Mahmoud, he thought that it would be an easy task to sever all connection with Constantinople; misapprehending the nature of the movement in Greece, he thought that the Christians would willingly make common cause with him against the Turks. But the grand signior proved too strong for him; and the Greeks were thinking of other refuge from Turkish tyranny than Ali's despotism and sham constitutions. Hence the result of his life's villainy was to smooth the way for a Greek insurrection, and of his death-struggle to create a diversion of the Ottoman forces which aided the outbreak. His fall forms the counterpart to the

operations of the Philiké Hetairia as the immediate occasion of the Greek revolution.

Servia harassed by the Janissaries.—Though a greater sufferer from Turkish cruelty, Servia was happier than Greece in preserving its courage and sense of nationality. The brave Serbs had never lost all remembrance of their empire and the disaster of Kossova. When restoring the country to the Porte, by the Peace of Sistova, Austria had stipulated for a complete amnesty to all the inhabitants who had taken part in the war against the sultan. Conformably with this agreement, they received a pasha who seems to have striven to rule the province with mildness and equity; and his successor won by his solicitude for the welfare of the pashalik the title of the "Servian Mother." But judicious appointments from Constantinople were powerless to secure the Serbs from oppression. The janissaries of Belgrade were the most unruly of their order, and they not only preyed upon the Rayahs, but openly contested with the spahis for possession of the country. At last the complaints of the Serbs and spahis compelled the sultan to remonstrate with the freebooting janissaries, by obscurely threatening them with punishment at the hands of soldiers of a different nation and creed. Hereupon the janissaries, conjecturing that a rising of the Rayahs was referred to, hastened to massacre all who were likely to prove dangerous to their power. At first overwhelmed with dismay, the Serbs soon organized a valiant resistance, and, with the open connivance of the sultan, they victoriously crushed the dominion of their oppressors.

Revolt of the Serbs.—The Serbs then began to consider some better means of providing for their future safety than a return to the old state of dependency on the Ottoman Porte. They hesitated to obey the sultan's

commands to resume their usual occupations. While they did not contemplate repudiating his suzerainty, they cast about for some more efficient protection. Advances were made to Austria, but failed to receive cordial response. Application was then made to Russia, who had ever manifested great tenacity in retaining concessions from the Porte, and had vigilantly exercised a protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia. In the protracted conflict which followed, the Serbs became the allies of the Russians. Unfortunately, their leaders were induced to place implicit confidence in the Tsar. In the Peace of Bucharest they insisted on coming to terms through Russia rather than directly with the Porte. Yet throughout the war the people continued to be guided by the idea that they "should obtain every internal liberty possible without breaking the external bonds with Constantinople;" and it was a fatal consequence of the political incapacity of their chiefs that they sought to compass this end by means of the good offices of the Porte's worst foe. Hence, in the treaty of Bucharest, the stipulations in behalf of Servia's internal autonomy took the form of concessions unsupported by any guarantee. The circumstances under which the treaty was made left the Porte at liberty to construe these concessions as it chose. It commenced by robbing them of all validity by refusing to leave the Serbs their arms, or to assure them against the return of the spahis.

Defective Organization of the Serbs.—On the Serbs themselves, then, depended what benefit they should reap from their hardships and sacrifices. These, again, brave as ever, and more confident than at first, depended on their organization for what effective action they could oppose against the armies of the sultan. Now, the original primitive village government of the

Serbs had been prevented from adapting itself to the requirements of national administration, not only by the violent nature of the revolution, but also by the ambitions which a military career had generated in the more influential men. The chiefs, to whom victory was due, were unwilling to surrender their authority when the Turks were not present, and the imminence of a return of the enemy caused their pretensions to be tolerated. Yet the rule of such men could not but be rude, grasping, and disunited. Some approach was certainly made to a national government from the first; but virtually the central power was vested in the chief leader on the battlefield. This was Kara George,* a Servian peasant, who had passed some time in the Austrian service, and was prospering by the trade of a pig-dealer when the war broke out. As a warrior he deserved the confidence of his countrymen, but as a diplomatist he was childishly incapable of coping with the disunion of his colleagues and the intrigues of the accredited Russian agents.

Defeat of the Serbs.—The Turks, on the other hand, advanced to coerce the Serbs with the armies which had served against Russia; and Belgrade was soon left to the mercy of the enemy. Then was manifested once again how unfavourable to the production of heroes is a long spell of Turkish dominion. The senate, the military chiefs, even the rugged Kara George himself, fled beyond the frontier into Austria. The people, paralyzed by these defections, awaited in trembling the cruelties of Turkish vengeance. One leader alone refused to desert his country in the hour of need. Milosh Obrenovics remained behind to mediate between

* Or Black George, on account of his gloomy disposition. Kara is the Turkish word, and Czerni the Servian, for "black," but the former is most frequently used in history.

the despairing Serbs and their conquerors. By craft and corruption he redeemed his countrymen from some of their miseries, though he secretly prepared for a new insurrection. While he pacified the nation, he ascertained that no help was to be looked for from the powers at Vienna; while he pandered to Turkish avarice, he sought an opportune moment for renewed rebellion. Resistance against Turkish misusage was about to pass into tentative but steadfast efforts to secure entire freedom from Ottoman occupation.

CHAPTER VII

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

"To produce a state of things in which the physical advantages of civilized life can exist in a high degree, the stimulus of increasing comforts and constantly elevated desires must have been felt by millions; since it is not in the power of a few individuals to create that wide demand for useful and ingenious applications, which alone can lead to great and rapid improvements, unless backed by that arising from the speedy diffusion of the same advantages among the mass of mankind."—SIR JOHN HERSCHEL.

"There would be nothing capricious or perverse in treating the expansion of England over the seas as strictly secondary to the expansion of England within her own shores, and to all the causes of it in the material resources and the energy and the ingenuity of her sons at home. Supposing that a historian were to choose to fix on the mechanical and industrial development of England as the true point of view, we are not sure that as good a case might not be made out for the inventions of Arkwright, Hargreaves, and Crompton as for the acquisition of the colonies; for Brindley and Watt as for Clive and Hastings."—JOHN MORLEY.

Area of the English Industrial Revolution.—Social revolutions may be roughly classed as political and economical. The ground-plan of modern continental Europe was especially the work of political agencies, notwithstanding the vast economical changes involved; the ground-work of modern England was primarily the result of industrial progress, notwithstanding the total redistribution of political power ultimately implied. But while the great European revolution was confined within its own area, the industrial revolution of England

has been more cosmopolitan than any other event in recorded history. The one was chiefly consequent on decay, and wholly directed by an imaginary return to primitive right. The other was produced by a society, not without a tolerable share of natural equity, pressing forward to utilize the powers which human ingenuity and organization had gained over physical conditions. Hence, while the first extended only where certain social evils prevailed, the second has become the birthright of every community which has reached a certain stage of progress.* Hence, too, instead of being conducted by warriors and legislators, whose services are limited to their country and age, the English industrial revolution was the work of massive popular tendencies which are dominant wherever mankind is possessed of vigour and freedom.

Advance of Agriculture.—Among industries, agriculture is the one which supports all others; and in the days of which we treat, men were still able to regard the cultivation of England's soil as the foundation of English industry. It was therefore an event of the first importance that, during the eighteenth century, a new system of husbandry, stock-breeding, and agrarian economy came into operation which bade fair to keep pace with the needs of a rapidly increasing population. The traditional system had been distinctly Virgilian; and Virgil had written in the first Georgic—

"At si non fuerit Tellus fœcunda, sub ipsum
Arcturum tenui sat erit suspendere sulco."

Now, said Jethro Tull, the first and greatest of the theoretical innovators, "None of the improvements made on any sort of arable land by foreign grasses or

* "La révolution industrielle en Angleterre a été la préface de la révolution industrielle dans le monde entier."—MANTOUX.

turnips could have been introduced into Britain without renouncing the *sat erit* doctrine of Virgil; for they will not succeed on any sort of land without pulverization by tillage; and they are most generally made on light land, and therefore may be properly called anti-Virgilian." At that time agricultural improvements were very slowly diffused. When Arthur Young made his tours in 1768 and 1770, he found in the more backward districts abundant survivals from the period of rude and slovenly practice. To add an extreme instance to his testimony, it is worth recalling that a select committee on agriculture, in 1833, elicited the fact that so lately as 1817 the natives of Cardiganshire had to be taught how to grow green crops before they could enjoy any fresh mutton or beef in winter. But thirty years after his tours, Young was able to write of the country in general, "The great flight has been taken in the last forty years," and "curious it is to me now to travel and see the marvellous change." From the wars agriculturists received fresh stimulus to exertion, and capital was laid out more freely than ever on the land. By 1813 the agricultural produce of the United Kingdom had increased by one-fourth within the preceding ten years;* rents had risen considerably over one hundred per cent., after all possible influence of war prices was discounted, and the stiff lands, which formerly commanded the best price, had fallen in value below the lighter soils when managed under the new tillage.

* "In 1710 the cattle and sheep sold at Smithfield Market weighed, at an average, as follows:—Beeves, 370 lbs.; calves, 50 lbs.; sheep, 28 lbs.; and lambs, 18 lbs. Now it may be stated, beeves, 800 lbs.; calves, 148 lbs.; sheep, 80 lbs.; and lambs, 50 lbs."—*Report from the Select Committee on the Cultivation of Waste Lands*, 1795, *Appendix* (*B*). Sir John Sinclair, whose words these are, attributes much of this improvement to the improved pasturage afforded by enclosed land. But scientific breeding also greatly assisted, though only by help of better feeding conditions.

Transformation of the Textile Industries.—Meanwhile steam and machinery transformed the conditions and results of manufactures. As the scale of production was raised by improved methods and appliances, the industries received new organization. Many were superseded by new discoveries; others were surpassed by those more adapted to derive advantage from mechanical improvements. The economy of the textile trade was entirely changed. Formerly wool was the staple product, and woollen goods the most important commodity of England, by reason of the quality of its fleeces and the expertness of its manufacturers. But as mutton came into greater demand, though the weight of the fleece increased with the carcase, the supply of long or combing wool greatly deteriorated. This circumstance was aggravated in 1802 and 1813 by duties imposed on the importation of foreign wool; but before the century began it had been clear, even to those who still regarded the woollen industry as a more important national concern than any other textile manufacture, that it was suffering from languor induced by the difficulty of applying machinery. The fabric which was gaining advantage over it on this account was cotton.* Though mentioned in the records of England some centuries earlier, true cottons were not manufactured till late in the eighteenth century, for the simple reason that English workmen were unable to spin pure cotton threads of sufficient tenacity for warp,

* "The cotton manufacture had been a flourishing industry at Antwerp—a port where the necessary materials were easily procurable from Egypt. Its first beginnings in England are very obscure, but it had begun to attract attention as an important trade in the rising town of Manchester in the earlier part of the seventeenth century. The beginnings of the manufacture in Lancashire appear to follow very closely on its decline at Antwerp; and there is at least a considerable probability in ascribing the development of this highly skilled art to the immigration of refugees."—Miss Lilian Tomn, *apud* Cunningham.

and could only use cotton for weft. The delicate fingers of the Hindus could construct webs of exquisite fineness, which were the wonder and despair of Europeans, and all genuine cotton cloths in England were imported from India. But a series of inventions produced looms and spinning jennies capable of making cotton fabrics which competed successfully with Indian goods, even in the Indian market itself. Further, at the beginning of the nineteenth century an abundant supply of the raw material from America was ensured, partly by the invention of Whitney's gin, for separating the fibre from the seeds of the plant, and partly by the purchase of Louisiana by the United States from Napoleon. Hence, though the woollen manufacture advanced, cotton obtained a superiority over the ancient staple which quite changed the relationship between English raw produce and English manufactured fabrics.

General Advance of Manufactures.—Striking as is this creation of a new industry, it was but a conspicuous example of what was taking place in all manufactures. Throughout the textile trades machinery evoked new growths and new forms of old processes. The Staffordshire potteries were established on an entirely new basis by Wedgwood's production of a new kind of cream-coloured earthenware. The discovery of methods for using coal in smelting and puddling iron, and the consequent removal of the furnaces from the vanishing forests to the coal country, had already founded the English iron trade, when the steam-engine gave it additional impetus. The output of coal was proportionately increased by the growing demands of furnaces and steam-engines, and by the facilities afforded by improved methods of ventilation, steam-pumps, and the use of more economical means of

supporting the roofs of mines. As cause and consequence of this industrial advance was the development of means of transport. London was furnished with adequate docks, and on the coast harbours were constructed and improved. Much was done to repair and extend the highways, though much was left for another generation to do. But in the construction of canals a new era began. Sudden changes of level in the country to be traversed, which had been the main obstacles to earlier engineers, were overcome by Brindley, when making a canal from the Duke of Bridgewater's collieries at Worsley to Manchester, by carrying an aqueduct over the Irwell. The same enterprising nobleman and sagacious engineer also joined Manchester and Liverpool by a water road, in spite of still greater difficulties. The pecuniary return to the proprietor from these ventures was very great, and skill and capital were attracted to the work till the greater part of our system of inland navigation was constructed by 1825. Thus, too, a class of navvies, more efficient for heavy work than any other labourers in the world, was trained in time to give England a commanding advantage in the making of railways.

Expansion of Trade.—To these prime causes of the industrial revolution must be added assistant circumstances, which greatly promoted its rapid course. The fact that the most flourishing industries were new, or newly organized, favoured their development by protecting them from the restrictive customs and laws which still hampered the older trades and handicrafts. For the same reason the new agriculture made most rapid progress in districts like Lincoln heath, barren under the old methods, and in Northumberland, where moss-troopers and border frays had been the cause of prolonged desolation. 'The wars, which absorbed all

the energies and exaggerated all the wants of Europe, long supplied to production the incitement of a greedy market. When the System embarrassed continental trade, the ships of Britain sought and found in more distant lands demand for what goods the smugglers left on the hands of the manufacturers. Our mercantile marine grew at a greatly accelerated rate during the eighteenth century. The wars, while they temporarily hindered its advance, only conquered a wider field for commercial operations. The same contest, which drew upon England the continental blockade and war with America, added to its colonial empire Ceylon, Malta, Mauritius, the Cape, St. Lucia, Trinidad, Demerara, and Essequibo. The same period was marked by the foundation of our Australasian empire and an immense extension of our Indian dependency. England's naval supremacy having been confirmed, markets were also safely sought where victory or commercial enterprise had established no welcome station. Thus by the end of the wars the new industrial system had been firmly founded. Manufactories had been built, operatives marshalled, needs created, and the national livelihood made dependent on an entirely new organization. Never before had such an extensive advance in technical art and scale of production been made; never before had social changes of such moment been achieved so rapidly or wrought so permanently.

Sufferings of the Labouring Classes.—But while the nation grew rich, populous and powerful,* the poorer

* In a few years before 1800 the exports of our home industry increased nearly one-third, and in the next decade and a half they more than doubled. Increase of population was nearly as remarkable. During the latter half of the eighteenth century the people of England and Wales multiplied nearly twice as fast as in the previous fifty years; and in 1801 they are estimated to have reached in round figures the number of 9,187,000, including sailors and soldiers. In 1811 this number rose to 10,407,000;

classes of the community suffered grievous hardships. Daily experience and historical investigation demonstrate that of all revolutions an industrial one is most productive of incidental woe. In this case the misery was enhanced by the harshest operations of change. It was a transition from hand labour to machine work; from the small house industry to the great factory system; from considerate custom to implacable competition; from imperfectly differentiated agents in production to the conscious antagonism of land, capital, and labour; from the staid contentment of the country to the feverish rivalry of the town. Like all transitions, it bore hardly on certain portions of society; like most, and worse than most, it bore hardest on the lowest and most numerous classes. These classes were the labouring poor. No other name can describe them more characteristically at this time. It was indeed the grim truth, that to be a labourer in those days was to be

and the same rate of increase continued for the next ten years. In 1801 Scotland contained 1,599,000 inhabitants; in 1811 they numbered 1,805,800, not including soldiers and sailors. For Ireland, no trustworthy accounts of population at this time exist. Pitt's estimate of the taxable incomes at the close of the eighteenth century amounted to rather more than £100,000,000 a year; sixteen years afterwards incomes exceeding these by half as much again were taxed by the state. Previously to the war the national expenditure had been about £20,000,000 per annum; in the latter part of the contest it averaged £100,000,000; and the National Debt was increased by nearly £600,000,000. Yet it was believed at the time that the debt was being steadily paid off. Pitt passed in 1786 a bill for liquidating the principal of the debt by means of the wondrous powers of compound interest. Though the annual contribution to the sinking fund was soon for the most part raised by loan, and it purchased stock which had itself been created by a new loan, paying for it at the market price, and losing for the state the sum by which the market price exceeded the rate of issue—a loss which with incidental expenses has been estimated at over six millions and a half—England and its wise ones continued to believe for long that the National Debt was being cleared off by a schoolboy's formula. Another estimate of the loss incurred puts it at more than a million and a half a year for many years, that is, up to 1828, when the delusion was finally overcome.

poor—poor, not in the sense of cheerless subsistence, but in that of grinding indigence, or absolute pauperism.*

The Old House Industry.—Formerly, in all the more prosperous counties of England, and they were the majority, there had been great numbers of cottagers who united agriculture with some kind of handicraft within doors. The irregularity of employment, and the uncertainty of results attending agriculture, were balanced by constant occupation and gains obtained from some kind of manufacture, which was generally of a textile character. Spinning often engaged the whole time of the weaker members of the household, and the yarn thus produced was woven into cloth by the father and older sons when nothing was to be done on the land. In the woollen manufacture, which was carried on under somewhat similar circumstances by small masters employing a few journeymen besides their own families, business was conducted so soberly that all hands enjoyed a similar immunity from want of occupation. The masters neither worked for orders nor speculated on the vicissitudes of the market, but

* Cowper, who was well acquainted with the poor of Olney, has left us a pathetic description of the circumstances of a respectable labouring family living on dry brown bread, with hardly any firing or candles—

> "With all this thrift they thrive not. All the care
> Ingenious parsimony takes, but just
> Saves the small inventory, bed and stool,
> Skillet, and old carv'd chest, from public sale."

In Burns' *Cotter's Saturday Night* the "weel-hain'd kebbuck, fell," was "a towmond auld, sin' lint was i' the bell." To foreigners, however, the country presented a prosperous appearance. Alfieri, for example, having in early life passed through Portsmouth, Salisbury, Bath, Bristol, Oxford, to London, wrote in his autobiography:—"Il paese mi piacque molto, e l'armonia delle cose diverse, tutte concordanti in quell' isola al maximo ben di tutti m' incantò sempre più fortemente." As to artisans, one concrete instance must suffice. The journeymen tailors stated that their wages between 1775 and 1795 would purchase 36 quartern loaves; in 1801 only 18½ loaves. Other classes of artisans gave similar accounts.

produced with regularity the supply which sooner or later would find a demand; and the men, assured of constant employment, and treated rather as partners than as day-labourers, contentedly worked with the same manufacturers for years in succession, and ruefully regretted their imprudence when the prospect of higher wages tempted them to enter the uncertain service of large factories.

Rise of the Factory System.—But as the enterprise of capitalists, the introduction of machinery, and minute division of labour, led to production on a large scale, this primitive system was superseded by factory organization. The safeguards against over-trading, erected by the Statute of Apprentices and kindred legislation, were burst through and finally abolished. Customs which had preserved the equilibrium, at the same time that they hindered the expansion, of industries were repudiated. Labour passed from under the discipline of a craft to dependence on speculating *entrepreneurs*. Before the invention of the steam engine the capitalist generally gathered his labourers to some spot where a head of water was available. With the advent of steam-power, the factories gravitated towards towns which then offered paramount advantages. To these towns flocked all those who sought to earn their livelihood by manufacturing industry. The isolated handworker and the small master in the country were unable to compete with the machinery and organized operatives of the capitalist in the town. Their only alternative was to migrate to some factory centre. Here they became tributary to the capitalist, with no resource but their single craft, dependent for bread upon a harsh system of trade which was subject to all the fluctuations of a world-wide market.

Enclosure of Commons.—As the handworker left

the country, the country changed much as the towns were changed by his arrival. Capital bought up the small holdings which he and his class had vacated; it annexed those which might otherwise have survived the loss of manufacturing employment, and it enclosed the wastes which had greatly helped the landless men to eke out a contented subsistence. Those cottagers whose occupation was mainly manufacturing had already migrated into the towns when the great enclosing period began. Those who had remained in the country had now to chose whether they would join the operatives of the factory, or descend to the condition of hinds. What they suffered by losing their rights of commonage is now very difficult to determine, and it certainly varied much with different parishes. It would seem, however, that while the enclosures deprived the day-labourer of a solace, often of a resource, they completed the ruin of the manufacturing cottagers.*

Decline of Small Farming.—The agricultural movement, however, proceeded to diminish the demand for labour by turning the enclosed arable land into

* "When Arthur Young made his tours he gathered all available particulars respecting the expenses and produce of cows. After tabulating the details, he had to confess that it was extremely mysterious, but that he could not possibly discover wherein lay the profit of dairying. But the fact was, as the cowkeepers themselves told him, that cows were kept because they consumed what would otherwise be useless. At that time cow-keeping, except about the towns, was on the same basis that poultry-keeping and pig-feeding are now. It was a by-industry, conducted by unmarketable labour on land which bore a very small value; and the prices got by this practice were too low to show a profit if the expenses were reckoned in terms of saleable labour and rack-rented land. When wastes and commons, grazing rights and fallow stubbles, still remained, it was literally true that cows were generally kept to consume what would otherwise be lost. The rural system, in which cow-keeping assumed the comfortable aspect of a by-industry, departed for ever along with the wastes and common fields."—*The Progress of Agriculture, and the Decline of Small Farming*, by the present writer, in *Westminster Review*, 1889.

pasture; and though war prices caused much of this to be broken up again, wages were so little determined by economic laws that increased employment yielded little compensation for famine scarcity. Moreover, the landlords and farmers denied to the agricultural labourers the accommodation which naturally should have been theirs as land became enclosed and rented. The evidence at command does not appear to support the prevalent view that loss of rights of commonage made it generally impossible to maintain small farms and freeholds. But in order to reduce the upkeep of buildings, and to facilitate the collection of their rents, proprietors let their land only to large farmers, and refused to accept cottagers as tenants for a few acres. In order to keep a better command of labour, the farmers used all their influence to prevent their men from hiring small holdings. Coleridge was thus led to reproach the landowners with dereliction of duty in his "Lay Sermon to the Higher and Middle Classes."* At this time, when the rigorous subordination of labour to capital and economical organization seemed to be a short cut to universal plenty, the motives of landlords were probably more public-spirited than a spectator would at first be inclined to allow. But the results of their conduct were those of the narrowest selfishness. Irresistibly, the labouring population of England, which in its worst times was not without a hope of mending what was bad in one occupation by recourse to another, was now definitely divided into a town proletariat and a degraded peasantry.

The English Poor-Law.—In both capacities labour

* Coleridge was equally distrustful of the mercantile spirit. In the *Devil's Thoughts*, the pig seen gliding down the river with wind and tide, cutting its own throat the while, is likened to England's commercial prosperity.

was delivered into the bondage of an unfair treaty with capital. The laws against combination, the traditions derived from the days of the assessment of wages, the law of settlement, and the impotency of hand work, deprived of all contractual quality the relations which followed. And, doubtless, the situation would have been too intolerable to last if some mediating agent had not mitigated the friction of the labour market. Unfortunately, however, the buffer between wage-earners and despair only defended a bad order by making it more vicious in itself and more demoralizing to the people. The Poor Law, which originally passed from exhortation to compulsion, had lived to convert charity into cajolery, alms into hush-money. Relief of the destitute had come to be indemnity to the underpaid, and the poor-rate had become an insurance fund against rebellion or starvation of the labourers. In 1782 the Act known as Gilbert's abolished the existing workhouse test, which since 1723 had prevented in many instances the extravagant growth of pauperism. This Act, reinforced by another passed in 1796, empowered the parish authorities to give relief to any industrious person at his own home without forfeiture on refusal to enter the poor house. Labour was now confessed to be the stipendiary of the rates. Through the reluctance of employers to pay reasonable wages, labour had been pauperized. Through the same reluctance, united with some regard for humanity * and caution, this pauperism was favoured to the disadvantage

* The latest and most learned historian of this industrial period, M. Paul Mantoux, indicates the European significance of the episode. "La seconde moitié du xviii^e^ siècle vit se relâcher beaucoup la sévérité à l'égard des pauvres : on reconnaît ici l'action de ce grand courant sentimental qui a exercé une si profonde influence sur la pensée européenne. La misère cessa d'être regardée uniquement comme la conséquence ordinaire de l'imprévoyance et du vice, et l'opinion s'émut a l'idée de tant de souffrances imméritées."

of industry, thrift, and prudence. Consequently, employers came to find common labour slothful and clumsy, while ratepayers had to bear a tax which rose from being about two millions in 1780 to over four millions in 1803, and nearly eight millions in 1817. In efficiency, morals, and money, society paid a heavy price for the temporary suppression of labour's claims to equitable and worthy treatment. Thus the founding of England's industrial pre-eminence was accompanied by the aggravation of a disease which has not yet ceased to mar and disturb its social system.

Machinery and Operatives.—The condition of those engaged in the fluctuating industries of the town was much less influenced by the poor law than that of the regular labourers on the soil. Nevertheless, special causes made this period one of great suffering to the manufacturing population. At first, increase of trade induced transient prosperity among operatives, but troubles surely overtook the workmen as machines surpassed the efforts of their practised hands. As the rate of production was accelerated, the market did not at once expand in a corresponding degree. The capitalist had often cause for impatience, which sometimes was hasty enough to make him send a cargo of skates to Rio Janeiro; but sooner or later the reduced price of his wares opened new markets, and meanwhile he continually found opportunities to sell at great advantage. But the arms and fingers of men and women steadily declined in value before the speed, dexterity, and power of machines. Hand-workers either found no work to do, or they slaved for a miserable wage. Mill operatives secured better earnings when trade was brisk, but in dull times they were more helpless than hand-workers. No effective competition among employers insured to workers considerate treatment, and the law made penal

all attempts at combination. We hear of petitions against machinery as early as 1776; Acts for its protection were frequently passed; and the struggle against it was maintained far into the nineteenth century.

High Prices, Leases, and Yearly Tenancy.—But great as were the evils inherent in the industrial transition, they were hardly more intense than those produced by extraneous circumstances. The recurrence of bad and irregular seasons, from 1765 till the end of the wars, repeatedly forced up prices far beyond the utmost point to which the movement of wages in those times could reach. And while high prices were distressing the manufacturing population, they were laying up less immediate but more permanent troubles for the agricultural classes. The incentives they afforded to more energetic and extensive cultivation were supported by facilities for obtaining loans which the paper currency provided. The number of country banks increased from about 280 in 1797 to above 900 in 1813; and so boldly did they aid the farmers in their speculations that at the close of the war, when prices fell and agriculturists experienced great losses, no less than 240 of these establishments stopped payment. The most lasting consequence of this period of inflated agriculture was the consummation of a change in English land tenure which had been supervening since the first rise in prices. "It is a custom growing pretty common in several parts of the kingdom to grant no leases," said Arthur Young in 1770; and he pointed out how prejudicial the change was to progressive husbandry. Such remonstrances came frequently from other observers. But the landlords were too anxious to profit by every advance in prices to fix their rents for more than a year at a time. They persisted in constantly raising rents from year to year. When a collapse occurred with the

return of peace, and a period of great fluctuations ensued under the reign of the corn-laws, the farmers themselves were unable to agree to pay fixed rackrents for more than a year in advance. By the time that the corn-laws departed, the new system was firmly established. The "good understanding" survives to this day; and English husbandry is now suffering from the want of stamina and resources, induced by abolishing the class of substantial and improving tenants.

Decay of the Yeomanry.—The same influences were mainly instrumental in effecting the removal of the more considerable yeomanry, who had lost little by the decline of house industry. At the end of the eighteenth century occupying owners were still very numerous in most parts of England, and their estates were subjected to the same ordeal as the business of the tenant farmers. The yeomen also borrowed money for speculative farming; they frequently spent it on the purchase of additional land at high prices; they often yielded to the temptation of raising their style of living as they saw the successful farmers doing. Some sold their land forthwith at a time when land-jobbing was very active and uncircumspect, and embarked in more enterprising trades, or in farming on a large scale. The greater number, however, clave to their estates, and involved them in heavy charges, and themselves in extravagances. The fall of prices rendered solvency impossible, and life intolerable to most of them. Their lands were sold to the great landowners, or to wealthy manufacturers and traders, to be consigned to the custody of family settlements, beyond the reach of *bonâ fide* cultivators.

Social Effects of the Industrial Revolution.—From this brief sketch it is evident that the industrial revolution changed England's social system as fundamentally and extensively as any political movement

has changed the form of states. The vocation of the country definitely declared itself. Occupations, which hitherto had been pursued only to complete the economy of a civilized society, were now erected into pillars of the integrity and prosperity of the country. The welfare and progress of the nation were entrusted to the exertions of a new class. Those who formerly had been the basis of the economical structure were now degraded into members of an industrial organization, reaching to the ends of the world. In the balance of political power, the new order imperatively demanded corresponding adjustments. But when the revolution commenced, the landed interest was supreme; when its triumph was assured, the landlords were at the zenith of their wealth and influence. Hence, though the parliamentary organization of the landed proprietors was broken up during the reign of George III., the manufacturing population gained political representation but slowly. The revulsion of feeling, produced by events on the Continent, endured long after its occasion, and retarded most disastrously recognition of the democratic element proper to constitutional government in an industrial state.

Industrialism and Political Representation.—At first industrialism was represented exclusively by the capitalist class. Yet, decided as the antagonism of capital and labour has grown since then, the masses participated in a redistribution of moral power, if not in executive authority. Within the period of revolution, the new aspirant to a share in government had but one enemy, the conservative landlords; it had but one party object, the protection of the majority. While the Whig party approved of the pressure of public opinion from without on parliamentary government, but withstood any proposals for a modification of its oligarchic

constitution, the political creed, which attained articulate expression on the occasion of Wilkes' contest with the House of Commons, declared in favour of direct popular representation within. As soon as the middle class began to feel its strength, it naturally maintained that parliamentary government should be the rule of the majority through their delegates. Thus, to correspond with the new structure of the Whig party, issued the Liberalism to which historians agree in tracing modern Radicalism. From the Whigs, as we have seen, had sprung a party favourable to popular government; and from the metropolitan constituencies and great counties were sent members to uphold the representative character of the Commons. The party thus formed was not considerable, but its purpose was kept before the country from the time that Chatham gave his adherence to a measure of reform. Under the brilliant conduct of Fox the cause of the people was in no want of effective advocacy, and the justice of its claims was maintained by the younger Pitt. But the very hopefulness of the movement turned to its disadvantage. The growing ardour of reformers induced the formation of leagues to prosecute an agitation in behalf of radical reform. And when the spectacle of the French Revolution confounded in men's minds the thoughts of improvement and anarchy, these societies called up very sinister associations, and heightened the general dislike to innovation. "In Britain," says Wordsworth of this time, "ruled a panic dread of change." From the Birmingham mob up to the prime minister the nation was determined at all costs to preserve inviolate the existing order of Church and State. Instead of discussion followed proscription; instead of agitation followed prosecutions; in place of reform succeeded Tory inertia. To the great misfortune of the country, industrialism

was cheated for more than a generation of political consideration commensurate with its structural importance in the groundwork of modern England.

Bentham's Clear Rule of Reform.—Nevertheless, though the industrial revolution failed to be accompanied by appropriate constitutional reform, it was at this period that liberal principles received such statement and illustration as secured their successful application on the arrival of calmer times. Adam Smith elaborated a doctrine of personal and industrial liberty before monopoly and protection were seriously attacked. Jeremy Bentham explored the province of equitable legislation when Blackstone's authority was paramount. The work of the first writer is the foundation of what economical science modern Europe has called to its aid, and must, therefore, be treated as a separate part of its groundwork. The teaching of Bentham, however, so far as it was systematic, was limited by the bounds of strict jurisprudence, and his detailed theories addressed themselves only to lawyers. But the wide-reaching and luminous idea, which was the basis of all he thought and wrote, has become the common possession of all civilized men. "He gave us," said Maine, "a clear rule of reform." Utility had been a recognized criterion of conduct since the days of Epicurus; and in Bentham's own age it possessed advocates of such repute as Beccaria, Priestley, and Paley. Yet it was Bentham who insisted, once for all, that the proper object of all government and legislation is the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Influence of Bentham's School.—From jurisprudence he exorcised the spirits of superstition and phantasy by ridicule and exact investigation. The widest principles and the meanest details were alike the subjects of his rigorous criticism. Referring always

to the greatest happiness of man under the conditions of actual human feelings and needs, he elucidated principles of legislation, rules of procedure, and details of practice, which in all their features and circumstances enforced conformity with a rigid test of utility. Thanks to the help of Dumont and other collaborators, the principle with its chief corollaries soon became familiar on the Continent and in England and America. Axioms, which are now the immediate intuitions of educated men of all nations, were once truths newly demonstrated by Bentham's logical method.

CHAPTER VIII

THE NEW MECHANICS: THE NEW ECONOMICS

"Primo itaque videtur inventorum nobilium introductio inter actiones humanas longe primas partes tenere: id quod antiqua sæcula judicaverunt. Ea enim rerum inventoribus divinos honores tribuerunt; iis autem, qui in rebus civilibus merebantur (quales erant urbium et imperiorum conditores, legislatores, patriarum a diuturnis malis liberatores, tyrannidum debellatores, et his similes), heroum tantum honores decreverunt. Atque certe, si quis ea recte conferat, justum hoc prisci sæculi judicium reperiet. Etenim inventorum beneficia ad universum genus humanum pertinere possunt, civilia ad certas tantummodo hominum sedes: hæc etiam non ultra paucas ætates durant, illa quasi perpetuis temporibus."—*Novum Organum.*

"On the whole, man is a tool-using animal. Nowhere do you find him without tools; without tools he is nothing, with tools he is all."—CARLYLE.

"The nutrition of a commonwealth consisteth in the plenty and distribution of materials conducing to life. . . . Plenty dependeth, next to God's favour, merely on the labour and industry of man."—HOBBES.

The Machine Age.—The means and success with which man has at different times encountered the difficulties of making Nature subservient to his desires are among the most important elements of his history. And doubtless they would occupy a more prominent position in historical narrative if written history were not under the necessity of eliminating as many constant quantities as possible, and this particular quantity had not remained for ages in succession one of the most constant. But when our own time is approached, the

old lines of historical construction are interrupted ; the constant becomes the scene of rapid change, the established the victim of revolution. Especially is this the case with the conditions of man's conflict with his physical environment. Since the middle of the eighteenth century changes have come to pass which have made civilized man rather Nature's conqueror than its drudge and prey. As certain stages of primitive civilization are wont to be distinguished by palæontologists according to the material from which tools were made, so the present age may be characterized by the complexity of their structure. Whereas once the materials of which tools were made sufficed for their classification, now the number of substances and multitude of parts constituting modern appliances permit them to be generally described only as complex, or machines ; and our epoch may justly be called the machine age.

Machinery and History.—Yet it would be wrong to suppose that in past times men had not essayed to contrive apparatus for sparing and reinforcing their labour. Many were the inventions necessary to equip society before the era of machinery ; a few engines of great utility and ingenuity had been produced, and several attempts to anticipate the main contrivances of our time are recorded. Failure, indeed, to impart to tools a high degree of organization was due not so much to feebleness of individuals as to the unprepared state of society. While an age abounding in a talent affords a rich field for its employment, an age poor in a power is incapable of realizing even that which it has. Herein lies one reason why the general progress of society is not more steady and less intermittent ; but the art of making and using tools is especially subject to sudden advances and protracted delays. There is nothing so likely to remain in a stationary condition as

tools, and there is nothing equally quick to advance when a fertile discovery has been compassed. In favourable circumstances, tools propagate tools with wonderful directness and speed; and it is on this account that modern technological progress has been rapid and portentous beyond example.

Watt's Double-acting Steam-engine.—The early history of the reciprocating steam-engine especially illustrated this truth. Many years passed, and many disappointments were experienced, before Watt's ideas were successfully realized. Details of execution continually made further demands on his inventive powers; but he would not have grudged the intense application necessary to render the machine powerful and automatic if he had not been harassed by the difficulty of getting the mechanism executed, and by the indebtedness which his slender pecuniary resources made unavoidable if he was to remain true to his purpose. In those days accurate workmanship did not exist. Artisans used rude tools for rough work; and Watt's ideas entirely outstripped their means of construction, while his designs were frequently curtailed to suit the capacity of those who would have to manage his engines. Against these obstacles the delicate inventor would probably have struggled in vain, unless he had received from others moral and material support—support which, at that time, he could have obtained in no country of the world except Great Britain. From Dr. Black, from Dr. Roebuck, and Matthew Boulton he obtained the encouragement and means necessary for the development of his plans till they were in a fit state to meet the demands of the world. And then, again, only in the same country could he and his partner have found, at that time, an immediate and expanding market for the new engine when it was ready for work.

Rapid Success of the Steam-engine.—As soon as the merits of Watt's engines were demonstrated, a great demand for their services came from the mine-owners. Shafts, which were about to be abandoned, were worked with renewed activity; old works, which had ceased to be remunerative, were revived; new mines, which otherwise would have failed, were successfully opened; and all manner of pumping was performed with greater economy. To meet the wants of other industries Watt applied his engine to the production of rotary motion; and he invented his centrifugal governor for regulating velocity, which, with the flywheel, originally designed to overcome the dead points, ensured smoothness of movement and uniformity of speed in the execution of all kinds of work. Steam power immediately passed from being an auxiliary of the pump to being the motor of mills, bellows, tilt-hammers, and the machines in textile factories.*

Progress of the Mineral Industries.—The extensive use of motor machinery involved a large consumption of metal and fuel. The engines themselves

* The old motors, too, experienced the influence of mechanical progress. Both wind- and water-mills were greatly improved during the second half of the eighteenth century. Indeed, millwrights were the class which possessed most mechanical aptitude, and produced most of the pioneers of modern engineering. Water-mills were especially improved by scientific investigation, to which Smeaton made considerable contributions. And water-pressure engines were at work on the Continent as early as 1750, the first being erected by Winterschmidt in the Harz mountains, and the second by Höll at Schemnitz, in Hungary, for pumping purposes. It is probable that this was "the new invented water engine" which Mr. Arthur Rogers has found among the investments of an adventurer in South Sea Bubbles (*History of Prices*, vii. 609), for it is known to have existed in France in an incipient form as early as 1731. The idea may well have originated many years earlier, and its picture would certainly have taken the form of a pump. In this case it ceases to "suggest the fraudulent promoter," and shares "the plausible appearance" which so many of the bubbles possessed.

were principally constructed of iron, and their gearing became more efficient and durable as metal superseded wood. Their furnaces required a large supply of coal, and so did the blast works and foundries which produced their constituent materials. In some degree steam power afforded the means of meeting its demand for minerals by facilitating the processes of mining and smelting. Its application to pumps, bellows, and rollers greatly promoted the output of coal and iron, and increased the net produce from the raw material. But the growth of the mineral industries was more the effect of prior causes. If British methods of extracting cast iron, malleable iron, and steel, from the ores, had not already been otherwise improved, the steam-engine would hardly have escaped being an abortive invention.

Smelting, puddling, and rolling Iron.—Although the English ironworks suffered considerably in the civil war, the fundamental cause of their decline was want of fuel. The great consumption of charcoal had destroyed most of the available woods, and occasioned legislative prohibitions against the erection of furnaces. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Abraham Darby founded the ironworks of Coalbrookdale, for the purpose of manufacturing cast-iron wares, which had hitherto been obtained from abroad; and it was in this establishment that the use of coke gradually superseded the employment of charcoal for smelting purposes. It was here, too, that in 1766 the process of converting pig-iron into malleable iron was first accomplished by means of coal in a reverberatory furnace. A true puddling furnace, however, was patented by Onions, of Merthyr Tydvil, in 1783; and in the following year Henry Cort took out his patent for improvements, which definitely reorganized the whole economy of the manufacture. Without originating any entirely novel

process, he arrived at the modern English method of manufacturing malleable and bar iron by systematizing and improving known processes and inventions, and by applying the rolling mill to the forging of bar iron.

Davy's Mining Safety-Lamp.—The remaining notable cause of increased mineral production came from without the circle of reciprocating agents, steam, coal, and iron. Before 1815 no efficient means of lighting coal mines had been discovered which did not involve the presence of heat sufficient to explode fire-damp. For more than a century the pits had reached a depth at which fire-damp was found in dangerous quantities.* But the most careful and ingenious ventilation was ineffectual to prevent frequent accumulations of the gas; and in the first years of the nineteenth century a series of murderous catastrophes appealed to those who pursued knowledge to provide the miner with a safeguard against the most formidable of his many dangers. As the demand for coal increased, and mining became more developed, many experimenters endeavoured to construct a safety lamp. It was Davy, however, who first succeeded in inventing and perfecting the wire-gauze lantern, which, under ordinary circumstances, afforded complete security from explosions.† Davy, with noble liberality, claimed none of the great remuneration which a patent would have secured to him. Yet the coal-masters could well have afforded to pay him a large premium, for the lamp permitted mines to be worked profitably which either had been abandoned or must otherwise soon have been closed, and it rendered available for the market a great quantity of coal which had been left in the mines to

* The first explosion in the collieries on the Tyne occurred in October, 1705.

† George Stephenson very nearly anticipated him.

guide ventilating currents. But Davy was sufficiently gratified by receiving from the north-country mine-owners a handsome honorary token of their obligations.

Cast Steel as Tool Steel.—Besides an abundance of raw material, the construction and development of machinery required tools of great precision and power. In one respect this need had been anticipated. The first condition of accurate workmanship in metal is the employment of cutting tools competent to execute their tasks with ease and rapidity. It was, therefore, a gain of no small moment to the early British engineers that they found ready to their hands a supply of the steel which, till the appearance of our present high-speed tool steels, proved to be that most suitable for working other metals. In the middle of the eighteenth century Benjamin Huntsman had discovered the means of producing crucible cast steel of the same kind and by the same method which obtain at this day. By his investigations the conversion of blister steel into cast ingots through vehement heat was originated in every essential detail of its delicate process. From his own experiments alone he discovered the iron, fuel, furnace, crucibles, and treatment proper for the purpose; and by his own energy he created a market for the stubborn product by first selling it to the French.

Want of Efficient Tools.—But the best simple tools could not alone turn out accurate work. To construct the new machines well and readily, other machines were necessary; and their total absence was the cause of much tedious toil and embarrassment to the first inventors. At the beginning, Watt was unable to get a serviceable cylinder bored at all. For long his chief concern was to have the parts of his engine constructed with such amount of accuracy as enabled a special agent, like Murdoch, to make the machine work where

it was wanted. He sought to create manual dexterity by restricting to certain individuals and their children certain kinds of work; but hand labour was neither sufficiently uniform, accurate, nor powerful to make engine-fitting under any circumstances anything but a lengthy and anxious business. The same drawbacks attended the manufacture of all other kinds of machinery. To enable machines to realize their capabilities, they required to be constructed with the same resources that they supplied; they demanded, in fact, to be made by machine tools.

Development of Machine Tools.—This was a want which contained within itself the means of its own satisfaction. The class of men who laboured for the perfection of primary machines were not slow to devise auxiliaries. Soon the rude lathes and boring apparatus of the old smiths and millwrights were supplanted by machine tools which performed their required work with the precision of automata and the power of steam. Various shifts and expedients were adopted by each shop for its own benefit, and the factory of Boulton and Watt at Soho depended entirely upon its own tools and organization. But in Bramah's shop the manufacture of his tumbler locks induced special attention to exact and uniform work. There were afforded instruction and incitement to mechanical improvement which resulted in the hydraulic press, and in the important inventions of Maudslay and Clement for turning by the slide rest, punching boiler plates, cutting screws, and engine planing, with their various applications. The attainment of these objects was also aimed at, and often partially compassed, in workshops of less celebrity. The same wants elicited like expedients from men trained to the same work. Throughout the works of mechanical engineers the principal machine tools were

either invented, improved, or eagerly adopted. By the first quarter of the nineteenth century the main appliances of engine work were in use, and only awaited the forgings of the steam hammer to proceed to operations of greater magnitude.

Cause of England's Mechanical Advance.—The development of steam-power and the iron industries was from one point of view merely the exploitation of England's physical resources. From another point of view it was a natural consequence of England's past social advance. Though abundance and convenient distribution of minerals are highly favourable to excellence in working metals, they were not alone sufficient to produce the industrial phenomena of our age. In France, for example, the iron trade was slow to profit by English improvements, suitable though much of the French iron country was for the new system. Here government incited manufacturers to adopt British methods, and published a description of the various processes; yet "in 1818 only a very small quantity of cast-iron was made with coke, and no wrought iron was prepared with coal," and the production of both kinds had not materially increased since 1801. Nor was this result entirely due to the difficulties of assimilating a foreign process, for the charcoal blast furnaces were managed at the same time in a most incompetent fashion. But in England, society was fully ripe for industrial advance; economical matters had become main subjects of national interest; and it was this circumstance rather than the island's mineral wealth which caused the new departure. In point of fact, the third great English manufacture, that of cotton goods, was an exotic, and its naturalization was achieved before coal and iron constituted the foundation of our industrial economy.

Cotton-spinning Machinery.—A method of spinning by rollers was invented as early as 1738. The idea retained vitality for the next thirty years, and probably the famous water-frame was its lineal descendant. Nevertheless, it was not till 1769 that Arkwright patented his machine for spinning by passing the roving of cotton between two pairs of cylinders revolving at different speeds, in order to reduce the thread to the proper tenuity for it to be twisted by a spindle and wound on a bobbin. Arkwright's water-frame proved to be most suitable for spinning a hard, strong thread for warp; and it was an opportune coincidence that, some years before it was patented, a machine had been invented by another person for spinning cotton-thread sufficiently fine and soft for weft. This was the original spinning-jenny of Hargreaves, which was really a compound spinning-wheel capable of producing a number of threads at a time. The manufacture by machinery of the material of entire cotton goods was now made practicable; but invention did not stop here. Neither of these engines spun thread fit for the finer kinds of fabrics, and it was only by a combination of the two in Crompton's mule that this end was attained. While the mule superseded the jenny, the water-frame retained its position on account of the demand for strong warp when the power-loom came into use; and, after experiencing several improvements, its name—which no longer answered to the usual means of motive power—was changed into throstle. Through these inventions and sundry minor ones, yarn which cost 38*s.* in 1786 was sold in 1806 for 7*s.* 2*d.*, and in 1832 for 2*s.* 11*d.*; and the spinner, instead of retarding the weaver as formerly, supplied him with a superabundance of material for his former cloths, and all manner of lighter fabrics besides.

The Power-loom.—But the looms did not long remain behind the frames and jennies. The rapid production of yarn gave warning that more expeditious means of weaving would soon be necessary; and the success of spinning and other machinery gave assurance that machine-weaving was not impossible. It was these considerations, indeed, which induced a clergyman, Dr. Cartwright, unacquainted with mechanics and the process of hand-weaving, to devise an apparatus which was ultimately developed by himself and others into the power-loom. Cartwright took out his patent in 1787. Nevertheless, some time elapsed before power-looms became economically successful, and hand-weaving long remained common. In France, too, about this period, Jacquard invented a loom to aid the textile industries of Lyons. By this engine the warp was automatically raised and lowered, according to the requirements of a preconceived pattern recorded by perforations on an endless chain of slips of cardboard; and it became as useful in the manufacture of figured silks or Kidderminster carpets as the power-loom was in weaving cottons.

Chemical Bleaching.—To remove the last hindrance to the rapid production of cotton goods, the process of bleaching vegetable cloth, which formerly occupied six or eight months, was abridged by the use of chlorine and lime till it was performed in two or three days. Scheele having noticed the power of oxymuriatic acid, as it was then called, to destroy vegetable colours, Berthollet pointed out its use for bleaching purposes, and the discovery was applied by Watt, Tennant, and others in England.

Historical Significance of the New Chemical Industries.—The use of chlorine in manufactures was one of the applications of chemical knowledge which

marked the origin of a new branch of industry. The significance of such an innovation is not exhausted by the fact that a piece of cloth could be bleached at home in a few days, which formerly was bleached in Holland at fifteen times the cost. Its true import, rather, was the nascent development of an economy of chemical manufactures, which has attained the rank of an important system of industries. And this development took place in England, not because the original discoveries were made by Englishmen. As a matter of fact, the only important discovery made in this country was Roebuck's method of manufacturing sulphuric acid at a low cost. In our own time the investigations of an Englishman have enabled Germany to build up an enormous and lucrative trade in aniline dyes because technological progress had prepared Germans to avail themselves of such scientific advance. In the days of which we treat, the discoveries and inventions of men of all nationalities enabled England to start the alkali trade and other commanding industries simply because its inhabitants at that time alone possessed the skill, enterprise, and appliances for putting to good service every technological advance gained by the researches of the civilized world.

Development of the Alkali Trades.—Formerly the potash and soda used to manufacture soap, glass, etc., were obtained from the ashes of plants and seaweed, while the main bleaching agents were exposure and sour milk. During the Revolution the importation of soda into France ceased, and the Convention appointed a committee to consider means for obtaining it from indigenous sources. It was then found that Leblanc was in possession of a method of manufacture which was based on the decomposition of chloride of sodium or common salt by sulphuric acid in an ordinary reverberatory

furnace, by which were formed sulphate of sodium and hydrochloric acid. At first the hydrochloric acid gas, which was given off with the sulphate of sodium, was discharged into the air to poison all animal and vegetable life in the neighbourhood. Ultimately its condensation in water became sanitarily necessary and obligatory by law. But here the alkali trade came into connection with the bleaching industry. The most economical method of obtaining chlorine is by the action of hydrochloric acid on peroxide of manganese, and thus the waste product from the first process of soda-making came to provide the basis of the manufacture of bleach. The growth of this system of industries, perfected as it has been by continual saving of labour and products, is a notable phenomenon in the economical history of England and in a smaller degree of Europe. The war and the taxes on salt and soap prevented Leblanc's process from obtaining immediate adoption in this island, but after the repeal of the former duty, the alkali trade developed with great rapidity. Soda, which in 1814 cost £60 per ton, was obtainable fifty years afterwards at £4 10*s.* per ton; bleaching powder, which was worth about £100 per ton at the beginning of the century, fetched in the middle about £11 per ton; while sulphuric acid (the consumption of which provides for wise statesmen an index-number to the condition of industry generally) passed in the course of a hundred and thirty years from £128 to £6 per ton.

The Steam Printing-press.—In two other great industrial improvements the tendency of England's social condition to favour mechanical progress was especially apparent. The inventors of printing and paper-making machines were foreigners; but it was only English capital, enterprise, and needs, which at this time were capable of bringing their ideas to a

practical test. König, the contriver of the first steam printing-press, was a German, who had striven vainly to obtain means to make experiments in his own country. He repaired to England only after he had proved that he would find no better encouragement in Russia. Established in London, he soon discovered a printer who was induced by the prospect of commercial advantages to furnish funds for a trial press. The attempt suggested a more elaborate scheme; and with the assistance of a countryman possessed of much mechanical skill, König at length produced a steam-driven machine, which has been the parent of all rapid printing-presses.

The Paper-making Machine.—The paper-making machine was the invention of Louis Robert, a clerk in Didot's factory at Essonne. The Frenchman was more fortunate than König, for Gamble, Didot's brother-in-law, undertook to patent the invention and get it perfected in England. Gamble secured the assistance of the firm of Fourdrinier in the venture, and by exhausting their resources, the invention was embodied in a practical machine, though not before the patent had ceased to confer any benefit. The appliances of the old paper-making industry had experienced little improvement since the introduction of the art into Europe. Robert's machine produced sheets of unlimited length and great width, and with such economy of labour and time that the work of weeks now occupied minutes. In the seventeenth century England's supply of paper came chiefly from abroad; in the next century home production hardly equalled consumption. By the use of Robert's invention England competed successfully with other countries, and came to import the raw material in large quantities. Machine-made paper was the counterpart to steam-printing among the mechanical

causes of more diffused information and intelligence. Its cheapness countervailed to some extent the injurious effects of the paper duties, and its great lengths made possible still more rapid printing.

Moral Characteristics of the great Inventors and Engineers.—The foregoing inventions were the chief agents in the introduction of modern machinery. Attended by minor contrivances and improvements, they established a system of industrial production which rapidly imposed itself over all the efforts of civilized men to obtain necessaries and gratifications. For the most part they were primarily the work of men who desired to apply their abilities to alleviating labour and want rather than to amassing wealth and ministering to luxury. They resulted from constructive instincts united to a manly desire to execute thoroughly well the tasks which genius prompted. Among the great mechanical inventors, Arkwright alone manifested the talents and passion for organizing the labour of others to his own advantage. Boulton, who made of Watt's invention a commercial success, possessed great business abilities, but they ministered solely to a delight in industrial generalship. Roebuck, who at an earlier period was the guardian of the embryo engine, also essayed to organize industry on a large scale, but his dominant motive was the practical application of scientific knowledge. When more original inventors engaged in manufacturing enterprises, they did so in order to bring their work to perfection, and accordingly they experienced the losses which invention as a rule involved. Nor was it otherwise with those who conducted the great operations which gave modern England its first canals, roads, harbours, docks, and bridges. These invented civil engineering as truly as inventors originated mechanical engineering. They were likewise

men of humble birth, and the costly nature of their undertakings prevented them from speculating for profit. But none the less did they apply themselves with the greatest diligence and singleness of purpose to their vocation. Satisfied with payment, which for Brindley but slightly exceeded a millwright's wage, and for Telford only sufficed for a respectable competence, they spent their whole energy on devising and superintending the removal of physical obstacles to society's welfare and development.

Social Dangers involved by the New Industrial System.—But the system assumed a new character as soon as it was made available for the general public. The elevation of society was lost sight of in a feverish desire to acquire money. Beneficial undertakings had been proved profitable, and it was now assumed that a business, so long as it was profitable, did not require to be proved beneficial. The sophism suited vulgar inclinations, and unfortunately it gained much support from the individualistic doctrine of economics which the same period produced and perfected.

The Old Mercantile System of Economics.—Till the beginning of our age no material advance was made in economic theory. Neither speculative absurdity nor mischievous consequences had been able to discredit the mercantile system, the object of which was to make trade profitable to the nation by taking care, as Bacon said, "that the exportation exceed in value the importation, for then the balance of trade must of necessity be in coin or bullion." And since a country's prosperity was held to depend on the success with which it impoverished others by depriving them of their treasure, it became an axiom that the welfare of one's own land is incompatible with that of other nations. The humanitarian Voltaire lamented, "Telle est la condition

humaine, que souhaiter la grandeur de son pays, c'est souhaiter du mal à ses voisins. Il est claire qu'un pays ne peut gagner sans qu'un autre perde." Even Montesquieu had declared, in a chapter on the nations to whom commerce must be disadvantageous, that "Un pays qui envoie toujours moins de marchandises ou de denrées qu'il n'en reçoit se met lui-même en équilibre en s'appauvrissant ; il recevra toujours moins, jusqu'à ce que, dans une pauvreté extrême, il ne reçoive plus rien . . . l'argent ne revient jamais, parceque ceux qui l'ont pris ne doivent rien."

Fallacies of the Mercantile System.—Men who were engaged in commerce invariably fell into the fallacies of the mercantile system as soon as they passed from their special business to the consideration of national policy as a whole.* Professed politicians were too much influenced by the voice of vested interests, the sophisms of erring authority, and the tendencies of habit, to correct its inferences by results, or its principles by criticism. Some writers exposed clearly enough certain of the prevailing misconceptions, and enunciated many of the fundamental propositions of economic science, but they failed to subvert the structure of the system, or to develop their truths into a comprehensive theory. And when a better doctrine of the production and distribution of national wealth was arrived at, it was by the exertions of a purely theoretical thinker. Since then, no doubt, the new political economy has manifested many shortcomings. But if the science is justly chargeable with incapacity to meet present needs, if it even be guilty of having contributed to the creation

* When writing of human bondage, Spinoza had said, "Verum omnium rerum compendium pecunia attulit. Unde factum, ut eius imago mentem vulgi maxime occupare soleat ; quia vix ullam lætitiae speciem imaginari possunt, nisi concomitante nummorum idea tanquam causa."

of present difficulties, it can at least point to a time when it destroyed by mere force of reason the blundering prejudices of vulgar practice; and it may thus claim a presumption that it may yet again become capable of correcting the errors of the past and introducing the improvements of the future.

"The Wealth of Nations:" its Fundamental Hypothesis.—In 1776 Adam Smith published *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.* Without making any pretence to precise nomenclature or formal construction, this treatise first brought economics within the boundaries of science. It gathered up all the sporadic facts which earlier observers had noted, and organized them under fundamental principles into a consistent body of reasoned knowledge. In order to effect this great work, Smith confined his attention to certain classes of phenomena, and forebore from dealing with those kindred subjects which together constitute the matter of sociology. In his hands political economy was concerned only with the production and distribution of wealth by the operation of man's acquisitive propensities. Just as in his theory of ethics he had regarded exclusively the sympathetic side of human nature, so now he assumed the action alone of the desire "of bettering our condition, a desire which, though generally calm and dispassionate, comes with us from the womb and never leaves us till we go into the grave." Hence the science he created has been reprobated with the most defamatory epithets for neglecting what is highest in man; yet, unless he had circumscribed his subject by this application of the analytic method, he could hardly have accomplished his object. Life, it is true, is an organic whole; and economics, though principally concerned with man as a greedy being, must miss part of its subject if it refuse to reckon with the rest

of his nature. With progress the scope of the science may expand till it merges in that of sociology; but so intricate are social phenomena that this class of facts would never have been brought within the reach of scientific treatment unless the great Scotchman had insisted upon starting from the arbitrary hypothesis that man is revoltingly selfish.

Adam Smith's View of Wealth.—The opening sentence of the *Wealth of Nations* declared the fundamental principle which distinguished its doctrine from the mercantile and physiocratic systems. Wealth is never precisely defined in its pages, but from the outset it is assumed that "every man is rich or poor according to the degree in which he can afford to enjoy the necessaries, conveniences, and amusements of human life." The work begins by asserting that "the annual labour of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessaries and conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist always either in the immediate produce of that labour, or in what is purchased with that produce from other nations." This truth had been enunciated by Locke, Serra, and others, but its value had been overlooked through neglect to proceed further with its analysis. Smith, on the contrary, immediately pointed out how the abundance of wealth obtained by a society was regulated, first, by "the skill, dexterity, and judgment with which its labour is generally applied; and, secondly, by the proportion between the number of those who are employed in useful labour, and that of those who are not so employed." In the first of these circumstances, division of labour, with its attendant co-operation, is the most important factor. All trade, both domestic and international, is simply division and co-operation of labour; and thus every civilized man is more or less a

merchant, and every advanced nation a commercial society.

Distribution of Wealth.—As division of labour involves exchange, so exchange involves the distribution of what is produced. The distribution naturally takes place among the agents concerned in the process of production, namely, the labourer; the capitalist, who sets him to work; and the landowner, who lends the use of his land. Labour and capital are employed in the production of every commodity, and, in most cases, land, for which a rent is charged; though it is not necessary that all three factors should be owned by different persons. The satisfaction of these different claims to a share in a product constitutes the natural price of every commodity, for the natural cost of any article is just what has been spent on its production in wages, interest, and rent. But the market-price of commodities is not so simply determined on account of the variations between supply and demand. Still, competition, and the mobility of capital and labour, continually impel the market-price of all things to gravitate towards the natural price. Herein consists the regulating force of industry. It is the competition of every man in striving to make the best of his labour, capital, or land, which determines for the most part the amount of the respective shares of the different agents in production, and ensures that, while no department of industry is over-profitable or neglected, none shall be permanently underpaid or excessively pursued.

Expedience of Industrial Freedom.—Pursuing this line of argument, Adam Smith concluded that the proper attitude of government towards industry and commerce is that of non-interference. By analysis of production, he proved that the necessary economical processes take place automatically; by criticism, he

demonstrated that all attempts to improve them artificially are futile and injurious. He condemned all restraints on labour, such as the privileges of corporations, statutes of apprenticeship, and the English law of parochial settlement, by showing that they cause work to be inferior in quality, more costly to the public, and less remunerative to the labourer. The fallacies of the mercantile system, and the consequent restrictions on commerce, he attacked with unsparing severity; and he accumulated a mass of reasoned evidence in favour of free-trade between countries and with colonies which was the main agent in bringing about that state of commercial freedom in Great Britain, the entire restoration of which he himself regarded as absurd to expect as "that an Oceana or Utopia should ever be established."

Practical Influence of Adam Smith upon Europe.—To trace the practical influence of Adam Smith's doctrines would involve a critical analysis of the economical history of all civilized states during the nineteenth century. Within the period under review it was necessarily much curtailed by stress of war, and the commercial policy of Napoleon. But in England it became immediately operative in the administration of Lord North, and in that of Pitt, who was a professed disciple of Smith, and was assisted at the Treasury by George Rose, the secretary under North. It appeared in the deliberations of the legislature from 1783, and in 1786 it gained memorable expression in the short-lived commercial treaty with France. The reforms in Prussia were practical applications of the same kind, insomuch as they were less tributes to sentiment and the rights of man than remedies prompted by a belief that national prosperity is best promoted by freeing land, labour, and exchange, which was transmitted from the *Wealth of Nations* to Prussian bureaucracy through

Krauss, a professor of Königsberg. The financial policy of Speranski in Russia, repudiating as it did juggling with the currency in favour of straightforward efforts to liquidate debt, indicated the wide range of the book's practical effects; and the treatise of Storch, written at the request of Alexander for the instruction of his brothers, was a token of the diffusion of its teaching. At the Congress of Vienna, the fact that the interest of each community is promoted by the welfare and intercourse of all, received such recognition as marked a new phase of diplomatic dealing. Although the crudest economical errors were still widely prevalent, as was manifest in the painful struggles of the Austrian Government to escape bankruptcy, there was evinced at this period a general sense of the insufficiency of the old principles, and a leaning towards *laissez faire*, which were clear signs of a fresh factor in the structure of Europe. And if the Revolution had not introduced more equitable principles of taxation, the new political economy would perhaps have achieved as much for fiscal justice as it did for industrial freedom: and certainly, without its aid, equity would have failed to produce a tolerable apportionment of the expenses of government.

Malthus on Population.—But while the new political economy was competent to exert immediately a beneficial influence on the conduct of national affairs, it was far from being either scientifically exact or practically complete. Many corrections, additions, and formal improvements were necessary to obtain even that amount of extension, definiteness, and consistency which prematurely challenged public confidence about the middle of the nineteenth century. Of the additions made to Smith's general doctrine none were more notorious than the corollaries which Malthus deduced from the ratio

obtaining between increase of population and increase of food. Adam Smith and many other writers had noticed that the human species had a tendency to multiply up to the level of the means of subsistence. Condorcet, indeed, had perceived that the fact was a rock of danger in the way of his anticipations of human progress.* But it was not till 1798 that the Essay on Population demonstrated how the circumstance contained the explanation of much of the misery which was often assigned to the consequences of social institutions. Indeed, unless Rousseau, Condorcet, Godwin, and others had imputed all the evils of vice and misfortune to our social system, and unless the English poor law had manifested the dangers attending erroneous belief concerning the principles of population, Malthus probably would never have entered his emphatic and elaborate protest against heedless reproduction. Certainly his remonstrance would have been less vehement at first, less elaborate in later years, and less uncompromising throughout the controversy which it provoked. Yet he did but state that men tend to increase in a geometrical ratio, or as the numbers 2, 4, 8, 16; while the production of food cannot be increased faster than in an arithmetical ratio, or as the numbers 2, 3, 4, 5; and that the disparity between these two different orders of increase is overcome by the action of moral restraint, misery, and vice.

* "Si on suppose qu'avant ce temps les progrès de la raison ayent marché de pair avec ceux des sciences et des arts, que les ridicules préjugés de la supersition ayent cessé de répandre sur la morale une austérité qui la corrompt et la dégrade au lieu de l'épurer et de l'élever; les hommes sauront alors que, s'ils ont des obligations à l'égard des êtres qui ne sont pas encore, elles ne consistent pas à leur donner l'existence, mais le bonheur; elles ont pour objet le bien-être général de l'espèce humaine ou de la société dans laquelle ils vivent; de la famille à laquelle ils sont attachés; et non la puérile idée de charger la terre d'êtres inutiles et malheureux."—*Esquisse d'un Tableau Historique des Progrès de l'Esprit Humain*, p. 364.

His teaching did but recommend that the first of these checks should be adopted by rational beings in preference to the hideous alternatives which nature never fails to impose.

Malthus on Poverty and Parentage.—Nevertheless, Malthus' treatment of the subject proved very nauseous to his generation. He wrote when law-givers, confounding cause with effect, as they had done in the case of money, believed a teeming population to constitute a powerful and prosperous nation, because strong and flourishing countries were always populous; when legislation, therefore, indiscriminately favoured national fecundity; when public opinion was averse to deliberate abstinence from marriage, and individual inclination was encouraged to neglect the motives of prudence; when philanthropy and ordinary compassion ignored the remoter consequences of indiscreet charity. But in truth he was, to use Blanqui's epigram, no more desirous that society should be a convent than he was that it should be a warren. He was, too, quite aware that a people's standard of comfort may be raised in course of the progress of civilization, no less than its level of misery may be depressed by inconsiderate propagation. He did not overlook emigration "as a partial and temporary expedient" for relieving a congested population; nor could he fail to perceive how industrial improvements were providing for increasing numbers of consumers. Still he offended much by insisting on the truism that a redundant population has no natural right to the means of subsistence, and that the English poor law should be abolished gradually. He offended yet more by showing parentage to be no blind spontaneous function, but the weightiest of responsibilities, whose assumption should be most anxiously considered.

Adam Smith's Error respecting Rent.—The

Malthusian theory of population was rather an elucidation than a correction of Adam Smith's treatment of its subject, but it was closely connected with a very important emendation of the *Wealth of Nations*. The tendency of people to multiply beyond present means of subsistence frequently involves resort to fresh and inferior land, or the expenditure of more capital and labour on that already under cultivation, as was happening in England at that time on an unusually large scale. The question then arises, to whose behoof does such an expansion of industry principally conduce? Who profits most by increase of agricultural produce, and the growth of population and manufactures which it supports? Do labour and capital enjoy the whole proceeds of their more strenuous application? Now, Adam Smith had said that "as soon as the land of any country has all become private property, the landlords, like all other men, like to reap where they never sowed, and demand a rent even for its natural produce." Such extortion, he had represented, forms a component part of the price of most commodities, though more than once he seems to be on the point of adopting a more defensible opinion.

The Ricardian Theory of Rent.—Now in 1817 Ricardo published his *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*; and in this work it was shown, as indeed other writers had observed, that rent is no part of price, and might be abolished without reducing prices in any degree. Rent is simply the surplus produce of land after capital and labour have received their current rate of remuneration. The quantity of this surplus varies with the quality and other circumstances of the soil. Society must cultivate a certain area of land with a certain degree of intensity in order to obtain food, but there is always a point where the less fertile soils

and the most costly tillage cease to yield a return exceeding the expenses of farming and transport to market. This margin of extensive and intensive cultivation shifts with the demand for agricultural produce. Speaking generally, there will always be some land and some capital employed which yield no surplus to serve as rent. It is the point where rent reaches zero that determines the rent of all other soils under cultivation. Hence Ricardo said "the rise of rent is always the effect of the increasing wealth of the country, and of the difficulty of providing food for its augmented population." The wider the margin of cultivation extends, the higher is the rent which landowners can obtain for the soils already in use. Though the principle did not characterize them as purposeless extortioners in the manner of the *Wealth of Nations*, it certainly suggested a doubt whether their functions might not be discharged by some less insatiable agent. It proved that as a governing party they were not to be trusted with the power of controlling the people's means of obtaining cheap food from abroad.

The Conflict between Capital and Labour.—The knowledge that rent is not a component part of price enabled Ricardo to apply, more consistently than did Adam Smith, the principle that labour is the real measure of exchangeable value; and to determine more precisely, by aid of the Malthusian theory of population, the relations between capital and labour, and the effects of taxation. As he defined with greater distinctness the antagonism between the interests of landowners and those of the rest of the community, so he made more evident the conflict involved in the distribution of wages and profits.

Say's Doctrine of Gluts and International Trade.—On the Continent the new political economy found a skilful expositor in J. B. Say. Recasting the doctrines

of Smith in a more symmetrical form, the Frenchman was able to add few material improvements of his own, but he developed with much felicity his master's views on trade. It was especially appropriate that a countryman of Voltaire and Montesquieu should render this service to international intercourse. Say atoned for much of his neglect of contemporary advances by the success with which he secured assent to the truth that the industry of all nations is made more productive by extending division of labour and enlarging the common market, and that wealth is to be increased by liberal exchanges with prosperous neighbours as well as by augmented production at home. Incidentally he gained association with an important corollary from this principle by advancing his theory of *débouchés* against the mischievous apprehension of gluts, which at various times has sanctioned restrictions, extravagance, and waste. He showed that general over-production is impossible because every one is always glad to exchange the commodities at his disposal if there exist sufficient of other commodities to make a bargain. Sometimes inconvenience is experienced when a particular commodity has been produced in excess through an error of judgment, or when the purchasing power of consumers has decreased through diminished production on their part. Complaints that scarcity of money is a cause of commercial dulness are merely expressions of shopkeepers' peevishness. If the proper commodities existed in sufficient abundance, their exchange would be effected, though one coin had to do the work of ten. The sole cure of over-production is increased aggregate production. "Les échanges terminés, il se trouve toujours qu'on a payé des produits avec des produits." This was, indeed, the chief practical contribution of the new political economy to the groundwork of modern

Europe; and it was the greatest, as it was the simplest, victory over the old order which science could have achieved.

Place of the Unemployed in the Modern Industrial System.—It remains to conclude this brief review of the industrial and economical revolution by a momentary reference to the most sinister of its conditions. In actual practice, by sober theory, England had worked out the system of free contract and individual competition, which was to supplant everywhere the system of status. Pregnant with its own evils, as well as prolific of its benefits, this industrial order had soon to submit to regulations, often ignorant, more often timid. But it is doubtful if any of the proletariat of to-day would be able to live as a serf lived under the *régime* of status. On the whole the gain has been great and permanent. The worst feature of the whole system up to the present time is that the leaders of industry and the statesmen of nations have so far failed to prevent periodical fluctuations of trade. The progressive industries have always been dependent for their progress on a ready supply of labour not otherwise employed at the moment. Hence it came about that the system of contract and competition, while it defended mankind from the terrors of famine and the burden of serfage, could not provide for the wants of rapidly increasing populations without the command of a very elastic supply of labour. In other words, labour was never sufficient unless it were often redundant. In order to meet the variations of markets, bewildering in extent and indispensable for the economies of large production, a numerous floating population, ever on the verge of hungry unemployment, has had to be kept on call as part of the great industry's ordinary stock-in-trade. "They also serve who only stand and wait" was from

the first a mocking counsel of consolation for the unemployed. But it did not save them, nor did it save the employed, from becoming pitiable victims to the principle, "Let one mind one, and all are minded then."

CHAPTER IX

POSITIVE SCIENCE: CRITICAL PHILOSOPHY

"Although the invention of plausible hypotheses, independent of any connection with experimental observation, can be of very little use in the promotion of natural knowledge; yet the discovery of simple and uniform principles, by which a great number of apparently heterogeneous phenomena are reduced to coherent and universal laws, must ever be allowed to be of considerable importance towards the improvement of the human intellect."—THOMAS YOUNG.

"Personal interests and feelings, in the social state, can only obtain the maximum of satisfaction by means of co-operation, and the necessary condition of co-operation is a common belief. All human society, consequently, is grounded on a system of fundamental opinions, which only the speculative faculty can provide, and which, when provided, directs our other impulses in their mode of seeking their gratification. And hence the history of opinions, and of the speculative faculty, has always been the leading element in the history of mankind."—J. S. MILL.

Positive Science and General History.—From the point of view of general history the growth of man's acquaintance with the physical conditions of his existence possesses a twofold significance. It is the part of special histories to record the steps by which the different sciences have developed, and to indicate the particular methods which promise by past success to facilitate further advance. It is the business of general history to discern the logical and practical results which accrue to society from scientific progress,

and to determine the speculative influence which consequent physical conceptions exert over men's beliefs. In the eighteenth century, science was notable chiefly because it encouraged men to trust in their own reason; in the nineteenth, it confirmed and rewarded this faith by yielding a knowledge of physical phenomena which has both totally changed the material conditions of civilized life, and greatly modified current conceptions of human existence. Hence the science of the period under review, falling between the two ages, issuing from the one and emerging into the other, was distinguished by few immediately practical results. And its influence on speculative beliefs hardly countervailed the dislike to vigorous thinking which circumstances attending the Revolution produced in the popular mind. On the other hand, science at this time first fully justified the hopes of earlier enthusiasts by laying the foundation of fact and theory, on which was reared the structure of modern physical knowledge.

The Growth of Positive Theory in Inductive Science.—So long as empirical data are few and disconnected, science cannot be said to exist. It is only when facts are brought into relation with one another by hypotheses, which at least give coherence for a time to a considerable body of particulars, that knowledge rises above common experience or curious observation. But as facts accumulate and grow more intelligible, scientific conceptions lose their provisional and arbitrary character. They at last become expressions of natural laws. While they organize known facts into consistent schemes, they provide tests for new conclusions and clues for further research. Though existing only in idea, they are capable of furnishing deductions which invariably conform with observation; though subject to correction and amplification, they rapidly absorb every

new discovery within their several provinces; though thus embracing ever-increasing quantities of data, they constantly tend towards greater simplification by realizing William of Ockham's logical law of parsimony, *Entia præter necessitatem non multiplicanda;* though mere theories, they prove themselves to be as positive as sensible experience. In fact, science becomes a system of positive theories which render particular phenomena intelligible, and the process of induction fruitful. It was to this fundamental stage that much of physical knowledge attained when in other respects the groundwork of our age was formed.

Newton's Law of Gravitation.—The enunciation of the most complete example of positive theory belonged, it is true, to an earlier period; but its speculative influence and extended application were of greatest historical importance throughout the eighteenth century and in the earlier years of the nineteenth. Not till more than fifty years after publication did Newton's great law secure general acceptance among students of science on the Continent. Mathematicians were still persuading themselves by rigorous demonstrations that in molar physics, gravitation—varying directly as the masses, and inversely as the square of the distance—was a more satisfactory formula than the Cartesian theory of vortices, when intelligent men began to feel the same confidence in their ability to comprehend the highest laws of matter as in a former generation they had felt it in their power to deal with spiritual questions after Descartes had offered them a starting-point in his *Cogito, ergo sum.* It was, moreover, during the process of verifying the theory that the greatest advances were made in the most imposing branch of physical science. In their efforts to complete Newton's application of his law to the movements of the heavenly bodies,

astronomers obtained a mastery of celestial physics which cast into insignificance the earlier empirical generalizations; and their triumphant course continued till the fabric of theoretical astronomy was handed over in an almost complete state to the observers of last century.

Construction of Lunar Tables for Navigation.—In one problem these labours gained wide respect for the new theory by yielding great practical benefit to the public. For a long time it had been well understood that the art of navigation was subject to formidable dangers and hindrances through want of means for accurately determining longitude, and many European governments had offered large rewards for the invention of sufficiently precise methods. One scheme, which promised to satisfy practical conditions if the necessary basis for calculation could be obtained, was to ascertain the difference between local time and that of some fixed station, and thence to reckon the difference of longitude between the two places. To do this it was necessary to employ very exact timekeepers; and not till 1765 did John Harrison receive a large reward from the British government for having made the first marine chronometers, on the principle of compensation through the unequal contraction of two metals, which proved competent to fulfil the required conditions. A second method likewise compared local time with that of a fixed station, but it sought to discover the latter by observing the position of the moon with regard to one of the principal planets or stars. Now, the invention of Hadley's reflecting quadrant in 1731 enabled seamen to make accurate observations from the deck of a vessel; but the process also required that the time of the fixed station, corresponding with the position of the moon, should be known. This datum could only be derived

from accurate lunar tables. Since the sixteenth century, astronomers had striven to forecast the precise movements of the moon; but the subject proved to be one of great complexity, which baffled all investigation till after Newton's discovery of the law of gravitation. Even then mathematicians had to extend their command of analysis, and solve the problem of three bodies, before they were able to advance beyond the point where the great master had left the question. Ultimately, through the labours of Euler, Clairaut, and d'Alembert, Mayer succeeded in constructing lunar tables which possessed so much accuracy that the Board of Longitude saw fit to adopt them for purposes of navigation. Rewards were granted to Euler and to Mayer's widow. The first nautical almanack was published in 1767, and since then the lunar theory has proved to be the most trustworthy source of the mariner's knowledge of his longitude.

General Acceptance of the Law of Gravity.—As late as 1740 the French Academy of Sciences divided a prize between a mathematician who attempted to account for the tides on the Cartesian hypothesis, and three others, who adopted the principle by which Newton had connected the tides with the attraction of the moon and the variations introduced by the sun as it acted in conjunction with, or in opposition to, this satellite. When in 1772 Maskelyne proposed testing, by the deflection of a plumb-line, the attraction exerted by the mass of a hill, he recommended the trial on the ground that it "would make the universal gravitation of matter, as it were, palpable to every person, and fit to convince those who will yield their assent to nothing but downright experiment." But, as a matter of fact, the celebrated Schehallion measurements, which were undertaken in consequence, and the following trials by the torsion balance, were chiefly interesting on account

of the information they furnished concerning the density of the earth. Meanwhile continental mathematicians had become fully aware that Newton had exhausted the resources of the ancient geometry—an admission which their English rivals unfortunately failed to concede—and they had equipped themselves with the powers of the calculus which he and Leibniz had bequeathed to them. Astronomical investigation now ceased to be an ordeal of the theory of gravity, and verification of the principle was merged in the rapid progress of the science. When some discrepancy between calculation and fact occurred, it only attracted more attention to the solution of the problem when it was reached. Anomalies were invariably proved to be but apparent, till at last they came to be taken as indications that a peculiarly refined illustration of the theory was about to be discovered.

The Law of Gravity extended to Sidereal Astronomy.—As the general tendency of Newton's astronomical labours was to demonstrate the harmonious interdependence obtaining at present among the planetary bodies, so that of the speculations of the next epoch was to prove the stability of the solar system, and to remove all apprehension of any considerable change in the seasons on the earth. And as soon as the internal economy of our planetary system had satisfactorily been determined, its external relations were brought within the limits of discussion. As early as 1783, William Herschel, the initiator of a new phase of observation and the founder of sidereal astronomy, concluded from his consideration of the proper motions of the fixed stars that the solar system was travelling through space to a point in the constellation of Hercules. By constructing telescopes of very superior power, the same astronomer was enabled to detect the

first of a large number of planets, which modern observation has added to those known to the ancient world. But the most notable result of his persistent researches was the detection of orbitual motions among the binary stars, similar to those produced in the solar system by force of gravity. This presumptive evidence, that the law of gravity obtains in other systems than our own, was laid before the Royal Society in 1802.

The Nebular Hypothesis.—Herschel's profound examination of the heavenly bodies also afforded support to a conjectural extension of the law of gravity to a more distant region of time as well as of space. Hitherto the nebulæ known to astronomers had not numbered 150. Herschel proved this class of phenomena to be large and varied. Among them he detected nebulosities which appeared to be homogeneous and irresolvable into stars, others which seemed to have central cores of different degrees of definiteness. Hence he was led to hazard the conjecture that these nebulæ were stages in the formation of stars, and that the celestial bodies were produced by the condensation of nebulous matter which was originally diffused through space. Now, as early as 1755 Kant had applied such a hypothesis to explain the evolution of the solar system in its present form; and in 1796 a similar theory had been put forth by Laplace. The hypothesis postulated the existence of highly diffused nebulous matter which rotated in the form of a spheroid, and, gradually condensing and cooling, threw off concentric rings till only the central portion remained to form our sun. The rings broke up and formed new spheroids, which also condensed, revolved, and sometimes threw off rings of their own, thus forming the planets and their satellites. Kant thought that he could account for both condensation and rotation by the two elementary

forces of attraction and repulsion; but Laplace supposed that condensation was the result of cooling, and postulated an original impulse of rotation. Both speculatists maintained that the harmonious disposition of our system pointed to a single genesis, and urged that the actual movements agreed with the particular process supposed. For some time the confirmation, which Herschel's researches afforded, was disregarded in the belief that, since more powerful telescopes resolved many nebulæ into clusters of stars, only higher magnifying powers were required to deprive all nebulosities of their distinctive character. But more recently various facts were seen to coincide with the hypothesis, and to render it probable that the outstanding nebulæ are really fragments of diffused matter in different phases of condensation. Later still, spectrum analysis has proved some of the nebulæ to be of a gaseous nature, and the sun and planets to be made of the same materials.

Newton's Theory of Light.—Indirectly, the pursuit of astronomical knowledge led to the cultivation of a branch of physics, the fundamental theory of which was only reached at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Long before the real nature of light was satisfactorily ascertained, the need for better telescopes had urged men to careful study of optical phenomena, and certainty of observation had required some acquaintance with the character of the medium through which the existence, form, and position of the heavenly bodies are perceived. Researches after the latter kind of information had yielded empirical laws of atmospheric refraction, the truth that light travels with a certain velocity, and that the effect of aberration is thus produced. Indeed, Roemer's inference from the eclipses of Jupiter's moons, that light travels at the rate of

192,500 miles per second,* and Bradley's verification thereof by discovering apparent movements of the stars in consequence, may be said to have formed the basis of modern speculation on the nature of light. The scientific construction of telescopes had, on the other hand, furnished a variety of data from which theory might advance to explain the nature and movements of the illuminating agent. It was, indeed, when he was engaged in grinding lenses that Newton made the experiments by which he discovered the composite character of white light, and the unequal refrangibility of the different rays which form it.

The Undulatory Theory of Light.—But till the beginning of the nineteenth century the authority of Newton, and the ability with which he had reconciled his corpuscular hypothesis with facts, deterred people from resorting to the more difficult assumptions of the undulatory theory. Then the necessary steps towards establishing what Huyghens and Hooke had only been able partially to formulate were made by Thomas Young. Regarded from our present point of view, Young's first investigations appear to have proved that his assumption that light is a sensation caused by the vibration of an ethereal fluid was at least a good working hypothesis. But unfortunately his experiments and reasonings were ignorantly and maliciously criticized by Brougham in the *Edinburgh Review*; the public cared so little to adjudicate on the merits of the controversy that only one copy of Young's able reply was sold,† and the current scientific conceptions remained undisturbed till, years later, other witnesses gave

* The real speed is about 186,000 miles per second.

† One consequence of the attack was that a publisher, who had offered Young £1000 for the copyright of his Lectures, was obliged to request to be released from his bargain.

evidence in favour of the theory. Then, by help of Malus, Arago, and Fresnel, the problem of polarization of light was solved by developing the undulatory hypothesis another step. The theory did not demand a new assumption, as the corpuscular doctrine so frequently did; it merely necessitated a more ample conception of what was already granted. It only required that the vibrations should be thought of as transversal, and not as longitudinal. Hence it led directly to a fuller explanation of double refraction by showing that certain crystals act as selective media to ordinary light, and only permit the transversal waves to pass in certain planes of vibration. Hence, too, it yielded data for most recondite calculations and most striking verifications. However advancing knowledge may further modify its statement, it afforded the means of bringing a great body of phenomena within the scope of calculation, and thus fairly ranked as a positive theory of physics.

Theory of Sound.—The mode in which sound is produced by a wave-like motion of the atmosphere gave Young a clue to the nature of light-rays; but it was only in this period that the true character of aerial vibrations was defined, and the fundamental theory of acoustics was completed by Laplace. This period was also remarkable for Chladni's contributions to the theory of musical tone, and the study of the diverse vibratory phenomena which are embraced by the science of sound. Chladni has, indeed, been called the father of modern acoustics; and the distinction is sufficiently just, because at this time the development of the science did not so much need the guidance of some new fundamental principle as careful investigation of the various conditions which determine different forms of audible vibration.

Dynamical Theory of Heat.—It was far otherwise with the study of heat. The nature of this agent was no less misunderstood than was that of light before the discoveries of Young and Fresnel; and the want of positive theory was equally unfavourable to the acquisition of empirical knowledge and the advance of scientific conceptions of the universe. A like belief in the emission of a material substance served to connect observed facts, and in some instances, as in those of conduction and radiation, it served to do so satisfactorily. But in the last two years of the eighteenth century both Rumford and Davy independently proved that heat is not material. The experiments of the latter consisted in melting ice by friction; but he did not assert that heat was motion till several years after he had made his experiments. Rumford, on the other hand, predisposed to regard the subject very seriously by his investigations into the economy of heating and lighting arrangements, instituted a careful examination of the circumstances attending the generation of heat during the process of boring cannon. He showed that the elevation of temperature was entirely produced through expenditure of energy by an experimental application of friction produced by horse-power to heat bodies of metal and water, and by proofs that nothing had been lost in weight or in capacity for absorbing or producing heat by the substances which by their motion had supplied high degrees of warmth. "What is heat?" asked Rumford. "Is there any such thing as an igneous fluid? Is there any such thing that can with propriety be called caloric?" He then argued "that anything which any insulated body, or system of bodies, can continue to furnish without limitation cannot possibly be a material substance;" that it is "extremely difficult, if not quite impossible, to form any distinct idea of

anything capable of being excited and communicated in the manner the heat was excited and communicated in these experiments, except it be motion." Rumford also endeavoured to estimate the quantitative relation between heat produced by friction and heat produced by combustion; he spoke of the power of animals as being due to their food, which might thus be caused to supply heat mechanically or by being used as fuel; and he pointed out that heat could be produced by mechanical action of various kinds. Hence he was, in truth, the first of a line of workers who were to demonstrate in another generation the correlation and conservation of forces.

The Phlogistic Theory of Chemistry.—In themselves both the demonstrations of Rumford and Davy were virtually complete, but neither was presented without logical error. Perhaps it was on this account that they failed to convert the scientific world. And up to a certain point the persistence of the belief in a hypothetical caloric was paralleled by the obstinacy of a cardinal assumption of the older chemists. For a long time phlogiston was conceived to be the principle of combustion, as caloric was imagined to be that of heat; its expulsion was supposed to be the occasion of fire, as that of caloric was supposed to be the occasion of elevated temperature. And so closely was its assumed existence connected with the state of chemical knowledge of the day, that its systematic determination by Stahl is rightly considered to have been of great service in aiding the collocation of discrete facts. But the authority of this principle was not so lasting as that of its physical analogue. Its retention was inconsistent with true scientific progress, and its repudiation was the first of the steps which made chemistry modern. The cause of this change was the institution of pneumatic

chemistry by Black, Priestley, Cavendish, and Scheele, though all these investigators believed implicitly in the phlogistic theory.

Modern Theory of Combustion.—To the discoverers themselves the bearing of pneumatic phenomena on the theory of combustion was not apparent, and indeed, hydrogen was for a time in danger of being identified with phlogiston. It required Lavoisier to show convincingly that the phlogistic doctrine was superfluous and confusing. He proved that it was rather oxygen, the so-called dephlogisticated air, which invariably accompanied combustion by uniting with the burning bodies; he endeavoured to identify the same element as the principle of acidity; and he finally committed to oblivion the old system and its grotesque terminology, by helping to construct and introduce the groundwork of modern chemical nomenclature.

Institution of Modern Chemistry.—The revolution in chemistry was as English in inception, as French in consummation, and as European in extent as the revolution in politics. It was also nearly as provocative of conflict between Frenchmen and their neighbours. Of the discoverers who gave it origin, Black alone lived to acquiesce in the repudiation of phlogiston, while Priestley to his last moments continued to combat in its behalf. In the controversy which attended its propagation Lavoisier was aided by Fourcroy, Monge, Morveau, and Berthollet; the new doctrines were styled the French system, and their acceptance was enforced by a vigorous onslaught on the chemists of other countries. The book of one able defender of the old theory, that of the Irishman, Kirwan, was even translated into French, and refuted in sections by Lavoisier and his associates. But the advocates of the old opinions were in no position to retard seriously the victory of

truth. Kirwan himself candidly admitted that he was overcome; and, with a new generation of chemists, the Lavoisierian doctrine became the universally accepted system. It only remained for Davy to correct the exaggerated opinion which the anti-phlogistic school had formed of the functions of oxygen. By his discovery that chlorine is a simple substance, he conclusively refuted the theory that oxygen is the exclusive principle of acidity—a correction which Berthollet maintained on the ground of his experiments on sulphuretted hydrogen and prussic acid. Indeed, the history of synthetic chemistry at this critical period is to be read in the names given to chlorine at different junctures. Scheele's original name—dephlogisticated muriatic acid—records the sway of Stahl's system; the French name—oxymuriatic acid—indicates the supremacy of oxygen; while Davy's title, derived from the colour of its gas, asserts that the substance is an independent element, capable though it is to support combustion and form acid matter, which could not be brought within Lavoisier's generalization, even by the power of electrolysis.*

Theory of Multiple Proportions.—Meanwhile analytical inquiry had rapidly advanced. Owing to the labours of Bergman and Scheele, of Klaproth and Vauquelin, to the platinum crucible of Wollaston, and the blowpipe of the Swedes, above all, to the attention attracted to the indestructibility of matter, and the importance conferred on the use of the balance by Lavoisier's innovations, chemical analysis had reached a relatively high state of precision, and had accumulated a large quantity of experimental results. But no theory

* Berzelius was the latest chemist of note to talk of oxidized hydrochloric acid, while his cook and factotum held to oxymuriatic acid still longer. See Dr. Thorpe's lecture on Wöhler.

of chemical combination invested these data with quantitative exactness, or regulated the relative quantities of the constituents necessary to produce a definite effect. Current opinion on the subject was so unsettled that a man like Berthollet could deliberately affirm that bodies were capable of uniting with each other in all possible proportions. The work of showing that chemical synthesis takes place according to a fundamental law of quantitative relation was only performed by Dalton in the first decade of the nineteenth century. This inquirer proved that bodies always combine in certain definite proportions, that each element has a constant weight of its own, and, therefore, that it always combines in multiple proportions of this weight. Dalton's own statement of his theory was entirely founded on the conception of primary atomic weights, the relation of which could be expressed numerically. But whatever view may be taken by latter-day physics of the idea of primary indivisible atoms of different weights, his principle of multiple proportions introduced into the science a clearness of conception which was of incalculable importance in enabling chemists to deal with the vast quantity of data yielded by modern laboratories, and it originated a system of notation which became indispensable to scientific intercourse.*

Theory of Voltaic Electricity.—Having extended itself to the borders of molecular physics, chemistry was overtaken by another science, and doubly connected with the rest of the scheme of human knowledge.

* "Whatever may be the ultimate fate of the theory which found deliberate expression in the *New System of Chemical Philosophy*," says Dr. Thorpe,—"and no one can say that it is not destined to give place to a higher and even nobler generalization, which shall more clearly connect matter with the forces associated with it—it is certain that the ages to come will reckon it as the central, dominant conception which has actuated the chemistry of the nineteenth century."

During the eighteenth century the study of electrical phenomena had been prosecuted with great diligence and success, and the invention of the voltaic pile enabled chemists to claim electric force as a part of their province. In 1800 Nicholson and Carlisle discovered that the energy of the pile could decompose water into its chemical constituents. Other experimenters soon extended this power of electricity over other substances. Davy made it his special business to identify the action of the galvanic battery with chemical action. By a number of well-contrived experiments he demonstrated that "amongst the substances that combine chemically, all those, the electrical energies of which are well known, exhibit opposite states;" and he asked whether from this relation of electrical energy to chemical affinity it may not be supposed that they are identical and "an essential property of matter." This statement was made in his famous Bakerian lecture of 1806. Twenty years afterwards he found that his experimental results had in great measure been anticipated by Berzelius and Hisinger, and that the branch of chemistry of which he had helped to lay the foundation had meanwhile obtained greater speculative importance. Thus had been induced a hope, as he said, that "many of the corpuscular changes, now obscure, will ultimately be found to depend upon the same causes, and to be governed by the same laws."

The Theological Stage of Geological Knowledge.—In those branches of physical research which so far have come under review, the construction of positive theory proceeds on the sure grounds of observation, experiment, and verifiable calculation. But in other departments of inductive science which possess equal claims to be founded on sound generalizations, experiments are rarely obtainable, the scope of observation is restricted, and mathematical calculation is almost

inapplicable. Such sciences are those which deal with the constitution of our globe and the laws of organic life. These studies, moreover, appeared to be more closely concerned with man's own nature and position than any others of a physical character, and, accordingly, they furnished a greater than common proportion of visionary hypotheses to retard the development of practicable theory. In the eighteenth century geology suffered especial disadvantage from these circumstances. Though many observers, of whom the greater number were Italians, ably endeavoured to explain several of the phenomena of the earth's crust by known causes, every comprehensive scheme of geological history became entangled in the miraculous as soon as the supposed periods of the creation and deluge were reached. Geology, indeed, was so much subjected to the control of natural theologians that it was regarded rather as an illustration in orthodox cosmogonies than as a subject for serious scientific investigation. Its abasement seemed the more assured because men refused to connect it with the pursuit of utility. Hence they sanctioned the more readily its exclusive employment by theologians because they supposed it to be an entirely speculative study, and therefore the lawful property of those to whose speculative interests it could best be adapted.

The Stratigraphical Treatment of Geology.—This attitude of indifference was only disturbed as the practical importance of mineralogy became better understood and its connection with geology received demonstration. In fact, if the founding of modern geology be defined as the work of first exciting the interest of the European public in the study of geological formations, the father of the science must be reputed to have been a professor in the School of Mines

at Freiburg. It was, indeed, the success of Werner in presenting the structure of the earth's crust as a subject of paramount practical importance that enlisted the first large body of students in geological investigation, and it was his personal charm and enthusiasm which induced his pupils to regard their study as a sublime science. Werner established his school during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, when the tender age of geology permitted the reproduction from earlier times of a master's power over the minds of his followers. Yet his own contribution to positive geological theory was commensurate neither with his extraordinary perception of mineralogical details nor with his love of discursive views. He was, however, at least instrumental in giving a wide circulation to the fact, well known to many earlier geologists, that the strata of the earth's crust have certain constant relations to one another in order of superposition over the primary unstratified rock. Moreover, according to some testimony, he taught his pupils to discriminate the different formations by the fossils they contain, and to perceive that the more recent the formation, the nearer the fossil remains resemble the beings of the present world.

Positive Theory in Geology.—On the other hand, Werner's etiological speculations and assumptions seriously impaired the progress of scientific opinion. Contending that the igneous rocks were aqueous precipitates, postulating at his pleasure the operation of unknown causes, and suspending when convenient the existence of present conditions, he led his disciples to deny the obvious inferences of more sagacious observers. But while he was thus depraving the imaginations of his pupils, a Scottish geologist was quietly working out a rigorous method of observation, deduction, and comparison. Hutton discarded alike speculation on the

origin of things and conjectures about obsolete causes. "Nunc naturalem causam quærimus et assiduam, non raram et fortuitam," was the maxim which guided his investigations. Assuming only the operation of existing forces, he applied them to explain the structures discovered by investigation, and having ascended through particulars to his conclusions, he descended again and verified them by comparison with more extended observations. He thus arrived at a theory of the earth which, though imperfectly developed by himself, provided a positive basis for geological science. His severe exclusion of hypothetical causes led him to assign immense periods of time to the different processes of formation. Prompted by the suggestions of Black, and warranted by the chemical experiments of Sir James Hall, he applied the principle of pressure to modify the effects of heat on the rocks which had been fused beneath the sea. Constant to his belief that we have neither evidence of a beginning nor prospect of an end, he maintained that no order of rocks betrayed a genuinely primitive character. Even the granite of the mountains he determined to be of a derivative nature. To him, at any rate, the cycle of formation and decay—the constant decomposition by mechanical and chemical causes, the accumulation of waste into strata beneath the seas, their fusion into solid masses by heat when not permitted to retain their sedimentary character, their elevations and distortions by volcanic force—presented no element of absolute inception.*

* It is interesting to note that the founders of the Geological Society of London in 1807 were actuated not by zeal for the construction of theories, but by a general desire to collect facts and by special interest in the new French views on crystallography. These views formed the basis of the modern science. Romé Delisle showed, in 1783, that the angle of inclination of the faces of primitive crystalline forms remains constant in the same species of mineral. Bergman noticed how the planes of cleavage

Intellectual Influence of Scientific Geology.—In the intellectual development of Europe during the last hundred years, no idea so powerfully assisted in the emancipation of men's minds as did this naturalistic conception of the being of the world. Hutton's principles were widely advertised by the exposition of Playfair; they only needed to be corrected and extended by one who was in possession of all attainable facts. Their general reception, however, depended on the abandonment of traditional prejudices respecting the age of the world. As long as men preferred to invoke the intervention of catastrophes rather than rely on the protracted operation of known causes, geological theory could not but be more imaginary than positive. Such a preference was entertained with inconceivable tenacity in various quarters till a comparatively recent date. So far as the development of the science was affected, it did not long survive the publication of Lyell's great work in 1830. The chief cause which prepared for the surrender of the old cosmogonies likewise dates from the period under review, and it furnished irresistible evidence not only in behalf of positive geological theory, but in behalf of reasoned biological doctrine.

The Origin of Palæontology.—William Smith

throw light on the building up of minerals from simple crystalline forms. Hauy, however, methodically reduced the structure of crystals to compounds of primitive forms. He successfully proved that crystalline formation takes place according to law, and consequently that geometrical form may be a test of the nature of substances:—a conclusion which Haüy illustrated by forecasting, from his observation of a difference in the angles of specimens supposed to be the same mineral, the discovery of Vauquelin by chemical analysis, that in one case baryta was present, and in the other strontia. The study of cleavages and angles was greatly facilitated by Wollaston's reflecting goniometer; but soon the importance of the axes of crystals was insisted upon by Weiss and Mohs, and crystallography became less associated with molecular hypotheses and more connected with optical science.

and, in a lesser degree, Werner, had exhibited the manner in which fossils are characteristic of the strata they occupy, and how by their means the relative ages of different beds may be determined. Fossils being granted to be really remains of past life on the earth, it followed that the series of strata must have been laid down during lapses of time sufficient to permit the growth of a succession of organic forms. Now, even in matters of geology the nineteenth century was not prepared to follow its predecessors and assume imaginary causes to account for the presence of fossils.* Gradually it was admitted that organic remains implied the efflux of considerable periods of time during the stratification of the earth's crust. "It is abundantly obvious," Cuvier affirmed in the most popular work on geology of the time, "that it is to these fossil remains alone that we owe even the commencement of a theory of the earth, and that without them we should, perhaps, never have even suspected that there existed any successive epochs and a series of different operations in the formation of the globe." "The application of botanical and zoological evidence," wrote Humboldt in 1844, "to determine the relative age of rocks—this chronometry of the earth's surface which was already present to the lofty mind of Hooke—indicates one of the most glorious epochs of modern geognosy, which has finally, on the Continent at least, been emancipated from the sway of Semitic doctrines." But how immeasurable were these periods could only be demonstrated as the circumstances attending the generation of a series of organic forms were better understood. Hence it was a coincidence of

* "Even in 1765," says Sir Archibald Geikie, "the controversy about 'figured stones' had not yet died out, and there were still not a few observers who continued to believe that the apparent shells found in the rocks of the land never really belonged to living creatures."

no small moment that about this time the higher problems of biology engaged the attention of the great French naturalists, and that at the same time the discovery of a large quantity of fossils in the Paris basin brought into prominence the palæontological aspect of the problem of species.*

Speculative Biology.—The theory of evolution has been placed only in our own time on a positive basis, and it is impossible to claim an equal rank for the suggestions of earlier inquiries. Yet the formation of the solar system from an original vapour, and the development of the earth's crust by continuous change, were maintained with considerable force during the period under review. It was likewise with evolution in biology. The speculations of Geoffroy St. Hilaire, Lamarck, Goethe, and von Baer constituted an intermediate stage in the train of thought, which surely conducted men from the study of comparative anatomy to our present views of the phenomena of life. Like the dynamic theory of heat, the doctrine of evolution in biology, though adumbrated by previous thinkers, now received its first reasoned statement, to be in another generation extended and verified by inductive research till it yielded positive laws of the highest order.

Early History of the Theory of Evolution.—In

* At this time Cuvier could justly say: "Tant de travaux et des résultats si heureux dans la partie philosophique de la zoologie autorisent bien à dire qu'elle est en quelque sorte aujourd'hui une science française. Appliquées un jour à toutes les espèces dans un ouvrage général, nos méthodes obtiendront bientôt une influence universelle."

To-day French writers claim yet more. "La France," says M. Tannery, "pendant la période qui nous occupe, ne s'élève pas seulement au premier rang pour les sciences mathématiques et physiques ; sa suprématie s'affirme également dans les sciences naturelles, et dans ce domaine elle se trouve encore moins contestée" (*apud*, *Histoire Générale*, tome ix., ed. by Lavisse and Rambaud).

botany the natural system of classification of the two Jussieus had already introduced the idea of close relationship among species, when Goethe pointed out with success, as C. Wolff had done thirty years before in vain, that the structure of plants was explicable as a metamorphosis and repetition of a single original form —the leaf around an axis. In the first decade of the nineteenth century Lamarck perceived a like resemblance among animal organisms, and maintained that all species of living bodies are descended from a few simpler forms. Dwelling upon the slight gradations which separate the members in the scale of organic life, and the results produced by artificial selection, he accounted for the variations now obtaining in nature by the influence of different foods and climates, and the effects of persistent exercise, operating through many generations of hereditary transmission. St. Hilaire declared that living beings were constructed after one plan, and that their different organs were merely modifications of an original type. He remarked that some parts occurred in all animals, though greatly differing in their mode of development; he further noticed that these parts always exist in the same relation to one another; and he interpreted the presence of superfluous organs as rudimentary survivals of what had been useful to pre-existing species. With Goethe he entertained, the belief that the superior development of one part or organ is compensated by inferior development of other parts. And Goethe, not content with throwing out formative ideas, confirmed the doctrine of homology by discovering that the intermaxillary bone of the lower animals exists in a rudimentary form in man; and he drew attention to serial homologies, or comparisons of different parts or organs in the same individual, by showing that the skull of vertebrates is only a development

of a certain number of vertebræ.* To the study of homologies, thus initiated, Goethe gave the name of morphology, which has now come to denote that wider department of natural history which Darwin called "its very soul." †

Persistence of Teleological Conceptions in Biology.—Yet the hypothesis of special creations remained unshaken by the theory of derivative species. Resistance in its behalf was advanced from all quarters, and from none so effectually as from the naturalist who did most to supply facts for the ultimate establishment of the doctrine of evolution. The wide and profound investigations of Cuvier introduced a new classification of the animal kingdom, founded on resemblances of morphological type and homology. But so impressed was he by the apparent organization of animal structures towards a final cause, that he would not abandon the

* Writing to Knebel in 1784, when his essay on the intermaxillary bone was composed, though it was not published till thirty years later, Goethe said: "I have refrained from indicating the logical outcome of the discovery—it is a truth which Herder has already printed in his *Ideen*, viz. that the distinctness of man from the brute is not to be looked for in any single point of difference. . . . Every creature is a note, a shade, in a great harmony, and the study which apprehends this harmony as a whole and in its vastness is alone fruitful; each isolated thing, otherwise taken, is a meaningless letter." Goethe was equally advanced in his opinions on geology, which he had been led to study by his official duties at the mines. His scientific reputation, however, greatly suffered from his mistaken theory of optics.

† The tendency of morphology to trace species to a common origin was strengthened by comparative embryology in the hands of von Baer, who later in the century showed that up to certain stages of their development the special forms of the most diverse animals are concealed in a general resemblance, that the process of differentiation starts from points indistinguishable from phases in the life of lower organisms, and, by his discovery of the ovarian ovum of mammals, that the origin of these animals is similar to that of others lower in the scale. Meanwhile Bichat had opened the way for the refinements of the cell-theory, by analyzing the animal organism into a series of simple tissues possessing definite structural characters.

traditional belief that species were created with the particular purpose of fitting them for their conditions of life. In his controversy with St. Hilaire, the state of science at that time enabled him to claim victory; his theory of types became generally accepted, and zoological research continued to be mainly empirical. Convinced that every organized being forms a complete system within itself, exactly adapted to a certain habit of life, Cuvier deduced from the most slender data the structure which an animal must have possessed in order to conserve itself under the conditions and limitations indicated by the evidence at command. Hence, by employing the method of Zadig, he was able to discern the nature of the fossil remains exhumed near Paris, and to bring them into comparison with the structures of living beings. Hitherto marine fossils had not supplied positive evidence that in past times species existed which do not live at the present day, for it was impossible to say certainly that the like did not inhabit some remote parts of the ocean. But Cuvier had the remains of large land and river animals to deal with, and from them he proved, with the assistance of Brongniart, that a series of extinct beings had once inhabited the globe during a succession of geological periods, and that these creatures bore evident morphological resemblance to one another and to animals of the present day. Thus, though he himself remained confident that lacunæ in the sequence of organic development manifested the intervention of special creations, though he would affirm that none of the agents which Nature now employs would have been sufficient for the production of her ancient works, he virtually created the science of palæontology, which, as Huxley said, would in our own generation have been obliged to invent the doctrine of evolution if it had not already existed.

Relation between Science and Philosophy.—While the advance of inductive science towards a system of positive theory is calculated to expand men's views of speculative problems, it is equally serviceable in setting forth the line of demarcation which separates the province of physical knowledge from the domain of metaphysics. As they become more complete, the explanations of science repose more directly on space and time of indefinite extent, they tend to divide matter more and more minutely, and they more successfully reduce phenomena to simple expressions of force. Yet it is the essential nature of these means of explanation that they are in themselves inexplicable by science. Organized life, too, is seen to elude more and more hopelessly the reach of merely mechanical conceptions as the difference between selective aggregation in the growth of crystals and the evolution of species and intelligence in the animal world is rendered more apparent. More important still, the relation of cause and effect, the fundamental principle of all scientific investigation, is found on examination to be merely a mental prejudice, if the evidence of sense alone is admitted; while if testimony from other quarters be permitted to invest the nexus with intrinsic reality, the truths of science are made contingent on a first cause, or are swallowed up in the mysteries of infinite regression.

The Problem of Philosophy.—Now it is the part of philosophy to consider the numerous problems which are thus left outstanding by the methods of science; but the history of philosophy has, for the most part, remained independent of the history of science. Such is the nature of the human mind that, till very recently in the development of the race, men have felt far more concern about the ultimate nature of things than about

the phenomenal laws of common experience. Thus philosophical and religious thought have hitherto held a position of great individual importance. During the eighteenth century, though the progress of science most immediately influenced current opinions, philosophy still pursued a course of its own, and continued to carry on the discussion which those, who devote attention to the highest problems of existence, render sooner or later of effect in the march of civilization. One aspect of its development, it is true, was connected with the views which obtained support from material science; but this was only a one-sided application of Locke's doctrines, while philosophy itself was following the impulses which Locke and Descartes together had communicated to it. The main problem of philosophy was then, as it had been since the downfall of scholasticism, to determine the conditions and worth of experience. All speculative questions were seen to centre in the inquiry, How is knowledge possible? How can there be any commerce between two such heterogeneous existences as mind and matter? How can we have any confidence in the result of such commerce? What, in short, is the relation between subject and object?

Kant's New Point of View.—In 1781 appeared Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason.** This book permanently changed the conditions of speculative inquiry, and placed the theory of knowledge in such a position that to this day the would-be philosopher must reckon with the great thinker of Königsberg before he can claim to consider pertinently the first principles of existence. Kant united in himself the two partial and conflicting tendencies of thought which prevailed in England and Germany. The academic routine of his

* For an elementary account of Kant's metaphysics, see my *Students' Introduction to Critical Philosophy*.

youth acquainted him with the body of logical abstractions which Wolff had developed from Leibniz's suggestions. By his own exertions Kant ascertained their vanity ; and when English sensationalism appeared to be the true alternative, his study of Hume apprised him of its inability to support the fabric of our experience as we conceive it to be. Convinced that philosophy up to that time had failed, he suspected that its subject-matter might have been stated wrongly. To quote again his oft-repeated description of his innovation, he proposed to do "just what Copernicus did in attempting to explain the celestial movements. When he found that he could make no progress by assuming that all the heavenly bodies moved round the spectator, he reversed the process and tried the experiment of assuming that the spectator revolved while the stars remained at rest." As Copernicus reversed with success the standpoint of the Ptolemaic system, so Kant hoped to succeed in solving the questions of metaphysics by abjuring both the individual's ideas and sensations as the ultimate truth of reality, and by assuming that, instead of the mind being formed by experience, the mind itself should form received experience according to its own laws.

The Critical Method.—According to Kant we must suppose that in our experience thought contributes sundry relations, subject to which all our empirical knowledge must be received. Now, if this prove to be the case, these indispensable elements will be forms of synthesis or relation ; and since experience is impossible without them, they will be *à priori* or prior to experience itself. Kant calls such *à priori* elements transcendental, and his philosophy consists in a transcendental criticism which endeavours to bring to light all the *à priori* principles of synthesis which serve as the ground-plan of

experience. And whatever may be thought of Kant's success in his efforts to do this, he himself entertained no doubt that, to quote one of the last sentences of his first critique, "Der kritische Weg ist allein noch offen."

Extensive Influence of the Critical Philosophy.—From the point of view of general history the introduction of the transcendental method into philosophy is of more importance on account of its negative power than in virtue of its positive developments. Kant himself said that "as the world has never been, and doubtless never will be, without some kind of metaphysic . . . it is the first and weightiest concern of philosophy to render it powerless for harm by closing up the sources of error." He did not succeed in imposing upon the world a new system; and though for a time his countrymen imagined that wisdom consisted in acquaintance with his doctrines, his direct influence was soon intercepted by the efforts of those who endeavoured to extend his method beyond the barriers which he had erected. But his criticism of knowledge afforded ample defence against dogmatism of all schools. If he showed that our intellectual conceptions are good only for our phenomenal world, he still more conclusively demonstrated the futility of endeavouring to explain by our sensations the nature of those relations which form the basis of experience and are implied in the very fact of sensation. Not that his protests were everywhere successful. The indiscretions of those who sought to extend and develop the transcendental method gave occasion to lengthened neglect of his admonitions among the psychologists, who supposed that on an empirical analysis of mental phenomena a metaphysic of existence can be based. And, in any case, to reach those minds, which are naturally inclined to mistake empirical psychology for an adequate philosophy, would not have

been easy without employing a more persuasive style of exposition. Nevertheless, it is to Kant's argument that we should trace the successful resistance to the teachings of sensationalism and materialism which came to us from the eighteenth century. Though strangely disguised in the process of repeated transfer, and frequently in anomalous alliance with the impulsive assertions of common sense, his contentions passed from thinker to thinker, and were ever ready on urgent occasion to combat the pretensions of those who presume to philosophize without metaphysics. For a time this part of his influence was the less prominent because the intellectual reaction at the beginning of the nineteenth century protected the old faiths from serious harm. Later, a generation arose which knew not Kant, persecuted his successors, and demanded only the means to build up the fabric of material science. But now, when these very physical methods themselves are at all points reversing vulgar conceptions of knowledge, a return to Kant commends itself to all circumspect thinkers as the best preparation for a sound apprehension of the problems of existence. It would appear that after more than a century's unremitting service to sober thinking, his criticism will be the chief discipline which our generation will derive in its eager search through the history of philosophy for aid in dealing with new versions of old questions.

Kant's Treatment of Ethics and Religion.—*The Critique of Pure Reason* placed out of the range of human knowledge the objects which, as moral agents, men are accustomed to regard with veneration. It denied that men can know anything of God, self, or will; but it coupled this denial with the reservation that what is speculatively unknowable may be apprehended practically. In succeeding works Kant brought his

transcendental method to bear on the metaphysics of practice. Analyzing the faculty which he called the practical reason, as he had formerly analyzed what he called pure reason, he affirmed that he found practically postulated therein the objects of whose existence speculative thought could know nothing. The moral law, free will, and God were represented to be practical truths of reason, which men must respect in deed, though they be hidden from knowledge.

Kant's Moral Influence.—This application of the critical method has not in itself been productive of great philosophical consequences, though it furnished the clue to those who sought to develop transcendentalism into a system. But for the German people it was a mighty adjuration to live only for its better self. Kant's great work had made him the most influential thinker in Germany when his theory of ethics proclaimed with stern insistence that man possessed within himself a moral law, a categorical imperative, which was the sole legitimate arbiter of conduct. This announcement was made also when the sophistries of popular philosophy and a nerveless enlightenment from abroad had put to shame faith in lofty purpose and high ideals. To such an age, said Schiller, unworthy as it was to receive a Solon, Kant was a Draco. He held up to it the moral law of reason as the only guide of life, and forbade conduct to pursue pleasure here or happiness hereafter. The will is free, he said, because "thou oughtst" implies "thou canst:" the self lives beyond this life because otherwise our wills could never be brought into harmony with the law: and God exists because no other power could mete out to virtue that reward of happiness which reason knows it to deserve; but it is the moral law in its purity, untouched by thought of selfish satisfaction, unmoved by worship of the Deity, which alone can

produce through the will truly good action. As the categorical imperative — the command to man as a rational being to act as if the maxim of his action could become, and were to become by his will, a universal law of nature—is the logical ground for the ideas of freedom, immortality, and God, so is obedience to it leal only when tendered for its own sake. "Nothing," says Kant, "could be more fatal to morality than that we should wish to derive it from examples. For every example of it that is set before me must be first itself tested by principles of morality, whether it is worthy to serve as an original example, *i.e.* as a pattern; but by no means can it authoritatively furnish the conception of morality. Even the Holy One of the Gospels must first be compared with our ideal of moral perfection before we can recognize Him as such."

Dogma and the Moral Law.—While, therefore, Kant braced the moral consciousness of the German people by his sublime conception of duty, and bequeathed to them the spirit which was to find articulate utterance in Fichte's *Reden* and the War of Liberation, he discredited, yet further than even the Lutheran Church of the age had been able to do, the ideas of popular religion. Dogmatic and sentimental religion was with him no part of the rational man; historical truths were to him no essential element in what is "purely an affair of reason." He vindicates against the contemptuous criticism of the *Aufklärung* the claims of the historical "husk" of Christianity to respect, but only because he considers such a matter to be on too low a level to deserve close speculative examination. When instructed ministers have to teach ignorant congregations, he admitted that the figures and inducements of popular religion should be used; but he contended that the teacher himself must neither forget the subordinate nature of the religious

ideas, nor omit to interpret the scriptural narrative solely with a view to illustrate and recommend the dictates of practical reason. If German theologians have been loth to submit to the rubrics of positive religion, and have carried rationalism beyond the point consistent with a sincere profession of faith, it has not been through lack of original ethical rigour, for disregard of dogma was in a large measure a direct result from Kant's memorable exaltation of the moral law.

Philosophy of Common Sense.—For a long time the influence of transcendentalism was confined to Germany, and thought in other countries continued to proceed as if no maturer mode of regarding philosophical problems had been introduced since the days of Hume. Among Hume's countrymen, recoil from his conclusions occasioned vigorous insistence on the immediate testimony of consciousness; and a small body of dogmatists arose who strove to defeat the destructive tendency of psychological analysis by confronting it with a scheme of ultimate truths. These truths or necessary beliefs of the Scottish school—since they were said to be the property of every intelligence, and to be recognizable by every unsophisticated individual—were called the philosophy of common sense. In their crudest form the arguments from common sense were hardly superior to that of Johnson when he refuted Berkeley's idealism by kicking a stone; but they received several degrees of elaboration, and became capable of affording occasional refuge to many whose speculative position needed the support of irresponsible assertion. At no time, however, have they approached the process of knowledge in the critical fashion of Kant, though, doubtless, a superficial resemblance between their assumptions and Kant's treatment of morality helped to recommend them to later thinkers. They have always retained their

undiscriminating character, and to this day they continue to cover hasty reasoning in theories for which they have no true affinity.

Empirical Psychology.—On the other hand, the objects of those who disregarded the lesson of Hume and the criticism of Kant have never been entirely speculative, but have always retained a certain degree of practical purpose. The first aim of empirical psychology is to perfect the theory and practice of education for the individual; its next object is to provide data for the improvement of societies through legislation and culture; and its application to speculative problems should follow after these two questions have received attention. In England, where men can as little as elsewhere dispense with a philosophy of some sort, but where the slenderest connection with immediate practice is held in more esteem than the strongest relation to abstract truth, the metaphysical aspect of psychology has been of historical importance equally with either of the other aspects, though it was here that practical science was most successfully cultivated.

Hartley's Theory of Association.—The fundamental principle of empirical psychology is the law of association between mental states, which has been recognized by varions writers since the time of Aristotle. It was first systematically applied to explain the phenomena of mind by Hartley in his work on man, published 1749. In this book sensations were taken to be the originals of our ideas, whose association was supposed to result from contiguity of the sensations in the same instant or successive instants of time. On this basis Hartley tried to explain the intellectual and moral nature of man with much sagacity, though he persistently connected with it a physical hypothesis of mental processes which had been suggested to him by some remarks in Newton's

works. This theory of vibrations and vibratiuncles was crude, and at that time supported by very little evidence; but it was certainly the precursor of the physiological treatment of psychology in modern times. Thus in history Hartley is prominent as a supporter of sensational and materialistic philosophy. Yet Hartley himself composed his treatise in the interests of moral and religious improvement; and so sincere was his large-hearted concern for what is good, that he has gained the admiration and respect of thinkers of all schools. His materialism and necessarianism, though they resulted from his observations on man's "frame," were not permitted to corrupt his observations on man's "duty and expectations." "I would not," he says, "be any way interpreted so as to oppose the immateriality of the soul. On the contrary, I see clearly, and acknowledge readily, that matter and motion, however subtly divided or reasoned upon, yield nothing more than matter and motion still." "I nowhere deny practical free will," he protests, "but, on the contrary, establish it (if so plain a thing will admit of being farther established) by showing in what manner it results from the frame of our natures." "All the pleasures and pains of sensation, imagination, ambition, self-interest, and theopathy, as far as they are consistent with one another, with the frame of our natures, and with the course of the world, beget in us a moral sense, and lead us to the love and approbation of virtue, and to the fear, hatred, and abhorrence of vice. This moral sense, therefore, carries its own authority with it, inasmuch as it is the sum total of all the rest, and the ultimate result from them." "The doctrine of mechanism," he contends, "has a tendency to make us labour more earnestly with ourselves and others, particularly children, from the greater certainty attending all endeavours that operate in a mechanical way;"

while "it is evident from common observation, and more so from the foregoing theory, that children may be formed and moulded as we please." And he concludes his work by deploring the consequences of a corrupt and perverted education of youth.

James Mill's Treatment of Associationist Psychology.—Hartley's practical bent was hardly consistent with subtle consideration of the higher metaphysical problems, but this did not impair his influence on English thought. His speculative views were handed down through Priestley and Tucker, and the fourth edition of his book was published in 1801. Thus the interval between the date of the *Observations* and that of the next great work on the subject, amounting though it did to eighty years, was no period of oblivion for the associationist psychology. James Mill's *Analysis* only superseded Hartley's treatise in the nineteenth century by asserting its principle anew and extending the application of its method. But the new version of the theory contained as many speculative conclusions as the old one did practical lessons, though Mill was no metaphysician, and his character as a psychologist and publicist was marked by intense faith in the power of education. In the *Analysis*, it is true, there is no theory of nervous action, but the law of association is applied to a wider range of mental processes, and is artlessly made to supply answers or denials to the most abstract questions.

Influence of British Speculation.—In the last portion of the *Analysis*, which is occupied with deriving the ideas of morality from non-moral elements, the practical aspect of associationist psychology comes into favourable prominence. It is, indeed, in the departments of education, jurisprudence, and sociology that Bentham, Mill, and their school have achieved all their

success. Nor has this been inconsiderable ; but as long as English thought mistakes practical method for a metaphysical system, the historian must continue to point out how greatly the irrelevance of sensational psychology in speculative questions was answerable for the barren results of philosophical investigation in an age when discussion was active beyond example. And this is not the less necessary because James Mill's successors found themselves forced to acknowledge some facts to be ultimate and irresolvable which, despite his logical severity, he treated in a circle for the sake of maintaining his disbelief in "mystery." For when they could not follow him in denying, they continued to imitate him by shelving, fundamental questions, and, like him, they ignored the insufficiency of which this necessity convicted their method. Yet, by sharing the dogmatism of the Scotch School, they added to their popularity as these last again extended their influence by encroaching on the province of associationism. But reference to ill-assorted eclecticism brings philosophy in this island into connection with continental thought. In France, at the same time that Hartley wrote, Locke's sensational principles also received extension and application from Condillac, and this manner of thinking remained dominant till, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Royer-Collard taught Scotch intuitionism. Hence, British speculation at this period, though of independent growth, was typical of a widespread intellectual tendency, and no less than German critical philosophy contributed to the ideas by which modern Europe had to seek to strengthen faith, remove doubt, or defend negation.

CHAPTER X

NATIONAL LITERATURE IN GERMANY

"So verschieden die Zeiten sind, so verschieden muss auch die Sphäre des Geschmacks sein, obgleich immer einerlei Regeln wirken; die Materialien und Zwecke sind zu allen Zeiten anders."
—HERDER.

"In des Herzens heilig stille Räume
Muszt du fliehen aus des Lebens Drang;
Freiheit ist nur in dem Reich der Träume,
Und das Schöne blüht nur im Gesang."

SCHILLER.

Literature and General History.—After account has been taken of the political structure and aspirations, of the industrial organization, commercial principles, and mechanical resources, of the scientific knowledge and speculative insight of a period,—after account has been taken of all these varied elements, which together form the solid groundwork of civilized societies, there still remains an important factor in social development which can be included under none of these heads, though it is never without some points of connection with them. This outstanding element resides in the province of pure literature. Too often, and in Germany very frequently, attempts to deal with history from a general point of view pay excessive attention to a critical estimate of the literature of the period. The primary forces of social life, with the exception of those of war and statesmanship, receive scant attention, while

the secondary influences of literary compositions obtain all the importance which a chronicle of publications, biographies of authors, pedigrees of books, and criticism of their literary merits can confer. The common reproach against literary men, that they attach too great importance to literature, is indeed merely a remonstrance against an error in historical proportion, which is, however, equally chargeable against the usual treatment of politics by professed historians.

German Literature and Modern History.—From the point of view of our present purpose the most notable literary event of modern Europe was neither the work of a commanding genius nor the formation of a school of writers, but the fact that a great people produced a literature of its own. The means by which Germany has attained to political unity and strength in our own time tend to reflect on the War of Liberation disproportionate significance to the neglect of those spiritual influences which are only less conspicuous because they are more fundamental. Yet the meaning of the memorable fight cannot be discerned unless it is understood to have supervened on an invigorating intellectual reunion of the German people. But the greatness of the movement far transcended its services to a single nation. Like the industrial revolution in England, like its own philosophical advances, Germany's literary revival contributed elements of intrinsic value to the culture of civilization. Like all literary products, however, it retained in a greater degree a national character, and if its results are in some measure the property of all highly developed peoples, its genesis was only possible in the Germany of that period.

The "Sturm und Drang" Episode.—When Lessing laid down his rules of literary art, writers were disposed to await from events, like those of the first

part of Frederick's reign, an improvement in the state of the German nation. But this expectancy soon wore off, and the longing for freedom and originality which Lessing expressed and heightened, ceased to obtain any satisfaction from the contemplation of social and political circumstances. As a new generation grew up, the craving for independence and spontaneity came into harsher conflict with external conditions. The aspirations of the mind found only bitter mockery in the realities of the world. Disgusted with actual existence, the German youth sought to vent its impulses in ideal creations. From the mortifications of life it fled within the asylum of the imagination. But the spirit, which could not face the restraints and disappointments of the traditional order, was not able to brook the laws and conditions of genuine art. Resort to subjective activity issued only in barren extravagances.

The "Sturm und Drang" Lawlessness.—With this tendency Lessing had no sympathy. During the latter part of his career he ceased to participate in the aspirations of the day, and he retired in despair from the theatre which he had done so much to emancipate. And truly the productions of the *Sturm und Drang* movement—taking the phrase in the narrower sense to which the name of Klinger's play properly restricts it—were, from the point of view of literary and artistic criticism, only capable of exciting regret and disappointment in one whose demand for independence was ever accompanied by insistence on the discipline of reason and the nature of things. In literary history they are remembered only on account of their connection with Goethe's early development; but in general history the episode possesses peculiar interest. That a nation, in the early moments of its awakening, should endeavour to develop the resources of its language is no

extraordinary thing. That recourse should be had to the literature of some more advanced but kindred nation for guidance and matter in the exercise of a renovated language, is a regular consequence of the process of national revivals. But for these steps to be overtaken by a wild effort to attain independently to literary freedom and originality, not because the generation really possessed genius or artistic power, but merely because a heightened sense of dignity and force sought satisfaction in strenuous efforts to produce in the regions of imagination and sentiment what was natural, powerful, and inviolable—this sequel, however erratic and ridiculous it might be in its particular results, was only possible if a vast fund of latent energy existed in the society. It proved that Germany's revival was not solely due to advance in material comfort. It revealed the operation of intellectual and ethical forces, which were to make of a social improvement a national regeneration.

Herder and National Culture, 1744–1803.—The man in whom first appeared the deeper meaning of the *Sturm und Drang* movement was Herder. In him the desire for complete life induced fundamental revision of his thoughts and feeling, though his wide sympathies and extensive views saved him from the illusions of individual subjectiveness. Of himself he experienced in full degree the attractions of Rousseau's teaching; guided by Hamann, who had been in England, he studied with zeal Shakespeare, Ossian, and the songs of old; instigated by the same friend, he formed the most comprehensive ideal of culture; and from Kant's personal instruction he learnt to approach knowledge under all its aspects. But his strength of character and force of mind enabled him to combine these various influences into one coherent tendency without making the mistakes

which marred the intellectual development of many of his countrymen. Though not a systematic teacher, his whole influence as an individual and a writer was to make men more aware of the solidarity of their circumstances, and the continuity of their past and present history. While he surpassed Lessing in condemning imitation, and in exalting the idiosyncratic elements in national life, he set forth a high standard of culture, and insisted on the correspondence which should obtain between a nation's circumstances and its religion, poetry, and art. In his enthusiasm for national genius, he wished that Germany might have been a Britain; in his love for what is unsophisticated, he dwelt with rapture on the beauties of primitive civilization. But no one did so much to protect his countrymen from the vices of insularity, or to give them an adequate conception of man's needs and capabilities.

Herder and the Historical Idea.—Herder, then, passed beyond the conflict in the life of the individual to the synthesis which forms the life of the race and the species. He lived down the paltry sense of present vexations, and arrived at a noble consciousness of the complex nature of human development. His own insight was most sure into the earlier forms of human culture; and his poetic faculty only attained its proper exercise when he sang over again in his own language the folk-songs which he diligently collected from all ages and countries. But his sense for the products of times other than his own was so deep and universal that he opened up new and truer views of all spiritual possessions of man, and of many a period in the past. He it was, indeed, who initiated the modern comparative study of poetry, art, language, and religion. He it was who familiarized students with the evolutionary treatment of civilization in general. While his views on

recorded history gave Germans a new interest in their past, he showed them that, notwithstanding their present plight, they were one of the national forces of the world. Thus, Herder was not only a powerful agent in bringing to maturity the intellectual life of modern Germany, but he was one of the most able promulgators of the historical idea which the century brought forth as a corrective of its own errors.

Herder's Influence on Goethe.—When Goethe associated with Herder in Strasburg he was a young man of twenty-two, who already had acquired a rich experience of the impulses which youth could receive in German burgher life at that time. During his university course at Leipzig he had learned to despise the literary methods of the dying generation. He had read something of Shakespeare, and drawn instruction from Lessing and Wieland. Science he had pursued in the form of alchemy, and religion he had felt with the pietists. The despair of thwarted passion had accrued to him from his early loves, while the attractions and loose manners of the stage, and the company of not very respectable acquaintances, had expanded his notions of conduct much beyond the necessary limits of everyday life. But his had not been the cruel experiences of poverty which unbalanced, while they stimulated, the powers of many of his weaker contemporaries. At Strasburg Goethe pursued these impressions into more intense forms. Scientific study was supplied by medicine and chemistry; his boyish flirtations were exchanged for an attachment which might conceivably have proved permanent; and his religious feelings gradually conformed to the sentimental pantheism which at that time attended an uncritical, though sympathetic, study of Spinoza. But it was from his intercourse with Herder, who, five years older than

himself, had already attained reputation and seen the world, that the young Goethe gained most instruction and guidance. Whatever Herder had to impart, Goethe received in the form which most directly hit his own faults and needs. Herder finally discredited to him the pretensions of French culture, and exposed the poverty of current German literature. He led Goethe to a fuller appreciation of Shakespeare, Ossian, popular songs, and Rousseau, and awoke in him a deep response to the truth of nature.

Goethe's Early Works, 1773-74.—Goethe had already written several small pieces of poetry when he made his first earnest attempt to unburden himself of the feelings which new knowledge had awakened in him. This was a drama of the Middle Ages, in which force and originality should no more than in Shakespeare's plays suffer from the restraints of form. The hero of this play is Götz von Berlichingen, a knight of the empire when club-law was yielding to the authority of the modern state. But in him Goethe portrayed no doomed obstacle to the advance of civilization. The story of his fall is made to represent the triumph of chicanery and degeneracy over noble and natural manhood. Götz of the iron hand is the embodiment of individual freedom and straightforwardness, his enemies of social fraud and hypocrisy. He falls because history says he did; but Goethe takes care that spectators shall deplore his fate, and heed only his independent spirit, his knightly virtues, and invocations to freedom. This play immediately obtained great popularity, and formed the model for a multitude of inferior imitations. In itself no work of art, it was written with extraordinary force, freshness, and feeling, and justly commanded admiration at this juncture in German literature. By the public, however, these merits were completely neglected in its interest for

the social antagonism which it represented, and the imitators were secure of almost equal popularity, so long as they staunchly upheld the cause of rude freedom against modern institutions. But Goethe had another aspect of the time's *schmerz* to illumine. Sick at heart because the last object of his affections was betrothed to another, and startled by the suicide of a love-lorn acquaintance, he wrote a novel, depicting the sufferings of a tender, sentimental soul in this rough world of social distinctions and marriage bonds. In *Werther*, the main cause of the hero's suicide is disappointed love, but inasmuch as the catastrophe is a solution of the general conflict between the individual's yearnings and society's laws, an additional motive is supplied by foiled ambition. Napoleon, ignorant of the circumstances in which *Werther* was written, noticed the combination of motives as a flaw in the novel when he conversed with Goethe at Erfurt in 1808, and by that time the poet seems to have lost the key to his own procedure. But *Werther* itself, and the raging sympathy for Werther's fate, can only be explained if, besides the love-troubles which every generation suffers, the existence of a special feeling of social dissatisfaction is taken into account.

Goethe and European Culture, 1749–1832.—By *Götz* and *Werther*, Goethe proved himself to be, in language, the first poet of his generation. But a perception of the vast nature of the man is not possible till it is understood that about the same time he was occupied with works which make him no less the poet of the period's intellectual tendencies. When Goethe went to Weimar, at the end of 1775, he had written, besides a quantity of smaller pieces, the fragment *Prometheus*, which expresses the defiant, negative side of pantheism. He had, moreover, written nearly all of what was

published in 1790 as the *Faustfragment*, that is, about half of the complete first part of the poem; and, according to his own testimony, he had conceived the idea of the whole tragedy. In the two parts of *Faust*, Goethe appears as the deepest and most comprehensive poet of European spiritual life during an eminently rich period of sixty years. In it we see reflected the movement of German culture and the course of European thought. In it we have an allegory of individual development at that time, and (since evolution in the individual follows that in the race) of part of individual development for many generations to come.* Such a work, of course, could only have been produced by one who had much of his own self to add. But it will be long before men and women cease to find in *Faust* a partial reflex of their own inner experiences; and never will they cease to find therein the most instructive and profound historical document of the age to which it belongs. Read without help from subtle commentators, the poem affords the most enlightening paraphrase of recorded history which genius, through a long and vigorous life, could set forth for the behoof of contemporaries and the guidance of posterity.

Faust as an Historical Document.—Faust is the embodiment of human aspirations when men have found inadequate to their wants the lore transmitted from the past. At such a time an inward impulse hurries afar the nobler minds. "Ihn treibt die Gährung in die

* Goethe himself said of Faust in his eightieth year: "It permanently preserves the period of development of a human soul. . . . The author is at present far removed from such conditions; the world, likewise, has to some extent other struggles to undergo; nevertheless, the state of men, in joy and sorrow, remains very much the same; and the latest-born will still find cause to acquaint himself with what has been enjoyed and suffered before him, in order to adapt himself to that which awaits him."—Bayard Taylor's *Translation of Faust*, i. 365.

Ferne," says Mephistopheles of the great doctor. As Faust approaches the limits of his resources, he becomes emboldened to abandon the seclusion of the student for the manifold experiences of life. This mood, this longing for spontaneity and natural revelation, conflicts roughly with traditional methods; and Faust, in rebuking the narrow formalism of Wagner, utters the faith of the *Sturm und Drang* enthusiasm. And when, in scornful despair, Faust curses his passing dream of a more beauteous life, the hidden *Geisterchor* chants, as did the inner self of man—

"Now we sweep
The wrecks into nothingness!
Fondly we weep
The beauty that's gone!
Thou, 'mongst the sons of earth,
Lofty and mighty one,
Build it once more!
In thine own bosom the lost world restore." *

"Wir tragen
Die Trümmer ins Nichts hinüber,
Und klagen
Ueber die verlorene Schöne.
Mächtiger der Erdensöhne,
Prachtiger,
Baue sie wieder,
In deinem Busem baue sie auf."

But the common multitude cannot at once follow such counsel. Left to itself, it can only lose its grief in different kinds of intoxication. It is only when the party in Auerbach's cellar has been transported by his wines that Mephistopheles can say that now the race is free and happy. Only the everstriving can work out their own salvation. When Faust has striven to the end, the angels of heaven lift him up, singing, "Whoever aspires unweariedly is not beyond redemption." †

Faust as a Human Document.—*Faust*, as a whole, is styled a tragedy; and such it is in deepest truth, since at the end of incessant efforts to work out his salvation the hero has to confess, what at the outset

* Miss Swanwick's translation, p. 52.

† "Wer immer strebend sich bemüht
Den können wir erlösen."

he had been able to spell out for himself in the Fourth Gospel, "Im Anfang war die That." In the last stage of his career, before the intervention of heaven deprives Mephistopheles of his reward, Faust is discovered to be engaged in the undertakings of material civilization. It is, indeed, exaltation at the prospect of carrying out the last drainage work necessary to reclaim a piece of land for human use which induces the utterance of the words appointed to declare his doom :—

"Yes! to this thought I hold with firm persistence;
The last result of wisdom stamps it true:
He only earns his freedom and existence
Who daily conquers them anew.
Thus here, by dangers girt, shall glide away
Of childhood, manhood, age, the vigorous day.
And such a throng I fain would see
Stand on free soil among a people free!
Then dared I hail the moment fleeing:
'Ah, still delay, thou art so fair!'"*

Thus on one side the solution of the tragic conflict of the eighteenth century is nineteenth-century progress. But the drama contains a tragedy within itself—the episode of Gretchen—which manifests the limitations and disasters which surround the individual on this earth. In the Prologue in Heaven, however, the Lord had declared, "Es irrt der Mensch, so lang' er strebt." The hero passes through the incident at the cost of weariness only, and Faust lives to appreciate the efforts which inferior souls like Wagner persistently make in behalf of a dimly seen service to humanity.

Goethe's Idea of Self-culture.—It is indeed evident that in the drama of *Faust*, along with so many other things, Goethe expressed his own idea of self-culture. Goethe, like Faust, was bent on acquiring experience and knowledge co-extensive with that of

* Bayard Taylor's translation.

humanity; like Faust, he aimed at attaining to harmony of soul with reality; like Faust, too, he went forth in his quest without seeking a like enrichment of his moral character. Mephistopheles is just so much of a devil as every acute and vigorous man carries in his heart; and Goethe always forces us to conceive of him as Faust's other self, which was necessarily present and operative in every phase of the changeful history. In his own participation in both sides of human nature lies the explanation of the reverence which Goethe commands, and the antipathy which he excites, among men who are closely attached to the first conditions of human society. It is impossible not to honour his ideal of complete manhood; it would be blindness to disregard the equivocal aspect which his erotic inclinations gave to part of his life. But Mephistopheles confessed once for all that he thought upon "the Fair in the plural;" and in Goethe's own life and work this very important side of human life was either imperfectly represented or misrepresented altogether.

Goethe as a Citizen.—Likewise was it with Goethe's relation to political life. He also had no sense for popular liberties, no perception of the indirect benefits surrounding all kinds of self-government. It was his opinion that "the poor people must always carry the bag, and whether on the right side or the left is pretty indifferent;" though in discharging his administrative duties he seems to have followed the antifeudal views which Lothario expresses in *Wilhelm Meister*. With him political conflict was only detrimental to tranquil self-culture. He placidly accepted Napoleon's pretensions; and his heedless demeanour during the time of insurrection has never been forgiven by the most admiring of his countrymen. But when these limitations have been admitted, Goethe's

steadfast purpose of making life a work of art, and art a work of law, still affords an instructive experiment in complete living.

Schiller, 1759–1805: His First Period.—A time came when Goethe found that his influence over the German public was in danger of being forfeited to his friend Schiller. Schiller was ten years younger than Goethe, and his life from childhood had been filled, not with sentimental dissatisfaction at the general conditions of society, but with keen personal suffering from the political despotism and civil distinctions of the smaller German states. Schiller was brought up under the tutelage of the Duke of Würtemberg, a ruler who had parodied Louis XIV. by silencing his suppliant estates with the assurance that he was the Fatherland. Personal liberty Schiller only obtained when by flight he became an outlaw; and during his years of struggling authorship he enjoyed no leisure, no solvency, and no intercourse with more mature minds. When, therefore, his glowing feelings sought an outlet and a vocation in dramatic composition, it was not in forms of art, but in scenes of fiery passion against tyranny and injustice. But in due course Schiller passed through a process of reflection and ripening like that which Goethe himself had undergone. What life at Weimar and scientific investigation had done for the one, the study of history, philosophy, and ancient literature did for the other. In 1789 Schiller was appointed professor of history at Jena by help of Goethe, who nevertheless still feared that he was likely to deprave the public taste. Five years later, Goethe discovered that he and his younger rival were at one in their artistic aspirations.

Classical Ideal of Goethe and Schiller.—The comradeship of Goethe and Schiller is always regarded as one of the most remarkable personal incidents in the

history of literature. To those also who care to trace in individuals the logical outcome of society's moods, it affords a signal example of that action of social conditions on great men, and of great men on current ideals, in which consists much of humanity's advance in spiritual culture. Both Goethe and Schiller began their careers by reproducing and heightening the deeper feelings of their countrymen. Both represented a revulsion from the existing state of things, and a yearning for an order more grateful to Germany's awakening needs. But neither could directly modify external conditions, and both were compelled to follow the general tendency to seek consolation in the world of imagination. Now Goethe and Schiller, when the impetuousness of youth was spent, saw with regret that their early productions were without form, and incapable of satisfying the matured intellect. They felt that if art was to be to them a self-sufficient world it would have to be controlled by laws of its own. Hence the initial belief in the close connection of true poetry with national life and genius came to be abandoned in behalf of an insulated conception of art. Schiller went the length of maintaining against Herder that it was no sufficient reason for seeking poetic material in northern mythology because thereby German peculiarities in thought and language could fully be retained. He even declared that the poet must withdraw beyond the boundaries of the real world, and form a sphere for himself by becoming "through the Greek myths the kinsman of a distant, strange, and ideal age."

Goethe, Schiller, and German Culture.—To determine the intrinsic merit of the works produced under these circumstances is a problem for literary critics. For the general historian it is sufficient to know that while they thus became poets for all time,

Goethe and Schiller did not withdraw themselves entirely from immediate contact with their generation. The latter, indeed, never lost his position of great German patriotic poet, though artistic excellence became the first object in his own mind. By his *Wallenstein*, Schiller inspired Germans with that trust in themselves which the possession of a tragedy in the great style must ever awaken in a sensitive people; and in *Wilhelm Tell* he openly returned to his original theme of freedom, and presented it again in a more enduring and ennobling form. His strenuous efforts to explicate the theory and influence of art were also not without effect on the minds of his countrymen; but in this matter he could achieve less than his older, more cultured, and longer lived friend.

The German Ideal of Culture.—That it is the special vocation of the German people to elucidate and realize the richest and most universal elements of civilization, has been claimed again and again by Germans themselves. During the period here reviewed, Fichte had asserted as much and more in his *Reden*, which were delivered in the winter 1807–8. "It is you," he cried to the German nation, "to whom, out of all other modern nations, the germs of human perfection are especially committed, and on whom the foremost place in the onward advance towards their development is conferred. If you sink to nothing in this, your peculiar office, then with you the hopes of humanity for salvation out of all its evils are likewise overthrown." Although Carlyle has handed down to us a melancholy account of English delusions about things German in the early part of the nineteenth century, it is not necessary to resort to Madame de Stael for independent confirmation of Fichte's view. In the earlier part of his career, Dr. Thomas Young, the anticipator of Champollion in the

interpretation of Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the originator of the undulatory theory of light, who was perhaps the most talented and acute thinker of his day, studied at Göttingen, and took the opportunity of seeing something of the German land and people in 1797. He acknowledged that "in the learned world the great majority are mere mechanical labourers;" that the "established custom of the booksellers, who pay every ordinary writer exactly in proportion to the number of sheets, and at their periodical fairs exchange bulk for bulk of every kind of publication, is the grand impediment—among those who subsist in part by writing—to the laconic efforts of a brilliant genius, and the cause that the innumerable and ever-increasing heap of volumes envelopes from day to day more and more the sciences which it is designed to illustrate." But he returned home thinking "Germany at present the most interesting country to a traveller of any in Europe; not so much from its original merit, but from its being a kind of compendium of everything that is excellent and everything that is remarkable in every country existing."

Social Aspect of the Literary Revival.—The first social result of the German literary revival was to throw the world of letters open to the whole nation. Literature passed from being the possession of a learned class to be the common property of all intelligent citizens. And the new race of writers surpassed the old school both in social consideration and knowledge of the world. One of Frederick's best reasons for contemning German books had been the cramped circumstances and experience of German authors. But the new aspirants were able, by the vigour of their purpose, their own merits, and the growing sympathy of their countrymen, to assert for themselves an honourable social position;

while their enterprising spirit led them to seek the advantages of travel at a time when much knowledge, which in these days can be obtained at one's door, was only to be gained by making arduous journeys. In the space of fifty years, literature succeeded in linking together with its slender bonds every grade of German society. The only disadvantage thus involved was the proneness of the upper middle class to gain another step on the nobility by claiming the licence of polite rank in moral conduct. Of course, from the point of view of common humanity, the approach of noble to burgher and of burgher to peasant, of Prussian to Bavarian, of Saxon to Rhinelander, was still very restrained; but, viewed in relation to the past, it marked all the difference between the forlorn and the hopeful.

Position of the German Stage.—Hence, along with the main stream of literary development flowed a large volume of popular literature, which seldom failed to be connected with the principal current. It was now that in Germany novels, chiefly of very inferior character, began to dispense on all sides their pitiful renderings of the higher intellectual life of the time. But what substance the numberless imitations of *Pamela*, *Sir Charles Grandison*, and the *Sentimental Journey*, of *Werther*, *Götz*, and *Die Räuber*, contained was infinitely better presented to the public in the drama. This was the most influential period of the German stage. When mental activity was coming into vigour, and neither newspapers nor public business afforded matter of general interest, the citizens resorted to the theatre to participate in the ideas and feelings which were passing through the nation. Here they first made acquaintance with the masterpieces of their time, and were given by superior actors representations of Shakespeare's works, carefully

adapted to their capacities. Here they received plenteous doses of chivalry and robber plays, and looked upon the dramas of middle-class life, or parodies of fate-tragedy. At the same time they were often diverted by Kotzebue's purposeless inventions. But most frequently they found their amusement in something germane to their higher wants. If chivalry or robber plays proved tiresome, resource was again had to burgher plays, in which the chord of social dissatisfaction was still harped upon. Indeed, taste for the theatre sometimes became a belief that the stage was the only sphere in which a humble burgher could unfold his potentialities. Viewed with regard to historical facts, Goethe's choice of scene for *Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre*, which now seems almost childish, is only the expression of a train of reasoning very natural in those days. As *Faust* is the best comment on the dynamical condition, so this novel is the best interpreter of the statical condition of German society at the time, and Meister's singular letter to Werner, announcing his decision to go on the stage, is doubtless an accurate account of the illusions and sophistries into which an aspiring young burgher of weak character would be likely to fall.

Mozart and Music, 1756–91.—To adduce further evidence of the depth and breadth of the German literary movement, it would be necessary to advert to growths which are properly characteristic of a later period. In painting, sculpture, and music, however, new sources of vigour were attained by a process nearly parallel with that observable in literary art. But in the history of Europe music only attained to an importance which cannot be neglected by the most rapid historian. Of the two great composers of Germany during this time, one at any rate is more remarkable as a

psychological phenomenon and inspired genius than as a product of antecedents, or an exponent of general history. Mozart is a wonder of the period. Yet his works are formed with the surest regard for the rules of art, with an unerring sense for beauty of detail and beauty of relation. He possessed an inexhaustible fund of melody, perfect command over all contrapuntal devices, and equal familiarity with all forms of music from the symphony and mass to the canzonet. He appeared at a time when instrumental music had passed from the artless, disconnected melodies of the dance, and the severe counterpoint of the fugue, to the grand cyclic forms of modern art. The inception of the sonata and the symphony belongs to the middle of the eighteenth century, and their development was the work of Haydn, who also published the first string quartet in 1755. Mozart succeeded in informing with his genius the various types of musical expression; and he realized Gluck's theory of opera—the theory which organically united libretto and music into a single intense dramatic representation—in a manner which was denied alike to Gluck's limited intuition and contrapuntal ignorance. It was this conjunction of individual creativeness with artistic form, of fine instinct with technical mastery, which caused Goethe to say that Mozart was the composer, and Don Giovanni the model, for the ideal setting of *Faust*.

Beethoven, 1770–1827.—If Mozart is the most gifted interpreter of the groundwork on which modern music rests, it is Beethoven who by common consent is the true representative in the poetry of sound of the historical period on which the present Europe is based. Among great musicians Beethoven was of slow development; and perhaps it was this circumstance that enabled him to reflect so well the passions and aspirations of

the time he lived in. He, the Rhinelander, says Hettner, had imbibed the culture of French and German enlightenment; Klopstock was the guide of his youth; Shakespeare, Goethe, and Schiller were the favourite poets of his manhood; while the spirit of the French Revolution filled his whole soul with a fervid yearning for political freedom and human dignity. By his immense individual force he enlarged the scope and deepened the purpose of musical forms; through his intimate sympathy with the times he gave them a content which touches modern minds as no music of an earlier age can. In him the struggle, which his works expressed, was enhanced by a gloomy disposition and physical misfortune. Yet he remained true to the spirit of his age, and in his titanic efforts to overcome the strife pushed the bounds of his art almost beyond the line of all possible art.

The Pianoforte and Chamber Music.—On the other hand, by his gift of chamber music, Beethoven conferred on society a benefit equal to the boon bestowed by Handel when he added to the music for church and theatre the elastic programme of the concert with its derivative amateur institutions. "In studying Haydn's chamber music," says Mr. Hadow, "we are often surprised by a note of presage, a hint or suggestion, not yet wholly articulate, which seems to be waiting for corroboration or fulfilment. During the middle period of his life it was, indeed, a matter of occasional conjecture on whom the mantle of his inspiration would fall." The mantle fell on Beethoven. The pianoforte dates from the middle of the eighteenth century. It was, indeed, nothing but the application of percussion action to the spinet and harpsichord; but compared with these it yielded a measureless range of musical expression. This instrument, the use of which was within the capacity of all private people, Beethoven first vested

with its full dignity, profundity, and versatility;* and in so doing he deepened and enriched in an unique degree the purest pleasures of home life.

* His early sonatas were printed with the superscription "for pianoforte or harpsichord." About this time, also, the introduction of the clarinet into the orchestra made a great change in instrumentation. It was invented by Denner of Nuremberg in 1690, but until Mozart no one fully realized its value.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XI

NATURALISM AND THE REVOLUTION IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

"O ye loud Waves! and O ye Forests high!
And O ye Clouds that far above me soared!
Thou rising Sun! Thou blue rejoicing Sky!
Yea, everything that is and will be free!
Bear witness for me, whereso'er ye be,
With what deep worship I have still adored
The Spirit of divinest Liberty.

"When France in wrath her giant-limbs upreared,
And with that oath, which smote earth, air, and sea,
Stamped her strong foot and said she would be free.
Bear witness for me how I hoped and feared!"

S. T. COLERIDGE.

National Character of English Literature.—In England, during the latter part of the eighteenth century, the same general causes as those which obtained in Germany were operating to evoke new developments in literature. Here also the expansion of society promoted the diffusion of letters and the independence of authorship. Johnson had been able to give a final blow to the practice of patronage; though Adam Smith still had reason to speak of writers as that "unprosperous race," and Crabbe had yet to find in Burke a generous benefactor. Here, too, the influence of France, by concentrating attention on elegance and correctness of style, had produced ideals and work which could not

satisfy the feelings and aspirations of a ruder and more natural public. Yet literature in England was still English. Pope, the master of the superfine school of taste, was also a master of his generation in ideas; and when the culture of town wits ceased to embody the intellectual capacity of the nation, literature was not to be classed as an alien craft because its recent development happened to have been characterized by overpowering solicitude for artificial forms and conventionalized figures.

Need of Realism.—In prose fiction the wants of a more robust public had already been met by work of the first merit. The translations and imitations of French romances had been superseded by the true novel of life. Richardson published *Pamela*, and Fielding published *Joseph Andrews*, in 1741–42; and *Tom Jones* and *Clarissa Harlowe* appeared within the next ten years. Now the novel was born as a work of art because it was produced as an imaginative study of natural truth. One reason why this was possible was because prose fiction had been left unencumbered by rules of taste. Such freedom was in some sort due to the novel's reputed inferiority of status. As the new agriculture and the new manufactures flourished most readily where the rules of the past were of least avail, so English literature attained excellence most immediately where it was least hampered by canons, precedents, and tradition. Yet the circumstances of the novel's rapid attainment to artistic worth and social importance yielded a lesson to the method of poetry itself. Poetry, indeed, even within its own self-restricted sphere, was verging on exhaustion. The art of elegance and arbitrary rule did not admit of infinite elaboration. When Pope had given his version, little was left for other writers to achieve, though what had been done

was so far from being a barren performance that without it later poetry would not have been possible. Thus if the secret of fashioning couplets in artificial diction on conventionalized subjects had been imparted to every one possessed of a facility for versification—and accordingly in many circles such verses were lavishly offered at the shrine of culture—no space existed under the accepted limitations within which original genius might unfold itself. In pictorial art the English mind had recently contended with some success against equally false traditions from abroad. Though in this sphere it had started under a load of preconceptions, guided only by the study of Italian old masters, it had at once instinctively followed the style most congruous with the national genius as manifested in the novel. If, therefore, a new field was required for poetry, it must lie, as seemed most probable, in the same direction, in the regions of realism and actual life.

Tendency to Compromise.—The habit of mind which had favoured the pursuit of correctness in poetry was, however, closely connected with the desire of the age to take things as they were, without hazarding extravagances in any quarter. The same motive which induced a spirit of compromise in philosophical and theological disputation, urged men to defend the activity of their imaginations from meanness or excess by agreeing upon a narrow code of literary taste. Such aims were reasonable enough after the experiences of the preceding period, but they were necessarily of a temporary character. All compromises rest on principles, of which, sooner or later, some obtain ascendency and issue in radical change. Those in England of the eighteenth century ultimately resolved themselves into tendencies of very decided character.

Methodism and Realism.—In the sphere of

religion, dislike of extravagance was especially strong. Among the faithful and the sceptics alike reigned aversion from extreme conclusions and intense feeling. A horror of enthusiasm dominated spiritual teachers, and the idolatry of sound sense, with its offerings of moralizing sermons, occupied for many years the established altars. But a generation grew up which knew not the ugly aspect of religious zeal, which was unaffrighted by visions of fanaticism. Large classes arose who had lost consciousness of the strifes of their ancestors, and had not been retained by culture in the groove of worldly indifference. To these people the religion of prudential equilibrium had no meaning. It did not touch their religious consciousness even to harden it, but left it slumbering in total seclusion. When, therefore, the Methodist movement proceeded from Oxford to address the nation at large; when the all-pervading presence of the Deity was insisted upon, and the reality of the religious life within was appealed to; when every thought, motive, and action was declared to have a relation to religion, and the true kingdom of God was shown to be a state of the soul; when, too, men's minds were bewildered by the hopes and fears begotten of a confused belief in the depravity yet spirituality of human nature, in the nearness yet separateness of the Almighty;—then the policy of sound sense, the lukewarmness of the Church, and the worldliness of its ministers were found to have neglected a great want in the life of the people. A time came when the Church itself was touched by the spirit of earnestness. Some of the zeal of Methodism passed into it, and some of the passion of rivalry stirred its enthusiasm. Yet the improvement was due not solely to the work of Whitefield and the Wesleys, but in part to the same causes which had produced the Methodist

movement. The Church also experienced in its own behalf the need of truer and intenser ideals, and sank of its own accord not a little practical worldliness in solicitude for the real interests of immortal souls. In like manner, if the first poet to abandon the artificial method was a religious hypochondriac and a Methodist scorner of life in towns and polite society, he was also the spokesman of a feeling which demanded a more natural content and a less constrained form in literature.

Cowper; "The Task," 1784.—As a matter of biography it would appear that Cowper would never have been an original poet unless he had suffered from insanity, and his insanity had taken a religious form from the revivalism of the day. Owing to this misfortune he found an asylum among tender and pious friends, where his feeble nature could luxuriate in the homely and rural delights of uneventful living which his poetry was to present to the world as a new revelation of itself. The writing of poetry was recommended to him by these friends in order to defend his mind from madness. But the work which established his fame, the work which made him an originator, was prompted by one more conversant with the outside world. Newton and Mrs. Unwin encouraged Cowper to write hymns and moral satires; it was Lady Austen who suggested to him composition in blank verse on an unconventional subject. *The Task* was written by a "stricken deer that left the herd long since," when called to "dress a Sofa with the flow'rs of verse;" and its truth to Nature's humblest features, its unconscious departure from that servitude to consequence which strung the literature of the century on a chain of "fors" and "therefores," its deliberate abandonment of the prevailing critical canons, were the results of a revulsion from current ideals, which sprang up in the seclusion of the Olney

parlour under the stimulus of feminine vivacity. The great popularity of the poem was, no doubt, in great part due to its celebration of the hearth, and to its evangelical piety, in both of which respects it came into closest accord with the rising comfortable classes. It owed, however, not a little of its fame to the qualities which made Cowper to England what Rousseau was to France. That love of lowly realism, that feeling for nature and a rural life, that sympathy with the poor, even that religious introspection which corresponded to the morbid self-examination of the later writer, were to a society, sound at the core, what Rousseau's naturalism was to a society corrupted throughout.

Crabbe; "The Village," 1783.—Though accurate to nature in her milder and more kindly aspects, Cowper's poetry failed to present in equal truthfulness the harsher features even of the rustic life which he loved so well. "God made the country, and man made the town" is an opinion which seems to have caused him to forget that the devil dwells in both. This defect of conception—a defect fatal to the artistic sufficiency of naturalism—was in some sort made good by Crabbe, who published his first work of importance, *The Village*, about the same time that *The Task* appeared. In Crabbe's unflinching descriptions of the grim side of common life, the art of realism never rises above prose; but the effect obtained by rigorously treating the sadder aspect of human existence "as Truth will paint it and as bards will not," even in couplets of inferior elegance, completed in good time the lesson which it was indispensable to learn before a new growth of poetry became possible.

Burns, 1759–96.—Cowper wrote not for the world nor for critics, but simply to exercise the activity within him. This was the main reason why, invertebrate being though he was, he succeeded in initiating a return to

the genuine sources of poetry. Two years after *The Task* was published, there appeared in Kilmarnock a volume of poems by one who, according to his own confession, rhymed neither for spite, money, nor notoriety, but for fun. He, too, was a singer of feeble will; he, too, was pursued by a madness of his own, the madness of undisciplined passions. So far, the peasant Burns corresponds with the gentleman, Cowper. Both poets, moreover, admired one another. Cowper's preference for "a manly rough line with a deal of meaning in it, rather than a whole poem of musical periods that have nothing but their oily smoothness to recommend them," led him as closely towards the Scotch poet, as did his mild religion and homely feeling draw towards himself the singer of the *Cotter's Saturday Night*, and the satirist of the *Auld Lights*. But Burns did not serve his genius by abandoning his class. He remained true to his condition of sturdy, independent peasanthood, though his tenderness, insight, and feeling for nature made him a poet. For this reason, while he shares with Cowper the same position in the movement which produced modern English poetry, he far transcends him in historical significance and abiding merit.

Burns and the Revolutionary Spirit.—Burns was no nursling of middle-class comfort and religious solicitude, reared to exhibit that aspect of natural truth which fashion from the past and the industrialism of the future seemed about to hide for ever. He was a true son of the soil, even of Ayrshire soil. In Germany, men had to obtain their folksongs through collectors, their sentiment through foreign writers, their sedition from the French Revolution, their enthusiasm from youth, their awe from mystics, their earnestness from philosophers. In Britain, the public received what they wanted of these elements direct from home-born genius. From Burns

it received the best content, the most touching forms, of popular song; from him, the naïvest declaration of manhood's rights and dignity; from him, the lessons of country life and natural objects. On Scotland itself Burns conferred what Scotsmen alone can express. In general history he was one of the first influences to shape the union into a bond of reciprocal service and respect. Scotch culture had been dominated by French forms and English fashions till, as Burns himself said, it spun thread so fine that it was fit for neither weft nor woof. Scottish memories were almost as lifeless as the Jacobite cause; England's unreasoning dislike was accepted as part of the nature of things. Burns, who desired to do something "for puir auld Scotia's sake," did much to change all this, as did Scott in the next generation. In general history, again, Burns is conspicuous, in that he first united in British literature modern naturalism with the spirit of the Revolution. At first, gauger though he was, with wife and weans who "maun hae brose and brats o' duddies," dependent on his employment in the service of an affrighted government, he responded with incautious zeal to the revolutionary outburst. But when the French threatened to invade England, and the exciseman had become a volunteer, Burns' sedition conformed to the real condition of things; and the verse which follows the well-known stanza on "The Kettle o' the Kirk and State" expressed very chastened sentiments—

"The wretch that wad a tyrant own,
And the wretch his true-born brother,
Who would set the mob aboon the throne,
May they be damned together!
Who will not sing 'God save the King!'
Shall hang as high 's the steeple;
But while we sing 'God save the King,'
We'll ne'er forget the people."

Influence of the French Revolution.—The union of naturalism with the revolutionary spirit is the key to the groundwork of modern British poetry. In Burns it found earliest expression because his genius was torn by a fierce conflict with animal passions and social jealousies. When it reappeared among English poets, the Revolution itself had appealed directly to all minds, and naturalism had passed from spontaneous utterances of the simple-minded to the reasoned statements of self-conscious innovators. The early hopes of the French Revolution nowhere found purer or warmer faith than in the minds of those who were about to reanimate English poetry. Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge were sanguine youths when the outbreak took place. Each, according to the nature of his character, participated in the illusions and contumacy which the event produced. According to their dispositions, too, all three underwent the reaction excited by the progress of affairs in France. But on such minds the Revolution could not exert a most lively influence only to suffer complete negation. How far the effects of such an experience may have contributed to their subsequent development could be determined only by the most subtle of biographical studies. Evident it is that their sense of personal independence and their lofty moral aims owed not a little to the elevation of mind obtained in youth from contemplating the prospect of a more generous social order. Evident it is that their self-confidence and fearlessness of criticism were chastened and fortified by wrestling with consequent disillusion. "I maintained a strife," says Wordsworth in *The Excursion*—

> "Hopeless, and still more hopeless every hour;
> But, in the process, I began to feel
> That, if the emancipation of the world
> Were missed, I should at least secure my own,
> And be in part compensated."

Southey, 1774–1843.—From Southey, the one of the three friends who possessed far the least genius and far the most faculty for literary production, enthusiasm for the Revolution received expression in *Joan of Arc* and *Wat Tyler*, the first results of his industry. Then he gradually became aware that human improvement is a tedious affair, and, while retaining his belief in the certainty and indefiniteness of progress, exchanged his Deism, Girondism, and Pantisocracy for the Anglican Church, the British Constitution, and the politics of the *Quarterly Review*. As a poet, Southey loyally adhered to his faith in the moralities. But his best work in this direction did not raise him to the first rank either among those who realize or those who initiate, while the length and unequal merit of his most ambitious efforts, and his habit of choosing remote subjects, convicted him before the public of the charge made by his worst enemy—that his "epic mountains seldom fail in mice." His life is memorable rather as that of a trusty man of letters than as that of a man with a message. But for England to have at this time a powerful biographer, historian, and essayist, who united the idea of constitutional order with the remembrance of revolutionary hope, was an advantage which has been too much overlooked.

S. T. Coleridge, 1772–1834.—To lovers of poetry, Coleridge is head of no school, the representative of no group or movement, but the writer of the *Ancient Mariner* and *Christabel*. Yet he was closely concerned in erecting an ideal of naturalism, and his power of critical disquisition made him an instructor to all who addressed themselves seriously to the problems of poetic subjects and forms. In the sphere of ethics, religion, and philosophy, he was in the next generation to mediate between English utilitarianism and German

transcendentalism. In the period here considered he came forth to preserve for the panic-stricken party of order the redeeming faith of the Revolution. Coleridge's conservatism was no craven dread of the doctrines of reason, nor was it a blind resort to prejudice and tradition. His function rather was to rescue reason from the wave of reaction, and to claim for it the authority of which bewildered Toryism had well-nigh lost sight. He sought, indeed, to give a reasoned account of what existed, and to make good the distinctions in man's moral and spiritual nature. History, he knew, must be an intelligible development, and its last results as intelligible as those which had gone before. As an apologist for the past, he was anti-revolutionary; as a believer in reason, he advocated the policy of sober reform.

Wordsworth, 1770-1850.—On the brooding and stubborn spirit of Wordsworth the Revolution made a profounder impression than on the minds of Southey and Coleridge. The import of the great event to rational spectators is recorded in his works more precisely and durably than in any other contemporary documents. But the steadfastness of his will and the stability of his intellect, the secluded habit of his life and the benignity of his disposition, render it impossible to trace any definite portion of his teaching to the influence of his early experience. It is certain, however, that reflection on the vicissitudes of France persuaded him that individuals may still wield great powers over their brethren, and heightened his belief in his own fitness to be a teacher of men. As Coleridge was first of all an orator and preacher, so Wordsworth was a leader and moralist. The one missed the pulpit of Unitarian chapels, the rostrum of the lecture-room, and the vocation of the journalist, to deliver monologues to the inquirers who came to Highgate; the other was

saved from entering into public affairs in order to deliver to the world from his retirement at the lakes his theory of poetry and his criticism of life.

Wordsworth's View of Nature.—In denouncing the conventional subjects and language of poetry, Wordsworth fell into the opposite error, which, to use a simile of Sismondi, would lead a sculptor to clothe his statue with real instead of marble vestments. The necessary corrections and elucidations were provided by the appreciative criticism of Coleridge. But Wordsworth's critical writings, even with Coleridge's help, would have achieved but little if they had not been supported and completed by his poetry. The lesson he taught the world came from the poet's sense of the oneness of nature with man, and the glory he shed on external appearances by viewing them in the light of this connection. The vulgar dualism of the eighteenth century, subverted by Kant in philosophy, Wordsworth dispassionately refuted by constantly dwelling on the intimations of a real unity. Instead of regarding nature as a cunning piece of mechanism, admirable in itself, and worshipful on account of a supposed cause—instead of reflecting on nature's landscape as the mother and support of men, as the scene of life and the condition of adventure, dear for its bounties and romantic from its associations—Wordsworth dwelt on the nature which is as much man's moral and intellectual existence as it is the ground of his physical life. He did not begin from man, and trace the features of his environment to his percipient mind. He concentrated his gaze on the external world itself, till it took on a new aspect and betrayed unnoticed relations to man's higher self. "Poems," he said, "to which any value can be attached, were never produced on any variety of subjects but by a man who, being possessed of more than usual organic

sensibility, had also thought long and deeply." And in a letter written towards the end of his life, he spoke of the spirituality with which he had endeavoured to invest the material universe, and the moral relations under which he wished to exhibit its most ordinary appearances. Everything familiar to us he held to be proper subjects of the poet's art. He doubted not that, if the scientific conceptions of the Kosmos become perfectly familiarized to men, the poet will be ready to "aid the transfiguration, and will welcome the being thus produced as a dear and genuine inmate of the household of man." That Wordsworth's view of nature and man will not bear statement in exact terms is, of course, evident. Wordsworth was no metaphysician; but he occupied a position between common sense and philosophic reason which forms a happy halting-place for many sensitive minds, by whom the grand problem of existence can be seen but vaguely by help of sensuous imagination.

Wordsworth and Poetic Naturalism.—Thus in Wordsworth English poetry arrived at truth to nature other than the mechanical and scientific conceptions which had been employed by Thomson and Darwin. It arrived, indeed, at what is distinctively poetic truth. The principle may be called the naturalism of poetry, as opposed to the naturalism of science and conduct. If its acceptance in diction took different forms from what Wordsworth intended, its influence on the themes of poets was direct and enduring. Generally viewed, the new naturalism was a part of the revolutionary movement which displaced in modern life the tyranny of convention by the rule of realism. It was, in truth, realism of the most refined kind applied to the relations of man with nature. The relations of man to man were left untouched by it; and Wordsworth's

treatment of morals differed not from that of the most regular didactic writers.

Literature and Cant.—Now, much as literature had done to bring about the social and political revolution, there still remained two urgent functions for it to discharge. One was that of fortifying the more manly minds against reaction, and helping them to consolidate and extend the gains from the revolutionary movement. The other was to combat the return of convention's sway over the masters of European society. The first end was proper to all literature of worth; the second belonged to a somewhat peculiar class of writing. The new masters of society had risen by their own industry. For this reason they were in little danger of suffering from too great regard for prescriptive distinctions. Their ascendency was moral and practical, not traditional. This circumstance involved dangers of its own. When men feel that their position depends on their moral and practical superiority, they strenuously endeavour to maintain the appearance of blameless respectability. Hence, being men of passions and weaknesses, like those of the class they superseded, the middle class ran a risk of being oversolicitous for the semblance of right living, and too little heedful of the virtues of candour and sincerity. They were in danger of becoming subject to the convention of cant as their predecessors had been to the convention of birth. The danger was the more imminent, because in the industrial life men's dealings are greatly affected by reputation. It was the more formidable because the sansculottism of the early revolution had given a great incentive to hypocrisy without imparting a single ethical advantage to civilized life.

Byron and Reaction, 1788–1824.—It is only by remembering the moral dangers which accompanied the

industrial order of society, and by keeping in mind the political perils which reaction threatened in the days of the Grand Alliance, that it is possible to appreciate the work of Lord Byron. Viewed in connection with his own generation, he who was long regarded as the most immoral and reckless of modern poets, the head of Southey's Satanic school, appears to have been in fact a strong partisan on the side of moral health and social freedom. It is curious that the poet to do this for bourgeois Europe was born an aristocrat, and lived in excessive pride of his rank. Yet, unless it had been so, Byron would hardly have felt that disregard of propriety, that distrust of respectable appearances, that love of revolt, which poverty, social disappointment, and riotous living engendered in his passionate and rebellious soul. Unless he had felt thus, he could not have flung with such effect his challenges to self-satisfied virtue, nor have given equal encouragement to those who strove to complete the emancipation of European society. It was not only his tributes to liberty and assaults on tyranny which braced the minds of foreign readers; it was much more the contemplation in his characters of a gloomy indomitable spirit, fretting against the tedium of life, but doomed to gnawing pain, craving knowledge but scorning obeisance, of a spirit like Manfred's, strong enough to be a hell unto itself, yet learning only that "'tis not so difficult to die;" of a spirit like Cain's, capable of aspiring to cheat death with death, yet succeeding only in drying "the fountain of a gentle race." And this spirit he set forth with such attraction for the whole of Europe because his own character and history had bred in him things which, as Landor said, were as strong as poison and as original as sin. In like manner his outrages on domestic sentiment were only the tactics of a satirist who had the misfortune never

to feel its sacred nature, though he could cite its scripture for his purpose. Byron's heroes, even when they are invested with melodramatic interest by the imputation of surpassing guilt, are never men of unfathomable turpitude, nor are they ever protagonists of vice. Every criminal situation is the result, not of an attractive fatality, but of a fortuitous collocation of natural circumstances. If sin is committed, it immediately appears as hollow and ridiculous as anything else; if virtue is traduced, it proves to be on the whole less contemptible, and much less disastrous, than boldest vice. The incidents are the outcome of things as they are, and of men as they are; and if they are often scandalous, it is only because it is of the nature of men and things to be productive of scandal. This implication it was good for demure citizens to see once again elucidated.* It was good, too, for them to witness the pathos and mockery, the tenderness and scorn, which the outside of this life excites in a sensitive yet cynical observer. Byron's epic of life had, indeed, manifold lessons for the pharisees of the nineteenth century. Perhaps it is because his own nation is the most pharisaical of the modern world that the present writer wonders and puzzles without avail when foreigners go so far as to rank *Don Juan* with *Faust* among the philosophical poems of the age.

Shelley and Sedition, 1792–1822.—It is common to regard Byron and Shelley as the poets of the Revolution, while the elder writers are generally classed as reactionaries; but it would be hard to adduce any intelligible principle to justify this denial of historical

* Burns had already given the same lesson to Britain—

"Then gently scan your brother Man,
Still gentler sister Woman."

sequence. That Southey, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and, in his own exalted sphere, Landor, were closely connected with the early revolution, is demonstrable as simple biographical fact, while in the tenor and results of their careers the influence of such an association is continually evident. That in due time the sobriety of disillusion and middle age supervened, only makes their participation in the new-born hopes the more intimate and consistent. Byron and Shelley, on the other hand, only attained to manhood when enthusiasm had given way to despair. Their sedition, though it was their *forte*, was based not on dreams of a better order, but on impatience at the endurance of a bad one. If they must be given a cant title, they should be called after the irreconcilables of our day, rather than after the enthusiasts of the revolution. Shelley had, it is true, a childish faith in the original virtue of mankind, and believed that, with the removal of the restraints of custom and law, society would spontaneously follow an elysian system of love and justice. But this hallucination sprang entirely from his temperament and youth. Shelley's distaste for history resulted from radical incapacity to comprehend human life in time and space. His rebellion against tyrannies in theory and tyrannies in fact had some relation to actual history, for the simple reason that history is in some measure what he believed it to be altogether, "a record of crimes and miseries." He was, however, most true to his mission in appealing to charity and love against the competitive principle of Crabbe's hard man of business and the new political economy, "Let one mind one and all are minded then." *

* Though the purpose of this study excludes notice of Keats, it would be niggardly not to indicate, in the words of Professor Saintsbury, that the author of *Endymion*, "as no one of his own contemporaries did, felt,

Scott's Poems and Naturalism, 1771–1832.—In both poets the influence of the new naturalism was strongly operative. Neither was a partisan of its doctrinal principle. Byron, indeed, was its vigorous denouncer; but in their work it attained the highest elevation to which the poetry of genius could raise it. Scott, however, was so far from sharing the poetic temperament, that the Revolution kindled in him no enthusiasm. He never experienced the passion for advance which touched every spontaneous singer of that time. Regardless of actual circumstances, he was born to feel no change congenial unless it were in a retrograde direction. But this love and reverence for the past was connected in a peculiar manner with that literalness of apprehension and unaffectedness of style which made him the most popular of writers and the most winning exponent of naturalism. Bürger received the impulse to write his *Lenore* from Percy's collection of songs. The ballad fell into the hands of Scott, and was translated by him. This event marks Scott's determination to write poetry, not in the style of *Lenore*, but after the inspiration which originally had stirred Bürger, in the manner of the old minstrels. Scott had been an eager collector of Border songs from his boyhood, and his enthusiasm for a ruder, heartier state of society induced him to translate Goethe's *Goetz*. Hence, when he attempted to write poetry of his own, it was romance of the days of yore. The success of his venture was unprecedented. His subjects and his style yielded to the public those aspects of naturalism which it could best appreciate. Absolute simplicity of treat-

expressed, and handed on the exact change wrought in English poetry by the great Romantic movement." "Keats, in short, is the father, directly or at short stages of descent, of every English poet born within the nineteenth century who has not been a mere 'sport' or exception."

ment and diction, unerring description of events, constituted, for men of all degrees of culture, reading which at that time appeared as a revelation of a new capacity for enjoyment.

Scott's Novels and Naturalism.—For the method of naturalism to achieve this, with no other aid than an imagination richly stored with visions of the feudal past, and scenes from romantic nature, was a signal triumph. Still greater was that won in the Waverley novels. Though these romances lacked the attractions of Scott's lively verse, they possessed what the poems wanted, and what was of far more importance. They contained a large portion of what Wordsworth had pointed to as the better part of realistic art, and of what Wilkie was then the exponent of in painting;—the delineation and contemplation of humble life. The "colouring of imagination" which Scott threw over his poor people differed from that which Wordsworth shed over his, as the ideal of the feudal chief differs from that of the industrious yeoman. The author of the Waverley novels, as Bagehot pointed out in a well-known essay, succeeded in rendering the life of poverty and toil a pleasing subject of art, by approaching it as a genial, assiduous landlord would approach his tenantry. Truth, the best of truth, is preserved, but the delineation of people in narrow and sordid circumstances is never so minutely executed as to make them what in real life they must generally be, in spite of their peculiar virtues and humour, "poor talkers and poor livers, and in all ways poor people to read about." Scott avoided the extremes of Crabbe and the arcadian poets. "His poor people are never coarse and vulgar; their lineaments have the rude traits which a life of conflict will inevitably leave on the minds and manners of those who lead it; their notions have the narrowness which

is inseparable from a contracted experience; their knowledge is not more extended than their restricted means of attaining it would render possible. Almost alone among novelists, Scott has given a thorough, minute, lifelike description of poor persons, which is at the same time genial and pleasing."

The Modern Novel.—The attractive aspect under which Scott's patriarchal feelings presented Scotch humble life was only surpassed by the enchantment which he lent to his native land. His influence in bringing together England and Scotland, and in extending the growing taste for natural scenery, is matter of common recognition.* His aid in bringing together different classes must not be overlooked. It was because his realism was informed by an artistic refinement that his services in this respect must be reckoned so considerable. Men are no more induced to approach one another by exhibiting their harshest, baldest characteristics than by merging all distinctions in an imaginary nonentity. They draw near to one another only in the belief that they are already nearer than they really are. If every one were entirely acquainted with the self of his neighbour, no man could sufficiently isolate himself. Hence, to mediate between classes, the modifications of sentiment or art are necessary. Scott displayed a large measure of both resources in his prose romances. To do the same thing for individuals is the main social purpose of the modern novel. It is accomplished by a like application of the method of naturalism. Men and women, who by instinct and

* "It is a well ascertained fact, that from the date of the publication of the *Lady of the Lake*, the post-horse duty in Scotland rose in an extraordinary degree, and indeed it continued to do so for a number of years, the author's succeeding works keeping up the enthusiasm for our scenery which he had thus originally created."—Cadell: *apud* Lockhart.

cultivation have attained to more than commonly true views of human character and relations, and are able to embody the same in artistic narrative, present to their fellow men and women series of incidents and groups of persons which, while amusing, instruct the individual reader in the affinities of all phases of life and the connections of all types of character. Herbert Spencer bid us look forward to a time when social intercourse will lose its many disfiguring hindrances in a fuller harmony of human character and a surer perception of one another's emotions and purposes. If this hope be well founded—and its promise seems as sincere as its realization would be blissful—then the function of the modern novel is both weighty and extensive.

The Novel of Common Life.—The elucidation of human character and circumstances, initiated by the novelists of the eighteenth century, had been conducted too much in the interest of masculine licence, or too much in deference to feminine weakness, to be very effective as a means of general culture. Frances Burney had acquired much celebrity by portraying a variety of what Macaulay, following Ben Jonson, has called "humours," which might be met with at that time in society of fashion; but her best novels, besides being deficient in humanizing power, as all works of grotesque art must be, were almost immediately rendered antiquated by the social changes consequent on the industrial revolution. It was not till the beginning of the nineteenth century that writers of her sex succeeded in placing the novel of life on that impersonal basis, which has enabled it to do justice to every feature of human existence. This they achieved, not by merely imparting to the art a more refined tone, though by thus doing they greatly widened its sphere of usefulness without detracting from its vigour, but by force of genuine

ability. Maria Edgeworth, indeed, was able to offer to English readers a friendly interpretation of their Irish fellow subjects, which in its success was not far inferior to Scott's corresponding office. Susan Ferrier's satire supplied a more prosaic view of Scotch life than was compatible with the vital principle of the Waverley novels. But in purely artistic treatment of common life both these writers were far below Jane Austen. The girl who wrote *Pride and Prejudice* was not a great intellect, nor was she a great wit, but she possessed a delicate perception of character, and a talent of faithful delineation, in the exercise of which she apprised the world that individuals had still a great deal to learn about one another, and a great deal of pleasure to gain in acquiring it. Within her own circle of middle-class life—the same life that was the source of energy and stability to the order of the last century—she found the material for uneventful histories, whose recital possessed all the charm of novelty and all the interest of personal sympathy. In her hands characters the most tiresome made good their claim to regard as sharers of our common human nature, and incidents the most ordinary secured attention in virtue of their relation to general domestic life. From her example men learnt how in simple dramatic narrative the realism of life might be winningly unfolded; how without the drawbacks of protracted analysis the truth of themselves might be elucidated to their common gratification and enlightenment.

CHAPTER XII

RESULTANT IDEAS AND TENDENCIES

"In unserer Gegenwart bewegen sich wie im sechzehnten Jahrhundert die Völker selbst in Massen, und in allen ihren Theilen und Schichten. Und dies ist die eigenthümliche Grösse dieser Zeit. Der hervorragende Rang der grossen Begabung ist in Abnahme, aber die Zahl der mittleren Begabungen ist in desto grösserer Zunahme begriffen; nicht die Qualität, nicht die Hohe der Bildung der Einzelnen macht den Ruhm dieser Zeit aus, sondern die Quantität, die Weite, die Ausbreitung der Bildung unter den Vielen; es ist im Einzelnen nichts Grosses und Erbabenes geschehen, aber im Ganzen ist dies wahrhaft eine grosse und erhabene Wendung in der Gestalt des öffentlichen Lebens, dass die Geschichte dieser Zeit nicht blos Biographien und Fürstengeschichten zu erzählen hat, sondern Völkergeschichte."—GERVINUS.

The National Idea.—Of the different groups of events reviewed in the foregoing chapters, no order appears to be logically superior to the rest. The territorial dispensation, that issued from the wars and political transactions, is, perhaps, the most striking change, and it proved more stable than the manner of its origin and the hopes of spectators would warrant at the time. Yet territorial changes, though striking enough on the map or at the *douanes*, are in themselves external to the life of the people when they are adjusted by diplomatic truck and barter as were those enforced by the Congress of Vienna. In Napoleon's settlement of Germany they assumed greater intrinsic importance because they

abridged an inevitable process of concentration. But those that sprang from the conditions attending the Restoration were momentous mainly because they eventually brought about serious conflicts. These conflicts were closely connected with the national idea. This idea, sublime in its aim, appealing in its egoism, was the answer of the nineteenth century to the cosmopolitanism of the eighteenth century. That men are born equal may, or may not, be true in so far as they are born as individuals; but as members of national bodies they differ as widely as the Celt differs from the Teuton, as the Latin differs from the Slav. And no one can say that these differences amount to more and less, to better and worse. But differences they are, and differences they will remain for at least the term of our civilization. For tens of thousands of years the mass of mankind sought only to be allowed to live and to reproduce. The time was now come when in every European branch of the race men demanded to be able to live their own life, in their own way, within the wide limits of national association. This demand led to a general development of men's activities as members of states, and more particularly to the growth of taxation, national debts, and citizen armies. But cost in this case was of small account. To be a people was of no avail unless the body felt itself to be a nation. To be a nation without a fisc, a debt, or an army was an impossibility which the monarchies had demonstrated, and which the nineteenth century continued to enforce. Such incidents were cheerfully submitted to as long as national aspirations could thereby be fulfilled.

Varied Circumstances attending the National Idea.—The passion of nationality was indeed one of the most influential agents in the history of the nineteenth century. Its growth had in many places been

provided for by the monarchs, who had prepared the peoples for an expansion of their provincial feelings into affection for larger unities by accustoming them to regard as paramount the interests of dynasties. But its mature form as a strong spring of concerted action for ideal objects among large masses of men was, in a great part of Europe, an outcome of the revolutionary epoch. The central conceptions, which gave it power and direction, were linguistic, geographical, traditional, or racial, and, in one case at least, religious. The circumstances from which it received impulse and sustenance were often the hopes of independence, the desire of self-government, and the suggestions put forth by actual changes, which the revolutionary propaganda and innovations introduced. The passion, however, was very variously affected by attendant circumstances. In Russia, at least, the sense of national unity, already existing in a somewhat low form, was greatly heightened by resistance against the Revolution. Alexander's subjects felt the more Russian in withstanding his civilizing projects, and his whole empire experienced a thrill of oneness and assurance in the act of repelling invasion by the revolutionary dictator. In Spain the battle for independence knit the people more closely together. But here the spirit of innovation of itself effected an entry, and in the future, aided by the folly of the restored king, it converted the feeling of national unity into a desire for a national government. In Germany the War of Liberation did much to awaken the national sense, but its influence was surpassed by the political changes imposed by Bonaparte, by the enterprising conduct of Prussia, and the spiritual regeneration which the nation underwent of its own accord. Italy was first made to feel itself a nation by the discipline of the French

Emperor, notwithstanding the great differences obtaining among its people. If Alfieri had written a little later he would have been able to supersede Metastasio's conventionalism by a truly national background, instead of by realistic vehemence in the mouths of patriots without a country. The national spirit of Greece, though it was based on ecclesiastical relations and was strengthened by the sight of the Revolution, was primarily set in motion by prosperity, which permitted a return to the language and history of ancient Hellas. That of the Servians, never entirely lost, rested on remembrance of autonomy in days long gone by, and was fortified by chequered conflict with the Turks.

Real Ground of the National Idea.—To elucidate, in fact, the full circumstances and meaning of this historical phenomenon would require a lengthy investigation. It is clear, however, on the face of the matter that the ostensible grounds of the sentiment would seem to positive minds to be rarely solid, and frequently fanciful. Musty tradition, defective ethnology, arbitrary conceptions of geographical fitness, arguments from philological resemblances, appeals to religious solidarity, have been brought forward in behalf of violent proceedings, till the idea of nationality has been made to appear an erratic passion which has already caused much suffering and confusion, and will probably occasion yet more. But, in truth, the formal pleas have never been the real grounds of nationalizing action. They have only provided common tenets of faith around which might gather men who were moved by their supposed interests and social aspirations to realize certain political ideals. The interests have not always turned out to be substantial gains; the aspirations have frequently entailed great sacrifices and disappointments. Englishmen, however, should be slow to grudge other

peoples the luxury of patriotic sentiments, or to overlook the fact that the routine of life may be more alleviated by sharing in the feelings and fortunes of a national state than burdened by the duties and encumbrances which such participation involves.

Survival of the Monarchical Idea.—Though desire for national independence and unity was often accompanied by a desire for self-government, the monarchical idea still retained much power over European peoples after the conclusion of the wars. The traditions of monarchy as a reformer survived the French Revolution in spite of Burns' toast to the last verse of the last chapter of the last book of Kings. They had been cast into abeyance for a time when the storm was gathering fury; but when the new movement had disclosed its terrible aspects, and the despotism of the empire had, on the one hand, again made absolutism respected, and on the other hand had wearied men with sacrifices in behalf of novelties, the old confidence in monarchs partly returned to the mass of the people. The liberal professions of Alexander, the reforms under the Prussian monarchy, the constitutional promises of the sovereigns at the end of the wars, the increased power and activity of the smaller German rulers, helped to confirm this faith. The discipline of the new military system helped to keep the sentiment alive; the enormous territorial armies helped to repress all overt acts of rebellion. However patriots and agitators might hate the dynasties, the monarchs had from the first a large fund of confidence and forbearance to draw upon in their struggle for self-preservation among the forces of a new and democratic order. Though publicists long regarded parliamentary government as a political panacea, monarchy retained its hold on European affairs till the experiment of representative assemblies had been

made. Since then parliamentary institutions have betrayed shortcomings of their own. It is yet doubtful whether, under the conditions of modern Europe, states can dispense with a strong monarchical element in government.

The Constitutional Idea.—The co-existence of the monarchical idea with a desire for representative institutions was indicative of a mode of viewing political reform very different from the crude absolutism or republicanism of the eighteenth century. The longing for self-government was greatly increased and diffused by the propaganda of the Revolution, and the social conditions introduced by the new industrial system. But events at the same time demonstrated that good democratic institutions are rather the fruit of slow growth than the product of deliberate manufacture. Still, it was plain that no considerable step towards self-government could be made in the greater part of Europe except by consciously elaborated innovations. The difficulty thus raised was met in great measure by the traditional faith in monarchy, and in a smaller degree by regarding the English *régime* with more appreciation than the authority of Montesquieu had been able to enjoin on the generation which derived its ideas from Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Economists. By incorporating the representative element of democracy into the existing monarchical system, it seemed that the best advantages of self-government might be obtained without hazarding the dangers of paper polities and ochlocratic transitions. Hence, within the period covered by this volume, the best instructed minds had so completely reversed the opinions of their predecessors that the ideal constitution, which became the object of men's hopes after 1815, was understood in the English sense of the word. The realization of the ideal

polity was conceived to be the establishment of a parliamentary government under a limited monarchy, such as time had successfully developed in Great Britain. The solution was so evidently the logical compromise to which recent events led, that at the Restoration it received abundant recognition from the professions of the victorious sovereigns.

The Constitutional Idea and the Bourgeoisie.—But the constitutional idea rested on a broader basis than the deductions of trusted publicists. On its democratic side, it received powerful support from the doctrines of Bentham and his disciples. On its monarchical side, it was upheld by a reactionary school on the Continent, and by a literary movement in Germany and France. In its revolutionary tendency it was confirmed by events in Spain, Italy, and France, till it issued in independent action in 1848. The main source of its power, however, resided in the new economical organization of European society. The almost total abolition of feudal usages, the extensive adoption of the Code, the careers opened to individual merit, the exertions called forth by the continental system, had all aided the development of the middle class which was already thrusting itself into prominence under the old *régime*. When the wars ceased, the Continent passed under the dominion of the industrial revolution. Now, this event had no more been anticipated by the material progress of the eighteenth century than the political revolution had been forestalled by the reforming statesmen and monarchs. The rapidly increasing importance of the middle classes, as they wielded more efficiently capital and machinery, was at least as much the result of economical changes as it was of political changes. If one revolution emancipated the continental bourgeois classes, the

other conferred on them supremacy. These classes, placed between the crowns and landed aristocracy on the one hand and the proletariat on the other, felt that their strength would be best preserved if a balance were maintained between the monarchical and democratic elements in government. This feeling was the more strong because on the Continent the bourgeois classes had experienced the disadvantage of having the industrial revolution imposed on them from without. In England the middle class was not only sprung from a sturdy stock, accustomed to take a part in the business and strifes of the community, but by carrying through the industrial revolution it developed to the utmost those virtues which are most necessary to the dominant members of an industrial society. In the greater part of the rest of Europe, on the contrary, the bourgeoisie had suffered a long tutelage. When it was raised by the new industrial system to a commanding position, it had gained none of the benefits to be derived from the exertions of accomplishing a great work. Hence it retained much of its old narrowness of view and timidity of heart. It felt enough confidence to wish to share government with the sovereigns, but it lacked the spirit to play a heroic *rôle*. And all the time its want of moral superiority caused it to fear the rivalry of the proletariat. Thus the new masters of society were impelled, both by instinctive regard for their interests and by the manifest tendency of events, to support the constitutional idea.

Evils of the Industrial Order.—And, in truth, the lords of the industrial order were confronted by serious difficulties from the outset. They, the capitalists, the organizers of labour, were the leaders of the movement; and in company with them flourished financiers and professional men. In numbers, intelligence, and

affluence, this class far surpassed its prototype under the old *régime*. But the labourers, whom they organized and led, were remarkable only for numerousness. Industrial progress induced a large normal addition to the numbers of wage-earners without at first tending to raise greatly the standard of education and comfort. Industrial fluctuations, on the other hand, maintained a redundant population to keep up a high level of misery, and the presence of needy hands helped to encourage speculative trading. Health and morals at the same time deteriorated among the masses, crowded together in towns, and reared for the factory, without regard for physical or ethical cultivation. To make these circumstances more bitter, the new political economy had exhibited the conflict of interests involved in the distribution of wealth. The same agent had rendered the system the more sinister-looking by unveiling the causes which limited population to the means of bare subsistence. If economic science has taught labourers to regard industrial crises as the results of laws, which are not to be withstood by impatient rioting, it has also convinced them that in the modern social organization inhere elements of chronic distress. As the economic revolution proceeded to transform European life, men of science began to reiterate that the multitude could never permanently improve its condition unless it put an arbitrary limitation to its numbers. None the less, seasons of commercial activity kept enticing into the world beings whose very rearing the following seasons of depression made an ordeal of woe. The monitions of Malthus were timely instructors of legislators and theorists, but they failed to arrest the evils of a teeming population, or to enable labour to deal on advantageous terms with capital. Hence grew up the discontents of the proletariat. In the preceding

century their masters had striven to find a short cut to freedom by inventing the rights of men; in the nineteenth the wage-earners sought to better their condition by narrowing down the principle to the rights of labour.

Rule of the Middle Classes.—And it must be confessed that if employers and organizers of labour were ready to withstand the pretensions of aristocracies and landed proprietors, they travelled but slowly beyond the region of their own immediate interests. Towards the employed they were too often harsh, grasping, and neglectful; and their representation of the industrial population retained a one-sided character which was defined by over-weening jealousy for the rights of capital. Yet the middle classes were undoubtedly the proper mediators between the old and democratic orders. By their exertions many wholesome reforms, and a great development of society's resources, prepared a better day for the labouring classes, notwithstanding a temporary subjection to the rule of capital. The strength and wisdom of the middle classes lay in their close relation to reality. While the nobility was too far removed from the real business of life to understand or approve the conditions of progress; and the labouring population was too absorbed in struggles for existence to obtain a comprehensive view of society's situation; the middle classes were engaged closely enough with the strife to live to perceive the first needs of the community, and were sufficiently at leisure to regard with calmness and intelligence the means of their attainment. Hence they promoted the evolution of a social order more free from anomalies, in other words, more in harmony with reality than any former instance of complex civilization. True, the rank and file often strove, and strove successfully, to thwart the plans of their more enlightened leaders. Certainly,

too, the middle class never has been, and probably never will be, without need of homilies on sweetness and light, for the simple reason that it embodies the most powerful human forces of a world which assuredly is not very good, as it is not intolerably bad. As long as it flourishes it will need to be warned against being vulgarized, just as the aristocracy will need to be cautioned against being materialized, and the proletariat will have to be defended against being brutalized, as we were often told by a stylist of the last generation. Still, it must be allowed that when the state of society brings the body in closest connection with the conditions of progress—and that is precisely what was done by the industrial revolution—then, in spite of its unlovely errors and shortcomings, it will achieve, on the whole, what is best for the community in the season of its ascendency.

Elements of Improvement.—But while difficulties were inseparable from the new industrial order, they were constantly prevented from culminating into an intolerable crisis by the resources of the system itself. Increase of food supplies was continually being procured by extending agricultural improvements and the margin of cultivation over the whole world. More cheap and speedy means of transport and communication mitigated the effects of local dearth, and opened for the redundant population a way of escape to new lands. The production of manufactured necessities and comforts was indefinitely increased by the progress of invention and organization. The process of exchange, and division of labour, continued to be more and more facilitated by mechanical appliances and commercial enterprise. A better appreciation of the nature of economic forces enabled governments to be generally less prejudicial, and sometimes even helpful, to the

course of industry. The discoveries of science co-operated with the ingenuity of inventors to further production, till the occasional services rendered by exact knowledge to labour grew into a close and vital connection.

Diffusion of Intelligence and Information.—The progress of scientific discovery itself was furthered in an ever-increasing degree both by the growing numbers of earnest men who could afford to engage in research, and by the continual improvement in instruments of investigation and in the means of intercourse between inquirers throughout civilized society. Among the mass of the community the most instructive of the information and lessons thus obtained were diffused by a superior class of periodical literature, initiated in England by the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews*. These publications awoke in the reading public an intelligent interest in the advance of knowledge and enlightenment, such as had been known only in the upper circles of France immediately before the Revolution, and of England when continental travel had been rendered impracticable by war. At the same time, speculative thought discussed the eternal problems ever more boldly and circumspectly. Philosophers promoted intellectual freedom with a persistence which was foreign alike to the arrogance of the eighteenth century and the despairing dogmatism of the reaction. The literature of imagination threw its influence on the side of mental liberty, and presented to the choice of men varying but serious criticisms of life. Meantime primary education kept steadily raising the standard of average intelligence,* and the daily press and popular publications,

* In 1797, Dr. Andrew Bell, a clergyman, whom want of assistants had compelled to make the trial, published a pamphlet describing the advantages of using pupil teachers in schools. In the following year

growing continually cheaper and more efficient, gradually imparted to every class more ample knowledge of facts, wider conceptions of social questions, and a keener interest in the welfare of the community. More influential still, increased intercourse between men steadily overcame the jealousy of ignorance, and softened the asperities of conflicting interests.

Religion for Religion's Sake.—One softening influence there was which our period prepared for but hardly felt. This was a feeling which was to be peculiarly characteristic of modern Europe, though it seems to belong to the mystic life of Asia rather than to our own bustling material age. Religion for religion's sake drew many a monk and many a nun into seclusion in mediæval times. But it had never been the soul of any popular form of religion. It is, of course, common to condemn the eighteenth century as irreligious. But the truth is that in England and the rest of Europe men were then spiritually recuperating after episodes as exhausting as they were full of disillusion. Men had grown tired of religion when it only brought a sword. Men were ceasing to revere creeds which bade them suffer here lest they might suffer worse hereafter. They began to think of sin as a factor in an incomprehensible contract, and many concluded that it did not exist. They had not yet begun to regard sin as a human state which the human soul must ever strive to subdue and absorb in a more generous order of human existence. They

Joseph Lancaster, a philanthropical Nonconformist, opened a school closely following Bell's monitorial system of mutual instruction. Thus a great impulse was given to the cause of elementary education in England. The British and Foreign School Society was founded by Dissenters in 1807, and the National Society by Churchmen in 1809. But, in truth, the success of the Bell-Lancaster method was world-wide. In 1820 there were 5600 schools thus organized in Europe, not including Denmark, where the system was officially adopted; and in 1829 Europe possessed 10,600 schools; Asia, 1600; Africa, 130; America, 1000; and Australia 100.

had not begun to suspect that the more gracious aids to achieve this sort of salvation would constitute the Christology of the future. The perplexing and discouraging interpretation of the Atonement, which Catholics and Protestants alike had derived from Paul and Augustine, but which never dominated nor rent with schisms the Eastern Church,* had blunted the perceptions of the faithful, and had excited the scorn of the rebellious. But from Herrnhut and from Oxford there emanated influences which found a fertile medium in the life of the eighteenth century. We have but to examine the work of Schleiermacher, and to follow the careers of Whitefield and the Wesleys, to be convinced that it was a great spiritual void which the so-called irreligion of the century had been concealing and extending.

John Wesley, 1703–91; Schleiermacher, 1768–1834.—The influence of the brethren of Herrnhut on English religious life was no new thing when John Wesley became "converted," on May 24, 1738, through the influence of Peter Böhler. And the Unitas Fratrum was, eleven years later, acknowledged in an Act of Parliament to be "an ancient Protestant Episcopal

* In this connection it is well to remember that nearly a third part of Christendom belongs to the Eastern Church, and that, to quote Dean Stanley, "the subtleties of the Roman law as applied to the relations of God and man, which appear faintly in Augustine, more distinctly in Aquinas, more decisively still in Calvin and Luther, and, though from a somewhat larger point of view, in Grotius, are almost unknown to the East. 'Forensic justification,' 'merit,' 'demerit,' 'satisfaction,' 'imputed righteousness,' 'decrees,' represent ideas which in the Eastern theology have no predominent influence, hardly any words to represent them. The few exceptions that occur may be traced directly to accidental gusts of Western influence. Hence arises the apparent contradiction that, whenever the Eastern theologians enter on topics which touch not the abstract questions of the Divine essence, but the human questions of grace and predestination, there is a more directly moral and practical tone than often in corresponding treatises of the Protestant West."

Church, which had been countenanced and relieved by the kings of England, his Majesty's predecessors." Nor was the influence of the Moravians less effective on their pupil Schleiermacher, who, long after he had left the community, testified to their supreme ability to express and awaken the spirit of true Christian piety. Through both men there was convincingly set forth the intuition, first appealed to by Christ, and latterly preserved by the Moravians—the intuition that the "kingdom of God cometh not by outward show;" "for, lo, the kingdom of God is within you." Wesley was fortunate in that he laboured at a time when he could feel assured that the effect of criticism of external evidences would be that "in a century or two the people of England will be fairly divided into real Deists and real Christians." Schleiermacher preached at a time when already Semler had inaugurated the critical treatment of the Bible which produced in its time the Tübingen School on the one hand, and on the other hand the commonplaces of the biblical scholarship of to-day. And the conditions of his work were so favourable that when he republished in 1821 the addresses on religion, which he had put forth in 1799 especially for the educated among its despisers—"unter ihren Verächtern"—he had to confess that the persons for whom the addresses were originally intended seemed to exist no longer. Rather, he added, would one, starting from his first standpoint, now have to issue addresses against bigotry and superstition.*

* The leading ideas of the *Reden* may be thus summarized: "The value of religion results from what it is in itself, and not from what it subserves. It is chiefly from seeing the purposes for which it is brought forward that cultivated men have turned themselves away from it." "Religion has to be sought neither in books nor in traditions, but in the human heart." "It is necessary that every one should make his own religion for himself."—LICHTENBERGER.

Compare these principles with the definition of Spinoza, whom

The Reinstatement of the Religious Consciousness.—Thus, though at first sight the doctrinal teachings of Wesley and Schleiermacher were as the poles apart; though the first could reproach with ill-judged heat his first master, William Law, for having rarely named the name of Christ, "never so as to ground anything upon faith in his blood," and the second could chide his wife for speaking constantly of the Saviour and placing God quite in the background; yet the two men represent in European history that great reinstatement of the religious consciousness which the enlightenment had despised and the Revolution had outraged. This consciousness, the existence of which the eighteenth-century movement hardly suspected, was all the time the treasured possession of Catholics, Protestants, and Methodists alike. It was this spiritual force which the nineteenth century was able to call to its aid, and which makes the old controversies seem to us so lifeless and vain. It is not too much to say that, as in other spheres, the eighteenth century preserved, or supplied by struggle and privation, the very religious elements which the next century appropriated to its own use and enrichment.

The Historical Method, Proper to Earlier Periods, Inadequate.—Hence the historian of the nineteenth century has to take into consideration the co-existence of various important collateral influences, when he seeks to follow the prevailing force which produced the phenomena he endeavours to explain. These several influences wax and wane, but none the less one great principle continues dominant, the principle of comfort and opportunity for all. And so it comes about

Schleiermacher revered so well: "Porro quicquid cupimus et agimus, cuius causa sumus, quatenus Dei habemus ideam, sive quatenus Deum cognoscimus, ad *religionem* refero. Cupiditatem autem bene faciendi, quæ ex eo ingeneratur, quod ex rationis ductu vivimus, *pietatem* voco."

that in dealing with a period of such complex development, a notable advance must be made on the customary method of approaching historical questions. Before our own age is reached it is convenient, if not very philosophical, to place the history of war and legislation in the foreground, and to make but occasional references to facts of other orders. It is always necessary to make periodical reviews of the course of religious, literary, and artistic culture, and of changes in manners and customs. It is only at uncertain intervals that attention has to be directed to such facts as the invention of the compass, of gunpowder, of paper and printing; to such occurrences as a plague, a succession of bad harvests, debasement of the currency, or the ravages of war; to the effects of geographical discovery, and the slow shifting of national occupations and industrial methods; to variations in the state of popular education, or to the progress of scientific knowledge; to advances in speculative opinion which are not merged in the fortunes of religious sects, and to practical theories which are not the formulæ of dominant interests.

A Change of Method required by the Modern Period.—But as our own time is approached, the picturesque groupings of manners, thoughts, and feelings different from our own fade away. In their place succeeds a prosaic plexus of events which will yield its meaning only to comprehensive treatment. The history of politics loses its supreme importance as the fundamental forces of social life gain freedom from extraneous bonds. Political association, with its vicissitudes, becomes but one aspect of a many-sided organization by which men produce for themselves the necessaries, comforts, and embellishments of life. When tradition drops its prescriptive right, and either disappears or stablishes itself on expediency, the history of peoples

embraces all other kinds of history, and is itself the outcome of men's actual efforts to live and enjoy under certain material and intellectual conditions. As this point is approached, therefore, the true basis of historical study is formed by industrial and economical events. The first condition of human existence, the first object of human association, is the production and distribution of wealth. When men's status is left unregulated by social tradition or religious subordination, every movement in other fields of activity, in ethics, science, speculation, or art, however significant they may seem in themselves, must sooner or later come into connection with the economical foundations of society if they are to effect great lasting results.

Industrial Character of Modern History.—Now, the period here reviewed is remarkable for unprecedented advances both in national freedom and social industry. The concurrence of the two orders of changes is a relation of the highest importance. If either revolution had operated at a different time, or in a differently adjusted connection, the final result must have departed indefinitely from that which really occurred. The main effect of the political movement was the removal of hindrances to human progress in continental Europe. The great result of the economical movement was the synchronous introduction of the means to achieve an enormous measure of that progress. In truth, the political revolution obtains most importance when viewed as a negative movement ancillary to the industrial revolution. Future historians of our civilization will not fail to dwell on the geographical circumstances which enabled the two processes to be consummated side by side. Eliminate the institution of citizen armies, the introduction of the Code and various agrarian reforms, the territorial dispensation of 1815,

and the awakening among some peoples of a spirit of nationality and independence, and the chief remaining features of nineteenth-century society in Europe, which were not evidently survivals from the past (like the recrudescence of religious obscurantism), will be seen to be mainly built up by the industrial system and economical theories which proceeded from England.

Comprehensive Character of Modern Historical Investigation.—Hence, as we have already said, in bringing the historical method to bear on present questions, it is necessary to qualify and extend the results from one order of facts by constant reference to those from others. It is, of course, desirable to start from the broadest possible groundwork, and to proceed in the search for true relations and momentous facts by following all the threads of industrial, scientific, intellectual, and artistic development which together form the web of our highly organized civilization. But while the existing state of historical knowledge may necessitate very imperfect estimates of minor influences, it is at least imperative neither to confine criticism to facts of a political character nor to neglect those of an economical nature. "Circumstances," said Burke, "are what render every civil and political scheme beneficial or noxious to mankind." The tendency of industrial development has been to invest with social importance all those members of society concerned in the production and distribution of wealth. The circumstances which now determine whether political institutions are beneficial or noxious to mankind are the wishes and requirements of the whole economical organization.

Industrial Expansion and the Idea of Progress.—At the present time it is becoming continually more evident that in self-governed communities the most important changes of the near future will be brought

about by the prevailing views on the modern economical system. Society's efforts to increase its welfare will be guided by the dominant opinions concerning the process by which things have become what they are, and the possibility of introducing modification in favour of its effective but less fortunate members. Such opinions must be of an historical nature; and they will be just and beneficial in proportion to the care and assiduity with which they have been formed from the consideration of industrial and economical history. Any attempts of publicists to arrest, rather than to direct, the movement towards changes of this kind can now only provoke impatience or occasion misconceptions. Our social organization is constantly expanding, and involving new needs and desires. Reform, being only the conscious adaptation of society to changed conditions, inevitably becomes more frequent and fundamental as society expands and grows more autonomous and less restrained by arbitrary traditions. The political tendencies of an age like our own must, therefore, necessarily be in the direction of what is commonly called progress. To deplore such tendencies, or to regard them as destructive to the social order, is as futile and as fanciful as to dread grievous consequences to the universe from the rule of gravitation. Perhaps the attraction of matter may some day reduce the cosmos to chaos; possibly political reform may land society in anarchy; but it is certain that as a catastrophe would be the result of a momentary suspension of the law of gravitation, so an immeasurable disaster would attend the cessation for any length of time of political advance in a period of industrial expansion.

Ground for Confidence in the Idea of Progress.—And the same cause which has produced the belief in progress urges to its fulfilment. The motive power now

impelling societies to continually readjust their institutions by conscious innovations is the pressure of the industrial system. The source of men's confidence in their forward movement is the knowledge that this pressure has been induced by their own exertions and advance in intelligence and freedom. That progress in its present phase is greatly extending individual happiness is an assumption which historical criticism must seriously qualify. But it is abundantly evident that, as the industrial system has occasioned a large increase of aggregate prosperity and a considerable advance in average intelligence; as it has extended contractual relations till every member is personally free within the existing economical conditions; as it has elevated the functions of labour to an equality with the functions of fighting, governing, and learning;—so it is ever striving to assign participation in the material products and honorary distinctions of society to every man in proportion to his contribution to the common stock of wealth, comfort, contentment, and knowledge.

APPENDIX

SOURCES OF INFORMATION WHICH SHOULD FIRST BE USED TO EXTEND ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE SUBJECTS TREATED IN THIS VOLUME:—

BAIN: *Scandinavia.*
BARTHOLDY, MENDELSSOHN: *Gesch. Griechenlands.*
BAUMGARTEN: *Gesch. Spaniens.*
BERNHARDI: *Gesch. Russlands.*
BIEDERMANN: *Deutschland im achtzehnten Jahrhundert.*

CAIRD: *The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant.*
Cambridge Modern History, Vols. viii., ix.
CLERKE, AGNES: *History of Astronomy in the Nineteenth Century.*
CUNNINGHAM: *Growth of English Industry and Commerce: Modern Times.*

GEIKIE: *The Founders of Geology.*

HADOW: *The Oxford History of Music: The Viennese Period.*

INGRAM: *History of Political Economy.*

KARMARSCH: *Gesch. der Technologie.*

LICHTENBERGER: *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century.* English trans.

MANTOUX: *La Revolution Industrielle au XVIIIe Siècle.*

ONCKEN: *Das Zeitalter Friedrichs des Grossen.*
OVERTON AND RELTON: *History of the English Church*, 1714–1800.

Political History of England, ed. by Hunt and Lane Poole, Vols. x., xi.
PRICE: *History of Political Economy in England.*

REUCHLIN: *Gesch. Italiens.*
ROSE: *Life of Napoleon I.*

SAINTSBURY: *History of Nineteenth Century Literature* (*in England*).
SCHERER: *History of German Literature.* English trans.
SEIGNOBOS: *Political History of Contemporary Europe.* English trans.
SOREL: *Europe et la Révolution Française.*

SPRINGER: *Gesch. Oesterreichs.*
STEPHENS, MORSE: *History of the French Revolution.*
SYBEL: *Gesch. des Revolutionszeit.*

THORPE: *Essays in Historical Chemistry.*
TREITSCHKE: *Deutsche Gesch. im neunzehnten Jahrhundert.*

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION

ABBEY AND OVERTON: *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.*
ABBEY: *The English Church and its Bishops*, 1700–1800.
ABBOTT: *Memoir of Kant.*
Agricultural Survey of Lincolnshire.
Agriculture, Select Committee on, 1833.
Annual Register.
AUSTIN: *Lectures on Jurisprudence.*

BAGEHOT: *Literary Studies.*
BAINES: *History of the Cotton Manufacture.*
BALFOUR: *Educational Systems.*
BAUER: *Gesch. der Christlichen Kirche.*
BLANQUI: *History of Political Economy in Europe.* Eng. trans.
BLUNTSCHLI: *Gesch. der neuern Staatswissenschaft.*
BODLEY: *The Church in France.*
BONAR: *Malthus and his Work.*
BOYS: *Agricultural Report on Kent.*
BRANDES: *Die Hauptströmungen der Literatur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.*
BRODRICK: *English Land and English Landlords.*
BROGLIE: *Duc de, Frederick II. and Maria Theresa.*
BROSCH: *Gesch. des Kirchenstaates.*
BUCKLE: *History of Civilization.*
BURNS: *Life and Works.*
BYRON: *Life and Works.*

CARLYLE: *Works.*
COLERIDGE, S.T.: *Poetical Works.*
" " *Biographia Literaria.*
" " *Lay Sermons.*
COLLETTA: *Storia di Napoli.*
CONDORCET: *Esquisse d'un Tableau Historique des Progrès de l'Esprit Humain.*
COSSA: *Introduction to the Study of Political Economy.* Eng. trans.
COUPLAND: *Spirit of Goethe's Faust.*
COWPER: *Works and Life*, by Southey.
CRABBE: *Poetical Works and Letters.*
CREASY: *History of the Ottoman Turks.*
CUVIER: *Theory of the Earth.* Eng. trans.
CUVIER: *Histoire des Sciences Naturelles depuis* 1789.

DAVY, SIR HUMPHRY: *Works and Life.*
DOWELL: *History of Taxation.*
DÜHRING: *Kritische Geschichte des Nationalökonomie und des Socialismus.*
DÜNTZER: *Life of Goethe.*
,, *Life of Schiller.*
Dictionary of Political Economy.

EDEN: *State of the Poor.*
ELLIS: *Life of Count Rumford.*
English Historical Review, 1886–1906.

FARINI: *Lo Stato Romano.*
FARRAR: *Bampton Lectures*, 1862.
FELKIN: *History of Machine-wrought Hosiery and Lace Manufactures.*
FICHTE: *The Popular Works of.* English trans.
FINLAY: *Greece under Ottoman and Venetian Domination.*
,, *History of the Greek Revolution.*
FISHER: *Napoleonic Statesmanship: Germany.*
FLINT: *Philosophy of History.*
FREEMAN: *The Ottoman Power in Europe.*
FYFFE: *History of Modern Europe.*

GALLOWAY: *A History of Coal Mining.*
GERVINUS: *Gesch. der Deutschen Dichtung.*
,, *Gesch. des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.*
GHETTI: *Storia della Indipendenza Italiana.*
GNEIST: *Contemporary Review*, September, 1885.
GOETHE: *Sammtliche Werke.*
GOTTSCHALL: *Die Deutsche Nationalliteratur.*
GRANT: *History of Physical Astronomy.*
GUALTERIO: *Gli Ultimi Rivolgementi Italiani.*

HALLER: *Gesch. der Russischen Literatur.*
HARTLEY: *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations.*
HÄUSSER: *Deutsche Geschichte.*
HELD: *Zwei Bucher zur socialen Geschichte Englands.*
HENNE-AM-RHYN: *Kulturgeschichte der Neuesten Zeit.*
HERSCHEL, SIR JOHN: *Outlines of Astronomy.*
HETTNER: *Gesch. der Deutschen Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert.*
Histoire Générale: ed. by Lavisse and Rambaud.
HOLBACH: *Système de la Nature.*
HONEGGER: *Grundsteine einer allgemeinen Kulturgeschichte der Neuesten Zeit.*
HOSKYNS, WREN: *Systems of Land Tenure.*
HUMBOLDT: *Cosmos.* Eng. trans.
HUME, DAVID: *Essays.*
HUME, MARTIN: *Modern Spain.*
HUXLEY: *Science and Culture, and other Essays.*

KANT: *Kritik der Reinen Vernunft.*
,, *Grundlegung zur Metaphysic der Sitten.*
KAUTZ: *Die Geschichtlicke Entwickelung der National-Oekonomik.*
KINGZETT: *The History, Products, and Processes of the Alkali Trade.*
KOPP: *Entwickelung der Chemie.*

LANFREY: *History of Napoleon I.*
LECKY: *History of England in Eighteenth Century.*
LEVI, LEONE: *History of British Commerce.*
LOCKHART: *Life of Scott.*
LYELL: *Principles of Geology.*

MACKAY: *The Tübingen School and its Antecedents.*
MACPHERSON: *Annals of Commerce.*
MCCULLOCH: *Dictionary of Commerce.*
MAINE, SIR HENRY: *Ancient Law.*
" *Popular Government.*
MALTHUS: *Essay on Population.*
MARSH: *History and Methods of Palæontological Discovery.*
MARTENS: *Recueil des Principaux Traités.*
MAY, SIR ERSKINE: *Democracy in Europe.*
" " " *Constitutional History of England.*
Metternich's Autobiography.
MICHELET: *Histoire du XIXe Siècle.*
MIJATOVICS: *History of Modern Servia.*
MILL, JAMES: *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind.*
MILLER: *Europe and the Ottoman Empire before the Nineteenth Century: Eng. Hist. Rev.*, vol. xvi.
Mines, Select Committee on Accidents in, 1835.
MOLTKE: *Essay on Poland.*
MONTESQUIEU: *Esprit des Lois.*
MORLEY, J.: *Critical Miscellanies.*
" *Voltaire.*
" *Diderot.*
" *Rousseau.*
MORIER: (*apud*) *Systems of Land Tenure.*

NAPOLÉON: *Correspondance.*
NICOLINI: *History of the Jesuits.*
NISCO: *Storia d'Italia.*

OMAN: *History of the Peninsular War* (in progress).

PARIS: *Life of Sir Humphry Davy.*
PLAYFAIR: *Works.*
PORTER: *Progress of the Nation.*
POWELL, BADEN: *Radiant Heat; British Association Reports.*
PROTHERO: *Pioneers and Progress of English Farming.*

QUINET: *Génie des Religions.*

RAE: *Contemporary Review*, 1883.
RANKE: *History of Servia and the Servian Revolution.* Eng. trans.
Report from the Select Committee on Bills of Enclosures, 1800.
Report from the Select Committee on the Cultivation of Waste Lands, 1795.
RICARDO: *Works*, edited by McCulloch.
ROGERS, THOROLD: *Six Centuries of Work and Wages.*
ROSCHER: *Gesch. der National-Œkonomik in Deutschland.*
ROSE: *Napoleonic Studies.*
ROUSSEAU: *Contrat Social.*
" *Emile.*
RUMFORD, COUNT: *Essays.*

SAY, J. B. : *Traité d'Economie Politique.*
SCHLEIERMACHER : *Life, as unfolded in his Autobiography and Letters.* Eng. trans.
SCHERR : *Deutsche Kultur-und-Sittengeschichte.*
SCHILLER : *Werke.*
SCHLOSSER : *Gesch. des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts.* See note p. 117.
SCHMIDT, JULIAN : *Gesch. der Deutschen Literatur.*
SCHUYLER : *Peter the Great.*
SCOTT, SIR W. : *Novels : Poetical Works.*
SCRIVENOR : *History of the Iron Trade.*
SEEBOHM : *On the Manufacture of Crucible Cast Steel.*
SEELEY : *Life and Times of Stein.*
SETH : *Development from Kant to Hegel.*
SIME : *Lessing.*
SMILES : *Lives of the Early Engineers.*
„ *Lives of Boulton and Watt.*
„ *Industrial Biography.*
„ *Men of Invention and Industry.*
Smith's Wealth of Nations. McCulloch's edition.
SMITH : *Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal.*
SMITH, ANGUS : *Memoir of John Dalton, and History of the Atomic Theory.*
SOUTHEY : *Poetical Works.*
„ *Life.*
STANLEY : *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church.*
STUCKENBERG : *Life of Immanuel Kant.*

TAINE : *The Ancient Régime.* Eng. trans.
„ *The Revolution.* Eng. trans.
TAIT : *Recent Advances in Physical Science.*
THOMSON : *History of Chemistry.*
THURSTON : *History of the Steam-engine.*
TICKNOR : *History of Spanish Literature.*
TOOKE : *History of Prices.*
TOCQUEVILLE : *L'Ancien Régime.*
TULL : *The Horse-hoeing Husbandry*, edited by Cobbett.
TWISS : *Progress of Political Economy.*

WALLACE : *Russia.*
WALPOLE, SPENCER : *History of England.*
WEBER : *Weltgeschichte.*
WELD : *History of the Royal Society.*
WELLINGTON : *Despatches.*
WHEWELL : *History of the Inductive Sciences.*
WORDSWORTH : *Prose Works.*
„ *Poetical Works.*

YOUNG, ARTHUR : *Travels in France.*
„ *Eastern Tour.*
„ *Annals of Agriculture.*
„ *Farmers' Letters.*
„ *Survey of Lincolnshire.*
„ *Northern Tour.*
YOUNG, THOMAS : *Works and Life*, edited by Peacock and Leitch.

INDEX

A

Agriculture in France, 69; advance in England, 175
Alexander I. of Russia, 27, 94, 101; submits to Napoleon, 104; conspires with Napoleon at Tilsit, 105; attacked by Napoleon, 112; assumes the part of general liberator, 114; on citizen armies, 120 *n.*; his character, 150; efforts to reduce serfage, 151; early reforms, 152; disappointments, 153; Speranski's ministry, 154; second period, 156; seizes Finland, 156; war with Turkey, 159; and the *Wealth of Nations*, 215; and the Russian nation, 305
Alfieri, 140; on aspect of England, 182 *n.*, 306
Ali Pasha, 168
America, South, British commerce with, instituted, 110 *n.*
Arago, 232
Aranda, 36
Arkwright, 203, 208, xi.
Armies, in eighteenth century, 2; in France, 65; revolutionary, 88, 119; introduction of short service citizen armies, 118; army reform in Turkey, 162; social discipline, 307
Arndt, 116, xiv.
Auerstadt, battle of, 103
Augustus III., 45
Austen, Jane, 302, xiv.
Austerlitz, battle of, 101
Austria, in eighteenth century, 26; after peace of Lunéville, 94; after Austerlitz, 101; war of 1809, 111; in alliance with Napoleon, 113; in war of Liberation, 122; at the Congress of Vienna, 127, 128; retrograde policy, 138; in Italy, 142, 143
Avignon annexed to France, 87

B

Bacon, on inventions, 194; on balance of trade, 209
Baden, after peace of Lunéville, 94; after Austerlitz, 102; reforms in, 133
Baer, von, 246 *n.*
Bagehot, on Waverley novels, 299
Bairactar, 163
Bavaria, after peace of Lunéville, 94; after Austerlitz, 102; at Congress of Vienna, 128; reforms in, 133
Beethoven, 278–280, xii.
Bell, Andrew, 314 *n.*, xiii.
Bell, Sir Charles, xiv.
Bentham, 192, 258, 309, xi.
Bergman, 236, 241 *n.*
Berlin, decree of, 106
Bernstorff, 158
Berthollet, 204, 235, 236, 237
Berzelius, 236 *n.*, 238, xiii.
Bichat, 246 *n.*, xiii.
Black, 196, 235, 241
Blucher, 119, 123
Bluntschli on Frederick the Great, 20
Bohler, Peter, 317
Bonaparte, Napoleon, his despotism, 89; First Consul, 90; his character and policy, 91; his German

policy, 93; consul for life, 95; concordat with Pius VII., 96; attitude towards the churches, 96; publishes the Code Napoléon, 98; made emperor, 100. *See* Napoleon.
Bonaparte, Joseph, 105, 144
Bonaparte, Jerome, 105, 133
Bonaparte, Louis, 105
Boulton, 196, 201, 208
Bourgeoisie, continental, 309
Bramah, 201, xiii.
Bridgewater, Duke of, 179
Brindley, 179, 209
Brongniart, 247
Brougham, 231
Browning, on an age of hope, 1
Bucharest, peace of, 159, 160
Bürger, 298
Burke, 8, 321
Burns, on the Cotter, 182 *n.*; as a poet, 286–288; on charity, 296 *n.*; on kings, 307
Byron, on rebellion against the Turk, 150; on Ali Pasha, 169; as a European poet, 294–297, xiv.

C

Cadell on Scott's influence, 300 *n.*
Calonne, 63
Campomanes, 36
Canals, in England, 179, 208; in Sweden, 158 *n.*
Carbonari, 144
Carlisle and electrolysis, 238
Carlyle on tools, 194
Catherine II., her reign and policy, 28–31; protects the Jesuits, 36; intervenes in Poland, 45; her Turkish policy, 160; educates Alexander I., 150
Catholic Church, in eighteenth century, 2, 4; disestablished in France, 83; loses its principalities in Germany, 94; re-established in France by Bonaparte's concordat, 95; Ultramontanism, 97; Febronianism, 97 *n.*
Cartwright, his power-loom, 204, xii.
Cavendish, 235
Charles III. of Spain, IV. of Naples, expels the Jesuits, 35; his reign in Spain, 36; his reign in Naples, 37
Charles IV. of Spain, 36
Charles Emanuel III., 39
Charles Frederick of Baden, 133
Charles XIII. of Sweden, 156
Chladni and acoustics, 232
Clement XIV. suppresses the Jesuits, 36
Clement, mechanical engineer, 201
Code Napoléon, 98, 132, 134
Coleridge, S. T., on English landlords and the mercantile spirit, 185; and the French Revolution, 281, 289; as a critic and poet, 290, xiii.
Colletta, on Bonaparte's rule in Italy, 141 *n.*
Condillac, 259
Condorcet, on population, 216 *n.*
Congress of Vienna, 122, 125–130; Greeks at, 167; Serbs at, 173; the new economics at, 215; changes at, 303
Consalvi, 143
Constitutional idea, in eighteenth century, 11, 57; in nineteenth century, 308–310
Continental system, 106
Cort, Henry, 198
Cotton manufacture, 177; spinning machinery and prices, 203
Criticism, the age of, 6; transcendental, 250
Cowper, on the poor, 182 *n.*; the *Task*, 285; on Burns, 287
Crabbe, 281; the *Village*, 286, 297
Crompton, 203
Cuvier, on fossils, 243; on French zoology, 244 *n.*; his teleological conceptions in biology, 246, xiv.

D

Dalton, his theory of multiple proportions, 237, xiii.
Darby, Abraham, 198
Davy, invents safety lamp, 199; and the dynamical theory of heat, 233; and chlorine, 236; and electrolysis, 238

Delisle and crystallography, 241 *n.*
Denmark, revolution of, 1660, 40; under Frederick III., 41; under Christian V., 41, 42; under Frederick IV., 42; under Frederick VI., 158; losses of, 159
Denner invented clarinet, 280 *n.*
Descartes, 225, 249
Dörnberg, 111
Duma, Catherine's, 29
Dumont, 193

E

Economics, in eighteenth century, 4; Napoleon's mercantilism, 107; the old mercantile system, 209; the *Wealth of Nations*, 211–215; Malthus on population, 215–217; the Ricardian theory of rent, 218; conflict between labour and capital, 219; Say's doctrine of gluts and international trade, 219–221; conflict involved in the industrial order, 310
Edgeworth, Maria, 302
Education, 314
Eighteenth century movement, 5
Elgin, Lord, 197
Empire, Holy Roman, in eighteenth century, 22; effect of Frederick the Great's career, 23; its ruin completed by Bonaparte, 92; formally dissolved, 103
Emser Punktation, 97 *n.*
England, aristocratic government in, 46; influence of Pitt, 47; pretensions of George III. to absolute government, 48; growth of liberalism in Parliament, 48; third coalition war, 100; provokes continental system, 106; in alliance with Spain, 109; trade with South America instituted, 110 *n.*; holds Portugal, 112; at Waterloo, 123; after Congress of Vienna, 129; moral gain, 129; measures against piracy and slave-trade, 130; area of its industrial revolution, 174, 321; advance of agriculture, 175; transformation of the textile industries, 177; general advance of manufactures, 178; expansion of trade, 179; sufferings of the labouring classes, 180; increase of population, wealth, and debt, 180 *n.*; the old house industry, 182; rise of the factory system, 183; enclosure of commons, 184; decline of small farming, 184; the poor-law, 186; machinery and operatives, 187; leases and yearly tenancy, 188; decay of the yeomanry, 189; social aspects of the industrial revolution, 189; industrialism and political representation, 190; Bentham's clear rule of reform, 192; social dangers of the new industrial system, 209; influence of Adam Smith, 192, 214; place of the unemployed, 221; British empirical psychology, 256–259; national character of English literature, 281; Methodism and realism, 283; naturalism and the revolution in literature, chap. xi.
Equality, principle of, 9
Euler, 227

F

Febronius, 97 *n.*
Ferdinand IV. of Naples, 37
Ferdinand VII. of Spain, 148; as Prince of Asturias, 108
Ferrier, Susan, 302
Feudalism, persistence of, 2; in France, 67; in Prussia, 135
Feyjoó, 146
Fielding, 282
Fichte, 116, 254; on the German ideal of culture, 274
Finland, 106, 156
Floridablanca (Moniño), 36
Foscolo Ugo, 140
Fouché, 100, 126
France, culture of, in eighteenth century, 9; monarchy in, 10; banishment of the Jesuits, 35; under Louis XVI., 50; Turgot's ministry, 50–54; revolution rendered inevitable, 54; till then unnecessary, 55; alliance with America,

62; conduct of the notables and parliaments, 63; union of orders in Dauphiny, 64; general hostility towards the government, 65; condition of the peasantry, 67–71; diversity of conditions, 70; popular discontent excited, 71; disturbing effect of administrative changes, 71; character of the nobility, 72–75; importance of the middle classes, 75; the dangerous classes, 76, 77; widespread disturbance, 78; meeting of the States-General, 78; the National Assembly declared, 80; insurrection in Paris and the provinces, 80; feudalism abolished, 81; the Assembly coerced by the mob, 82; persistence of anarchy, 83; fear of foreign invasion, 84; the Girondists promote the Jacobin cause, 85; outbreak of the revolutionary war, 86; tyranny of the revolutionary governments, 87; triumph of the revolutionary armies, 88; *coup d'état*, Brumaire, 18, 90; Bonaparte's policy, 91; the Concordat, 95; the code, 98; first empire, 100; third coalition war, 100; defeats Prussia, 103; growth of affluence, 107 *n.*; sanctions the continental system, 107; invades Spain, 109; attacks Austria, 110; invades Prussia, 113; defeated at Leipzig, 121; the Hundred Days, 122; second return of the Bourbons, 124; at the Congress of Vienna, 126; backward state of iron industry, 202; eminence of French scientists, 235, 244 *n.*; philosophy in, 259

Francis, II. as Emperor of Germany, I. as Emperor of Austria, 26; in third coalition war, 101; dissolves formally the Holy Roman Empire, 102

Frederick the Great, on monarchy, 13; command to Podewils, 16; compared with Peter the Great, 18; relation to the intellectual movement, 19, 20; personal character of his rule, 21; his relation to Germany, 22; protects the Jesuits, 35; despises German authors, 275

Frederick III. of Denmark, 40

Frederick IV. of Denmark, 42

Frederick William I., 21

Frederick William III. humiliated by Napoleon, 103

Free cities, German, for the most part abolished, 94, 128

Fresnel, 232

Friderikshamm, peace of, 156

Friedland, battle of, 104

G

Geikie, Sir Archibald, on fossils, 243 *n.*

Geneva, 61

George III., 48

Germany, in eighteenth century, 22; after the peace of Lunéville, 92–95; revolt against Ultramontanism, 97 *n.*; after Austerlitz, 102; insurrectionary spirit, 113; intellectual revival, 114; birth of modern German patriotism, 115, 305; leadership of Prussia, 116; battle of Leipzig, 121; at the Congress of Vienna, 128; the *Deutscher Bund*, 128; Napoleon's influence on, 92–95, 132; progress of the different states, 133; political attitude of the people, 139; Kant's influence, 253; national literature, chap. x.; the German ideal of culture, 274, 287; Fichte on, 274; Thomas Young on, 275; social aspect of the literary revival, 275; the German stage, 276; music, 277–280

Gervinus, on Congress of Vienna, 125; on our age, 303

Giannone, 37

Girondists, 61 *n.*, 85, 87

Glück, theory of opera, 278

Gneisenau, 119

Godoy, 36, 108, 146

Goethe, on tradition, 50; on metamorphosis and homology, 245, 246 *n.*; early association with Herder, 265; early works, 266;

relation to European culture, 268; Faust as an historical document, 268; Faust as a human document, 269; Goethe's idea of self-culture, 270; Goethe as a citizen, 271; in comradeship with Schiller, their classical ideal, 272; Meisters Lehrjahre, 277; on Mozart, 278, xiv.
Goldoni, 140
Greece, position of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, 164; intellectual awakening, 165; Philomuse Society, 166; Philiké Hetairia, 168; influence of Ali Pasha, 168; at the Congress of Vienna, 167; national idea, 306
Griffenfeldt, 42
Gustavus III., 42–44

H

Hadley, 226
Hadow, on chamber music, 279
Hall, Sir James, 241
Hanover, 134, 135
Hardenberg, 134; his legislation, 135, 137
Hargreaves, 203
Harrison, 226
Hartley, on man, 256–259
Hauy, and crystallography, 242 *n.*
Haydn, 278, xi.
Heine, on Napoleon's despotism and Napoleon's hand, 90
Helvetius, 7 *n.*
Herder, on taste, 260; and national culture, 263; and the historical idea, 264; his influence on Goethe, 265, xii.
Herschel, Sir John, on progress of material civilization, 174
Herschel, Sir William, on astronomy, 228–230
Hisinger, 238
History, modern, change of method required, 318–321, vii.
Hobbes, on wealth, 194
Holbach, on monarchy, 57 *n.*, 58
Holland, in eighteenth century, 61; after Congress of Vienna, 129
Hontheim (Febronius), 97 *n.*
Humboldt, on geognosy, 243
Hume, on monarchical government, 13; on the French financiers, 68; in relation to Kant, 250–256
Huntsman, Benjamin, invents cast steel, 200
Hutton and geology, 240
Huxley, 247

I

Industry in eighteenth century, 3. *See* Revolution, Industrial; Machinery; England.
Ionian Islands, 129.
Italy, spirit of reform in, 37; republics, 61; after Austerlitz, 102; at the Congress of Vienna, 128; need of autonomy, 139; Napoleon's influence, 140; references to independence, 141; restoration in, 143; the *sette*, 144; national feeling, 305

J

Jacobins, 82
Jacquard, 203
Jahn, 116
Jassy, peace of, 160
Jena, battle of, 103
Jesuits, and Pombal, 32; degeneracy of the order, 34; their expulsion from Portugal, 34; abolition of the order, 35; protected in Prussia and Russia, 35, 36; restored in Rome, 143
Jönkoping, peace of, 157
Jordan, 119
Joseph I. of Portugal, 32
Joseph II. of Austria, 21; his character and career, 23–27; and Febronianism, 97; Turkish policy, 160
Josephism, 26 *n.*
Jovellanos, 146
Jussieu, 245

K

Kainardji, peace of, 160
Kalisch, treaty of, 120

Kant, on his age, 6; influence on Germany, 115; his nebular hypothesis, 229, xi.; his critical philosophy, 249–255
Kara George, 172
Keats, Saintsbury on, 297 *n.*, xv.
Kiel, treaty of, 158
Kirwan, 235
Kolberg, 119
Kónig, his steam-printing press, 207
Koraes, 166, 167
Körner, 116, xv.
Kostomárof, 15
Kotzebue, 277
Krauss, 215
Kurhesse, 134

L

Laharpe, 150
Lamarck, 245, xiv.
Lancaster, Joseph, 314 *n.*
Laplace, 229, 232, xiii.
Lavoisier, 235, 236
Law, William, 318
Leblanc, 205
Legion of honour, 95
Leibniz, 15, 228, 250
Leipzig, battle of, 121
Leopold II., as Emperor, 26; as Grand Duke in Tuscany, 38, 143; and revolutionary France, 87
Lessing, 115, 261
Lisbon, earthquake of, 32
Literature and history, 260; national, in Germany, 115, chap. x.; in Greece, 166; in Austria, 138; in Italy, 37, 140; in Spain, 146; in Russia, 155; in England, chap. xi.; and Cant, 294
Locke, 7, 249
Louis XVI., 50–54
Louis XVIII., 122, 124
Louisiana, 108
Lunéville, peace of, 92, 102
Lyell, 242

M

Machiavelli, on ecclesiastical principalities, 95; on fortresses, 114; on "Uno Spirito Italiano," 140 *n.*
Machinery and operatives, 187; and history, 194; Watt's steam-engine, 196; wind- and water-mills, water-pressure engines, 197 *n.*; progress of the mineral industries, 197, 199; smelting, puddling, and rolling iron, 198; the miner's safety lamp, 199; cast steel as tool steel, 200; want of efficient tools, 200; development of machine tools, 201; causes of England's industrial advance, 202; cotton-spinning machinery, 203; the power-loom, 204; chemical bleaching, 204; the new chemical and alkali trades, 205; the steam-printing press, 205; the paper-making machine, 207; moral characteristics of the great inventors and engineers, 208; civil engineering, 179, 208; place of the unemployed, 221, 311
Mahmoud, 11, 163, 169
Malesherbes, 51, 54
Malthus on population, 215–217
Malus, 232
Maria Theresa, and Austrian reform, 26; and the Jesuits, 35
Maskelyne, 227, xii.
Maudslay, 201
Mayer constructs lunar tables, 227
Mercantile theory, Napoleon's, 107; in economics, 209–211
Methodism, 130, 284, 316
Metternich, 127, 142
Michelet, 98
Middle classes, in France, 75, 107 *n.*; in England, 190; rule of, 312
Mill, J. S., on speculative beliefs, 223
Mill, James, treatment of associationist psychology, 258
Milosh Obrenovics, 172
Modena, 143
Mohs, 242 *n.*
Monarchy, at the head of the modern state, 1; in eighteenth century, 3; confidence in, 10; interested in reforms, 11; Hume

on, 13; as a reformer, 13, 14; Frederick the Great on, 13; in Russia under Peter I., 14; in Prussia under Frederick II., 18; in Austria under Joseph II., 23; in Russia under Catherine II., 28; in Portugal under Pombal, 32; in Spain and Naples under Charles III., 36, 37; in Tuscany under Leopold, 38; in Piedmont under the House of Savoy, 38; in the Scandinavian states, 39; established in Denmark, 41; in Sweden under Gustavus III., 42; failure of, in Poland, 44; in England under George III., 48; in France under Louis XVI., 50; failure to obviate French Revolution, 54; decline of moral reputation, 56; Holbach on, 57 *n.*; attacked by the philosophers, 57; precarious position in France, 64; Montesquieu on, 73; faults in first revolutionary war, 88; failure in Turkey, 161; prepared for the national idea, 305; survival of the monarchical idea, 307; monarchy conceived of as limited, 309
Montesquieu, 7 *n.*; on monarchy, 73, 77, 308; on commerce, 210
Moravian brotherhood of Herrnhut, 316
Morley, John, on the industrial expansion of England, 174
Mozart, 277, xii.
Murat, 142
Murdoch, 200
Music, German, 277–280

N

Naples, under Charles IV., 37; at the Restoration, 138, 142, 143
Napoleon (*see* Bonaparte), on degradation, 90; policy after Austerlitz, 102; overthrows Prussia, 103; achieves the Peace of Tilsit, 104; issues Berlin decree, 106; invades Spain, 109; imposes Peace of Vienna, 111; invades Russia, 112; attacked by Prussia, 120; defeated at Leipzig, 121; deposed, 122; the Hundred Days, 122; his last campaign, 123; death, 124; as an agent of the Revolution, 131; on Liberal Government, 134 *n.*; influence of his rule on Italy, 140; criticizes *Werther*, 267
Nationality, in Spain, 109; lacking in Germany, 114, 128
National Idea, 303–307
Necker, 63, 75, 79
Netherlands, Kingdom of, 128
Newton, 7, 225, 230
Nicholson and electrolysis, 238
Notables, French, 63
Norway united to Swedish crown, 158
Novel, modern, 282, 300; of common life, 301

O

Obrenovics, Milosh, 172
Onions, 198
Ossian in Germany, 263, 266

P

Pacca, Cardinal, 143
Parini, 140
Paris, first peace of, 125
Parliaments of France, 63
Parma, 143
Pasvanoglu, 169
Peter the Great, his example to Europe, 15; general influence on Russia and the organization of classes, 16–18; uncertain results of his reign, 18; compared with Frederick the Great, 18, 19
Philiké Hetairia, 168
Philomuse Society, 166
Philosophy, materialistic in France, 9, 58; relation to science, 248; the problem, 248; Kant's new point of view, 249; the critical method, 250; extensive influence of the critical philosophy, 251; Kant's moral influence, 115, 253; common sense, 255; empirical

psychology, 256; Hartley on man, 256–258; James Mill's *Analysis*, 258; influence of British speculation, 258; in nineteenth century, 314
Pianoforte and chamber music, 279, xi.
Piedmont, in eighteenth century, 38; at the Congress of Vienna, 128; Restoration in, 143
Pillnitz, declaration of, 84
Pitt, Lord Chatham, 47, xi.
Pitt, William, and third coalition war, 101; his finance, 181 *n.*; and reform, 191, xii.
Pius VI., 38, 96
Pius VII., 96
Plato on despotism, 90
Playfair, 242
Poland, anarchy in, 44; partitions of, 45; republican semblance, 61 *n.*
Pombal, his ministry in Portugal, 32; his conflict with the Jesuits, 33
Poniatowski, Stanislaus, 45
Pope, 282
Portugal, 112, 145; under Pombal, 32
Poverty, European opinion on, 186 *n.*
Presburg, peace of, 101
Prices, of cotton yarn, 203; soda, bleaching powder, and sulphuric acid, 206; wheat in England, xiii., xiv., 182 *n.*
Priestley, 235, 258, xii.
Progress and industrial expansion, 321–323
Prussia, under Frederick the Great, 19; after Peace of Lunéville, 94; after Austerlitz, 102; overthrown by Napoleon, 103; panic in, 104; after Tilsit, 105; in alliance with Napoleon, 113; its leadership of Germany, 116; reform of its army, 117; turns against Napoleon, 120; in the Waterloo Campaign, 123; at the Congress of Vienna, 126; regeneration of, 134–137; influence of Adam Smith, 214

Q

Quinet on Napoleon's career, 131

R

Rastadt, congress of, 92
Rationalism in eighteenth century, 8; in France, 58
Regensburg, the German Diet at, 92
Religion, and geology, 239; Kant's treatment of, 252–255; religion for religion's sake, 315; reinstatement of the religious consciousness, 318. *See* Catholic Church, Methodism.
Revolution, French, rendered inevitable, 54; till then unnecessary, 55; advent of, chap. iii.; not due to misery of the people, 66; its proselytizing character, 86; under Bonaparte, 89, 91, 131; at the Restoration, 124; compared with English industrial revolution, 174; relation between the two revolutions, 320; prejudicial to English political development, 190, 191; in English literature, 289
Revolution, industrial, English, chap. vii.; Mantoux on, 175 *n.*; in Europe, 309–314, 320. *See* England, and Machinery.
Rheinbund, 102
Rhigas, 166, 167
Ricardo, 218, xv.
Richardson, 282
Rights of man according to American declaration, 56
Rivarola, 143
Robert, Louis, 207
Roebuck, 196, 205, 208
Roemer, 230
Rome, at the Restoration, 143
Romilly, xiv.
Rosenkampff, 153, 154
Rousseau, on equality, 10; theory of natural society, 58, 216; doctrine of politics, 59; republican ideas, 60; and the French peasant, 70, 308

Royer-Collard, 259
Rückert, 116
Rumford (William Thompson), and the dynamical theory of heat, 233
Russia, under Peter the Great, 14; institution of the Tchin, 17; foreign influences in, 27; under Catherine II., 28; invaded by Napoleon, 112; at the Congress of Vienna, 126; under Alexander I., 150–156; Peace of Bucharest, 159; alliance with Servia, 171; national feeling in, 305

S

San Marino, 61
Saxony, made a kingdom, 105; at the Congress of Vienna, 126; conservatism in, 133
Say, 219, xiv.
Scharnhorst, introduces short service system, 119
Scheele, 204, 235, 236
Schill, 111
Schiller, on civil conflict, 56; on British maritime policy, 107 *n.*; on Kant, 253; on freedom in poetry, 260; his first period, 272; comradeship with Goethe, 273; their influence on German culture, 273; as patriotic poet, 274, xiii.
Schleiermacher, 116, 316–318
Science, and general history, 223; growth of positive theory, 224; law of gravitation, 225; construction of lunar tables, 226; general acceptance of the law of gravity, 227; sidereal astronomy, 228; nebular hypothesis, 229; theory of light, 230–232; theory of sound, 232; dynamical theory of heat, 233; phlogistic theory of chemistry, 234; modern theory of combustion, 235; institution of modern chemistry, 235–238; voltaic electricity, 238; positive theory in geology, 238–242; origin of palæontology, 242; origin of crystallography, 244 *n.*; speculative biology, 244; early history of theory of evolution, 245; persistence of teleological conceptions in biology, 246; relation between science and philosophy, 248; helpful to industry, 314
Scott, his poems, 298; his novels, 299, xiii.
Selim III., 159; his accession, 161; his fall, 163
Semler, 317
Servia, harassed by the janissaries, 170; revolt by help of Russia, and the treaty of Bucharest, 171; defective organization, 172; defeat, 172
St. Hilaire, Geoffrey, 245, 247
Shelley and sedition, 296, xv.
Sinclair, Sir John, 176 *n.*
Sinking fund, Pitt's, 181 *n.*
Smith, Adam, 135, 154, 192, *The Wealth of Nations*, 211–214; practical influence on Europe, 215; his error respecting rent, 217
Smith, William, 242, xv.
Southey, 289; as a man of letters, 290, xiii.
Spain, under Charles III., 35, 36; misrule of Godoy, 108; insurrection against Napoleon, 109, 112; Joseph's rule, 144; assembly of the Cortes, 145; character of the Cortes, 146; constitution of 1812, 147; precarious position of the Cortes, 147; return of Ferdinand VII., 148; his *coup d'état*, 149; inevitableness of civil strife, 149
Spencer on social intercourse, 301
Speranski, his ministry and fall, 153–156, 215
Spinoza on money, 210 *n.*; on religion, 317 *n.*
Stadion, 110
Stahl, 234
Stanley, Dean, on the Eastern Church, 316 *n.*
Stein, 118, 120, 128; issues edict of emancipation, 135; municipal reform, 136; administrative reform, 137
Storch, 215
Squillace, 35

St. Germain, 51, 54
States-General, French (États-Généraux), 63, 64, 78
Streltsi, destruction of, 16
Sweden, in eighteenth century, 42-44; after Congress of Vienna, 129; under Carl XIII. and Bernadotte, 156–159; loses Finland, 129, 156; acquires Norway, 158; completes Trollhœta canal, 158 *n.*
Switzerland, in eighteenth century, 61; after Congress of Vienna, 129

T

Talleyrand, on legitimacy, 125
Tanucci, 37
Telford, 209
Tennant, 204
Thorpe on Dalton's theory, 237 *n.*
Tilsit, peace of, 104
Tolly, Barclay de, 113
Tomn, Lilian, on early cotton manufacture, 177 *n.*
Torres Vedras, 112
Tull, Jethro, on virgilian husbandry, 175
Turgot, 7 *n.*; his ministry, 50–55
Turkey, 106; decay of, 159; degeneracy of the janissaries, 160; accession of Selim III., 161; fall of Selim and accession of Mahmoud II., 162; elements of improvement, 163; new phase of revolt against Turkish rule, 164
Tuscany, under Grand Duke Leopold, 38; at the Restoration, 143

U

Ultramontanism, modern, 97

V

Vauban, 68
Vauquelin, 236, 242 *n.*
Venaissin annexed to France, 87
Venice, 127, 142
Vergennes, 53
Victor Amadeus II., 39
Victor Amadeus III., 39
Vienna, peace of, 111
Voltaire, 7 *n.*, 60 *n.*, 98, 209, 308

W

Wagram, battle of, 111
Warsaw, Duchy of, 126
Waterloo, battle of, 123
Watt, 196, 200, 201, 204, xi.
Weiss, 242 *n.*
Wellington, in Portugal, 112; on citizen armies, 120 *n.*; at Waterloo, 123; on Spanish constitution, 147, xiv.
Werner, 240, 243, xii.
Wesley, 130, 284, 316–318
Westphalia, kingdom of, 105, 133, 134 *n.*
Wilkie, 299
William I. of the United Netherlands, 129
Winterschmidt, 197 *n.*
Wollaston, 242 *n.*
Wordsworth, on the Convention of Cintra, 109; on England's dread of change, 191; on disillusion, 289; as critic and poet, 291–294, xiii.
Würtemberg, after peace of Lunéville, 94; after Austerlitz, 102; at Congress of Vienna, 128; reforms in, 133; Duke of, 272

Y

York, 120
Young, Arthur, on French farming, 69 *n.*; on English agriculture, 176; on cow-keeping, 184 *n.*; on leases, 188
Young, Thomas, on scientific law, 223; his undulatory theory of light, 231; on Germany, 275, xiii.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF