

orator saluted an "apostle of modern times." The theatrical character of the proceedings upon the occasion of the unveiling of the bust of Rabelais at Meudon made this small event rather interesting. Two literary societies, composed of men from the south of France, the *Félibres* and *La Cigale*, took upon themselves to atone at this late day for the neglect of northern Frenchmen. Under the pretext that the "jolly priest" of Meudon, a native of Chinon, in Touraine, had studied medicine at Montpellier and dwelt for some time in the Golden Isles, the *Isolo d'oro*, they came to an understanding with the municipal authorities of Meudon, and the result is a bust by the sculptor, M. Truphème, of the author of Gargantua and Pantagruel. On the 11th of July the invited guests were received at the station by a picturesque *cortège*, composed of ancient heralds-at-arms and lansquenets surrounding the triumphal car of Gargantua, followed by twelve "thélémistes" in brilliant costumes and a numerous corps of "escholiers" of the sixteenth century. In this order they proceeded to the little square where the bust had been erected with the inscription: "À François Rabelais, Curé de Meudon, Docteur de Montpellier et Caloyer des Isles d'Hyères; Les Cigaliers et les habitants de Meudon." M. Henry Fouquier was the orator of the day. In a very bright introduction he denied that the Frenchmen of the south wished to claim as one of their conquests a man who belongs to all France. After this speech M. Mounet-Sully of the Comédie-Française recited a charming poem by M. François Fabié, "*La Cigale à Rabelais*." We have been so fatigued, not to use a more violent and expressive word, by the semi-official and bombastic verses pronounced of late at the foot of various statues, that the stanzas of M. Fabié come as a graceful reminder that poetry is still possible on such occasions.

THE INDIAN EMPIRE.

The Indian Empire. Its history, people, and products. By W. W. Hunter, C.S.I., C.I.E., LL.D. 2d edition. London: Trübner & Co.

THIS compilation belongs to that class of books which, according to Charles Lamb's classification, bears the same relation to literature, properly so called, as does a backgammon board lettered on the back to represent the 'History of England.' It is the work of a clever man and an accomplished writer, and must have demanded a great deal of labor in its preparation; but it is difficult to conjecture the kind of reader for whom it can have either utility or interest. The "general reader" is generally credited—upon no trustworthy evidence, so far as we can see—with an insatiable voracity for every species of information; but if there be one of these persons who could sit down and work his way through Dr. Hunter's 'Indian Empire,' he ought to be put under a glass case and preserved for the instruction of posterity as an extraordinary *lusus naturæ*. His thirst for information would indeed be abnormal. From the "physical aspects" of India, he would pass lightly to a study of her "Non-Aryan populations"; then of the "Aryans," then the Buddhists, the Greeks, the Scythians, the Hindus, the Moslems, the Mahrattas, the British; agriculture, trade, geology, meteorology, vital statistics, and much other miscellaneous information. The student, on the other hand, of one or more of these various subjects would be repelled from Dr. Hunter's by another cause. It is an attempt to achieve the impossible. "The book," to quote the author's own words, "tries to present within a small compass an account of India and her people," and no account can be given in a small compass of so vast a subject without being

misleading and unsatisfactory. Dr. Hunter is himself partially aware of this:

"Continuous condensation," he says, "although convenient to the reader, has its perils for the author. Many Indian topics are still open questions, with regard to which divergences of opinion may fairly exist. In some cases I have been compelled by brevity to state my conclusions without setting forth the evidence on which they rest, and without any attempt to combat alternative views. In other matters, I have had to content myself with conveying a correct general impression, while omitting the modifying details."

The opening sentence of this paragraph ought, we think, to be reversed and run as follows: "Condensation, although convenient to the author, has its perils for the reader." We cannot profess to be an authority on the greater part of the matters treated of in this volume, but to a few of them we have devoted considerable thought and study, and of these we are bound to say that Dr. Hunter has, in our judgment, signally failed, in many instances, to "convey a correct general impression." To say this is to make no impeachment of Dr. Hunter's ability or veracity. It is the natural consequence of the method which limitations of space have compelled him to adopt—namely, that of "stating his conclusions without setting forth the evidence on which they rest." When we remember that upon nearly all the controverted points of Indian history (and their name is legion) the controversy is upon the evidence—upon the authenticity, that is, of the facts which are appealed to in support of this or that conclusion—the omission which Dr. Hunter acknowledges, deprives his historical dissertations of all value for any student who is not prepared to accept his conclusions at second hand.

Apart from this, however, there is another consideration which makes this volume of very doubtful value as an independent testimony to either the past or present condition of India. It is an official publication, prepared and published by a highly paid official of the Indian Government, and it is idle to suppose that one occupying this position can weigh evidence or state facts with the calm dispassionateness of a Grote or a Thirlwall. The consequence is that the more nearly he approaches the present day, the more grievously does an instructed reader find occasion to complain of Dr. Hunter's way of putting things. The impartial historian withdraws further and further in the background, and his place is supplied in the most unwelcome manner by an advocate holding a brief in favor of the bureaucratic system by which India is governed at the present day. We do not mean that Dr. Hunter is guilty of deliberate and intentional inaccuracy, but that from his position he is unable to weigh impartially the relative value of different orders of facts; that he places, so to speak, the emphasis on the wrong place, and is a great deal too apt to write as if good intentions on the part of a Government were identical with successful administration. Take, for example, the following passage, contrasting the present state of land-tenure with that which prevailed in India anterior to British rule:

"Legal titles have everywhere taken the place of unwritten customs. Land, which was merely a source of livelihood to the cultivators and of revenue to the state, has become a valuable property to the owners. The fixing of the revenue demand has conferred upon the landholder a credit which he never before possessed, and created for him a source of future profit arising out of the unearned increment. This credit he may use improprietly; but none the less has the land system of India been raised from a lower to a higher stage of civilization—that is to say, from holdings in common to holdings in severalty, and from the corporate possession of the village community to individual proprietary rights."

There is hardly a sentence in this passage which

does not, to our thinking, convey an impression to the mind exactly the reverse of the truth. For example, it may be true, in a sense, that "legal titles have everywhere taken the place of unwritten customs"; but of what advantage is that to the peasant proprietor of India if, under the "unwritten custom," he enjoyed a sense of security in his property which is altogether wanting under the British system of "legal titles"? And that that is so is a fact notorious to every one who has been in India. It is a common but most mischievous error to suppose that individual rights of property did not coexist with the ancient village-community system, which the English have done so much to break up. They did; and, being founded upon "unwritten custom"—i. e., upon the common faith and sanction, and the immemorial practice of the community as a whole—they were practically impregnable. But, by the English system of "legal titles," the rights of each little cultivator are recorded in a language which he does not understand; are in the custody of underpaid native officials over whom he has no control; are virtually inaccessible to his inspection; and, by means of fraud and bribery, have, in myriads of cases, instead of serving as a protection, become the means of ousting him from his little possessions. In nothing has British rule in India failed more signally than in giving firmness and security to the tenure of landed property.

Again, Dr. Hunter says that "the land system of India has been raised from a lower to a higher stage of civilization; that is to say, from holdings in common to holdings in severalty, and from corporate possession of the village community to individual proprietary right." There might, perhaps, be some cause for congratulation in this change if the transition had been effected with deliberate foresight and intention. Actually, however, the British rulers of India could not conceive that landed property could be held anywhere except upon precisely the same conditions under which it was held in their own island; and the havoc and desolation which, under this mistaken impression they have wrought in their newly acquired Indian possessions, is one of the most harrowing stories on record. When the village brotherhood tried to explain to the English official that they did not know what a "landlord" meant, the latter imagined that they were seeking to impose upon him; but, not being able to discover the genuine article, he seized upon some unfortunate official in the little village republic, and insisted upon investing him with all the responsibilities of a landlord. This man was held responsible for the payment of the revenue, and when he failed to do that, which was wholly beyond his power, the entire village community was sold out for a demand of which they had never heard, and found themselves transformed, by the flourish of a pen, into tenants at will of some greedy money-lender who had bought them, like so many head of cattle, at a public auction. As compared with the land-revenue system of their Moslem predecessors, that of the English in India must be pronounced a ruinous failure. The leading feature of the Moslem system was to root, so to speak, the entire machinery for the assessment and collection of the land-tax in the soil itself, and thus to give to all the functionaries employed a personal interest of the most stringent kind in the reduction of the State demand. The whole hierarchy, from the Zemindar downwards, were holders or cultivators of the lands which they had to assess, and it is obvious at a glance how strong a protection against undue exaction on the part of the state was provided by this felicitous arrangement. But an English revenue collector and his horde of native underlings are altogether divorced from the soil. Their duty is merely to realize the revenue at the ap-

pointed seasons, without regard for the consequences to those who have to pay it.

"Our system," writes a brother official of Dr. Hunter, "is simply to collect the tax to the last penny through the agency of the native tax-collectors. As the instalments fall due, the native tax-collector scatters his notices to pay all over his subdivision; there are no jungles to fly to for refuge, and there are auction sales which are upheld by the arm of a resistless Government. The English collector knows little and does less. The landowners feel that mercy is not to be expected; they pay what they can from the rents, and they mortgage or sell their property privately in order to liquidate any balances, for they fear that a smaller sum will be secured if the sale is an auction one managed by dishonest Government subordinates. *There is, in fact, no real revenue administration.*"

There is, in point of fact, a double aspect belonging to the British connection with India. Morally and intellectually, its influence for good largely preponderates. Not only have widow-burning, female infanticide, Thuggism, and other unnatural crimes been suppressed, but their perpetration has, in a measure, become impossible by the gradual restoration of the Indian mind to a sound normal condition. The remarkable intellectual capacities of the Indian races have been furnished with a common speech, and their energies turned into fruitful channels; and it is from this point of view that the future of British supremacy in India is full of hope and promise. But in the actual conduct of the Government, the experiment of administering the affairs of a vast continent by a foreign bureaucracy and without the coöperation and assistance of the people has failed, as it was bound to do. In the assessment and collection of the land-tax, in the administration of justice, in the management of the finances, in the organization of the police, the history of British rule in India is a history of almost unrelieved blundering, and consequent grievous sufferings on the part of the people. This it is which Anglo-Indian officials as yet lack the courage and candor freely to acknowledge, thereby building up an impassable obstacle to the carrying out of really efficient reforms. And the question, just now, that is of vital importance to the millions of that strange empire is, Will the rulers be wise in time, or will they delay concession until the time for concession is past? For the English have themselves kindled a new spirit in India which no earthly power can now restrain, which must bear down all barriers that impede its expansion; and the British officials must either consent to work in harmony with it, or be crushed before it, to the irreparable misfortune of India, and indeed of all Asia.

POLYNESIAN AND ARYAN.

An Account of the Polynesian Race: Its Origin and Migrations, and the Ancient History of the Hawaiian People to the Times of Kamehameha I. Vol. 3.—Comparative Vocabulary of the Polynesian and Indo-European Languages. By Alexander Fornander, Circuit Judge of the Island of Maui. London: Trübner & Co. 1885. 8vo, pp. xii, 292.

THIS volume is the completion of a work the publication of which was commenced in 1878. In the first two volumes Judge Fornander, with no written authorities (for none such exist), endeavored to reconstruct the history of the Polynesian race, making use of their legends, traditions, and myths, as they had been orally transmitted from generation to generation, of their religious ceremonies as they existed previously to the introduction of Christianity, of their manners and customs, and whatever else he thought fitted to throw light upon their origin and past history. Of these we have already given some account. This third volume has the character of an independent work.

The great number of languages spoken by the inhabitants of the multitude of islands of the Pacific which are embraced in the common name Polynesia, are supposed to belong to one great family, all the members of which are more or less nearly related. Judge Fornander's object is to show that this family is a branch, and the oldest extant form, of the Indo-European or Aryan tongues; in other words, that the inhabitants of the Polynesian Islands are ethnologically and linguistically our cousins, many hundred times removed indeed, and separated in space by thousands of miles of land and sea, and in time not only by many centuries but by many millenniums of years, but, nevertheless, not so far nor so long that conclusive evidence of a common origin cannot be traced. Judge Fornander possessed some rare qualifications for investigating the character of the Polynesian languages. He had resided in the Hawaiian Islands for thirty-four years. Unlike most foreigners living in a barbarous or semi-civilized nation, he took a warm personal interest in everything connected with the people. The official position which he held brought him into contact with every class of society, from the criminal to the King. He made himself an adept in the national language; he extended his studies to the languages of other islands, and thus acquired a knowledge of Polynesian speech at once extensive and practical. In regard to the Aryan languages he seems to have himself made no special investigations, but he has evidently studied with care the works of Bopp, Max Müller, Whitney, and a very large number of other writers on comparative philology and the general science of language. His work is a comparison of the results of his own long study and practice of the Polynesian languages with the results obtained by others in the field of Aryan philology. We are perfectly willing to admit that his knowledge of the comparative philology of the Aryan languages is as complete as is necessary for his purpose; but we have many and weighty objections to his methods of treating the facts. Throughout his book he appears, not as a judge, but as an advocate. He has a theory to maintain—a theory conceived early in life, and to which he is enthusiastically devoted. We would not have our readers infer that Judge Fornander in any instance consciously misrepresents or distorts the facts. Really great advocates seldom do this. On the contrary, we believe him to be an eminently conscientious writer, but one whose mental eye is blind to everything upon which the light of his theory does not fall. He seems to have little or no appreciation of that cardinal principle of modern scientific investigation, namely, that the investigator should not seek to mould his facts, but should allow his facts to mould him.

Judge Fornander naturally lays great stress upon the authority of Bopp, who, in his now almost forgotten work 'Ueber die Verwandtschaft der Malayisch-Polynesischen Sprache mit den Indo-Europäischen' (Berlin, 1841) advocated a theory in many respects similar to his own. He says, indeed, that to this work "I am indebted for the first idea of comparing the Polynesian and Aryan languages," not for the purpose of testing the truth of Bopp's theory, but "with a view of establishing their common origin." This frank declaration shows the spirit in which he commenced and prosecuted his investigations. Bopp's work met with the unanimous condemnation of the eminent philologists who were proud to acknowledge him as their master in the comparative philology of the Aryan tongues. Among these was Prof. Whitney of Yale, who, in the course of his strictures, remarked: "No man is qualified to compare fruitfully two languages or groups who is not deeply grounded in the knowledge of both." Judge Fornander enters into a

somewhat elaborate refutation of the criticisms on Bopp, and says: "I may be permitted to add to Prof. Whitney's maxim, above quoted, that 'no man is qualified to criticize fruitfully' a comparison of two languages or groups 'who is not deeply grounded in a knowledge of both.'" We protest against any such addition. Judge Fornander may, we are willing to assume, have a more extensive and accurate knowledge of the Polynesian languages than any living man. Should he write a comparative grammar, say, for example, of the languages of the Hawaiian, Samoan, and Marquesas Islands, he would probably produce an interesting and instructive work. But if his methods, his arguments, and his results were inconsistent with each other and with well-settled linguistic principles, there are scores of living philologists, among them Prof. Whitney, who would be able to point out his mistakes and shortcomings, even though their knowledge of the languages mentioned might be limited to what they had learned from the book itself. To "compare fruitfully" two languages one must undoubtedly be "deeply grounded in a knowledge of both," but the ability to "criticise fruitfully" such a comparison is the result of long study and training not necessarily in the languages compared.

Judge Fornander, in common with many philologists, maintains that many thousands of years ago a race, from which the Indo-Europeans or Aryans are descended, lived somewhere in Central Asia. Here his peculiar theory commences, namely, that a portion of this race separated from the rest, wandered, perhaps by more than one route, to the shores of the Pacific, and, continuing through many ages their eastern course over ocean and land, gradually peopled the many islands of Polynesia. The present inhabitants are the descendants of that primitive Aryan stock. The Malay race came subsequently, and, in opposition to Bopp, Steinthal, and others, he denies all ethnological or linguistic connection between the Malay and Polynesian races except such as arose from intercourse between them. He protests against the attempt "to stick the Polynesian in the Malay pocket," and it is not to be denied that the drift of recent investigation is more and more towards regarding them as races of different origins. This separation of the Polynesians from the original Aryan stock took place, according to Judge Fornander, at a period many thousands of years anterior to the Vedas, and when the Aryan language had as yet developed no inflections at all, or at most only a few germs of the vast and complex system of which the Sanskrit and Greek are the most striking examples.

Now, it is clear that the condition of Aryan speech at that remote period is wholly conjectural. All written documents or inscribed monuments now existing are modern when compared with this long-vanished ancestor. Such a theory leaves one at liberty to conjecture or assume almost anything he pleases or his theory requires, and his conjectures and assumptions are just as valid and just as worthless as those of any other person. Another source of uncertainty and error in Judge Fornander's comparison is of still more importance. The Polynesian languages are remarkable for their phonological simplicity. Judge Fornander says: "The best developed Polynesian alphabet, the Samoan, contains fifteen letters, ten consonants and five vowels; the New Zealand and Easter Island, fourteen letters; the Tahitian and Marquesas, thirteen letters; the Hawaiian, twelve letters." We may add that the total number of initial letters of the words forming Judge Fornander's vocabulary, which contains words selected from all the above-mentioned languages and many others, is thirteen. To write accurately all the Aryan languages would