

now be read with instruction no less than with pleasure. But it would be, on the other hand, simple folly to confound the talent for influencing the world with the quite different gift for discovering or enunciating the truth. Rousseau's works contain some things that are true, but it would hardly be now disputed that the small amount of useful truths which he may have impressed upon his contemporaries is far more than overbalanced by the mass of noxious and plausible fallacies to which his genius gave authority. These are, moreover, if Sir Henry Maine is to be believed, still current, and enjoy the repute which ought to belong only to sterling coin.

However this may be, all readers of Maine's 'Popular Government' will, especially if, like ourselves, they have studied our author's other works, be willing to admit that the latest and certainly by no means the least effective of Rousseau's critics belongs to that body of whom Montesquieu and Rousseau are equally members—the class, namely, of authors who can produce books of influence. His 'Ancient Law' marked an era in the legal studies of Englishmen. When it appeared just a quarter of a century ago, not one barrister in a thousand knew even the rudiments of the law of Rome; not one Englishman in ten thousand had even the dimmest conception of the deep mark made by Roman jurists on European speculation in law, in politics, and in theology. The idea, indeed, that law itself was a matter of more than technical or professional interest seemed a paradox to the great majority not only of intelligent readers, but of masterly writers on social and historical subjects. Macaulay was a lawyer, and displayed in one department the genius of a jurist. But no one would gather from Macaulay's history that the development of English law was nearly as important a factor in the progress of England as was the growth of English theology or of English literature. Macaulay belonged to the generation who had not learned from Maine the speculative importance of legal ideas. Since Maine's 'Ancient Law' appeared, every thinker or historian of average intelligence has become conscious of the fact that a nation's law is the record of a nation's genius. This notion, no doubt, was no novelty to Continental theorists, but it was, when Maine first began writing, a revelation to educated Englishmen. To have opened up a new line of thought to his countrymen is no small achievement for any author, and this feat is one which Sir Henry Maine has already performed at least once in his career. Nor is it at all unlikely that his 'Popular Government' will exert as great, if not as lasting, an effect on opinion as his 'Ancient Law.'

The book has been attacked, and is certainly on some points by no means beyond criticism. But the assaults of opponents who disagree with Maine's conclusions are in themselves a tribute to the power with which he expounds his opinions; and it does not need the proof derived from the controversy which 'Popular Government' has evoked, to show that the book has already produced an immense effect on that public opinion of educated men which, in every civilized country, and especially in England, sooner or later moulds the opinion of the whole nation. The aim of the work is, we take it, to prove or suggest that democracy, or, to use Sir Henry Maine's own expression, "popular government," is merely one form, and it may be a very transitory form, of human progress. That experience gives no guarantee for the stability or the success of democratic constitutions; that the very law of progress of which they are supposed to be the result is itself a very exceptional phenomenon, peculiar to certain ages and to certain peoples; that no careful thinker can feel any certainty how long the age of progress may endure, and

that the pæans which have hailed the advent of democracy are, to say the least, premature—that this, or something like this, is the general effect of Sir Henry Maine's book, will not be disputed by any intelligent reader. That 'Popular Government,' combined, no doubt, with the circumstances of the day, has already done a great deal to impress English readers with a belief that views such as those we have attempted to summarize have in them a large amount of truth, will not be denied by any one who observes the course of English opinion. The treatise is already a book of influence.

When this fact is admitted, two inquiries at once suggest themselves to intelligent curiosity: What are the sources of the influence which Sir Henry Maine has once and again exerted over his contemporaries? What, in the next place, is likely to be the permanence of his influence? Will he take rank with authors, such as Locke and Montesquieu, whose ideas have become a lasting contribution to the thoughts of the civilized world? or will his writings ultimately sink to the level of works, such, for example (to take a very extreme instance), as Godwin's 'Political Justice,' which, after exciting great attention, has long become, not only ancient, but, what is a very different thing, out of date?

#### *Milton and Vondel: A Curiosity of Literature.*

By George Edmundson, M.A. London: Trübner & Co. 1885.

THERE is no department of literary study more attractive to a learned mind, and none more beset with pitfalls, than this of authors' plagiarisms. The answer of genius has long been familiar in its unabashed claim to "take its own wherever it finds it"; but the list of those who have profited by high-handed appropriation of others' work, is so studded with famous names that one might well advise a young author not to seek originality, but, like the greatest of his craft, to look about for somebody "good to steal from," and rear his *monumentum ære perennius* on foundations already laid. Milton has been many a time violently attacked on this score, but with little effect, since the laws of the literary republic allow the imitation and incorporation of any ancient work, whether Hebrew or classic, and do not regard a similar obligation to the Italian or even the Spanish as an offence. It has been generally held, however, that writings in one's own tongue and those of one's foreign contemporaries are unfair game for such depredation. Now, Milton has been for many years vaguely accused of such indebtedness to Vondel, the most eminent of Dutch poets, but no real examination has been made in the case, excepting a cursory essay by Mr. Gosse, until the appearance of the very curious volume under review, in consequence of which it is most likely that the Shakspeare-Baconians will hereafter have a cousinly group in the Milton-Vondelians; and certainly these last will not be without excuse for their folly.

It seems a strange coincidence that two poets, each the most gifted in his own country, should have written at nearly the same time on the same themes, and have toned their works with the same theological and political color. Vondel's "Lucifer," "John the Baptist," "Adam in Banishment," "Reflections on God and Religion," and "Samson," published between 1654 and 1664, afford this parallel with the "Paradise Lost," "Paradise Regained," and "Samson Agonistes" of Milton. The author of this inquiry into the resemblances of the two series finds Milton's obligation to be unexpectedly close and large. He first shows by a citation from a letter of Roger Williams to John Winthrop that the former introduced Milton to a knowledge of the Dutch

tongue; he then proves with needless fulness the certainty of Milton's thorough acquaintance with Dutch affairs and men, among which Vondel and his books were in the first rank; he next reconciles the apparently conflicting points in the parallel chronology of the composition of the English poems with the publication of the Dutch ones; and finally devotes the body of his little treatise to a comparison of passages, the Dutch of the citations being added in the appendix; and he shows to his own satisfaction that Milton was indebted to Vondel for character-conceptions, plot-incidents, course and order of thought, distinct images, turns of fancy and ideas, and the mode of treatment of whole passages.

It would be impossible to compress this evidence, for its weight depends on the accumulation of instances. The student of literature will find it, indeed, a curiosity; but let him read with caution. For one thing, the translations are made into Miltonic verse, both in structure and phrase, and (while we do not question the exact fidelity of the rendering) something is to be deducted on that account. Again, not only does the practice of literature allow of appropriation from the Bible, the classics, and the Romance tongues, even to the extent of literal translation, but, apart from such direct borrowing, there is a large stock of imagery, sentiment, and rhetoric which is common property. If Milton had never read Vondel, yet in telling the same story about the same persons, in the same places, and drawing upon the same Biblical source for hell, heaven, Eden, the purposes of God, the manners, nature, and offices of the angels, and the biography of Adam and Eve, he would naturally have fallen into parallelisms; and from these, as, for example, that a standard is unfurled, a sword drawn, a messenger despatched, etc., nothing is to be argued as to plagiarism. So, too, from the mere use of such images as a ship under sail, an evening sun, towers of diamond, or others equally open to both authors, nothing is to be inferred to the detriment of either, though the special position of them in the text may sometimes prove a connection. But when every allowance has been made for what may have been derived from common sources, and under the most liberal construction of the rights of plagiary, the student will find it hard to resist the conclusion not only that Milton had read and pondered Vondel, but that his own work was fed from that source in a true sense. Taken by itself, a resemblance like the following unusual simile for the movement of the angelic host is slight:

"It quickly grew, and like a half-moon waxed,  
Sharpening its points, and closed on us two horns." (Vondel.)

"The angelic squadron bright  
Turned fiery red, sharpening in mooned horns  
Their phalanx, and began to hem him round." (Milton.)

Or such a rhetorical point as this:

"John's shades and deserts, cell and prison shall  
Change into light and paradise." (Vondel.)

"Eden raised in the waste wilderness." (Milton.)

Or even such an extraordinary circumstance as the change of Satan into the dragon form. But when there is a large number of these similarities, as here, one suspects that Milton's mind absorbed Vondel as intimately as it did Pindar. The evidence is perhaps most strong in the most unlooked for quarter, in the "Samson." Vondel's play is modelled exactly as Milton's in classical form; the time is the same; the details of the scene-setting are similar; the conduct of the story and striking passages of the thought and feeling are practically so closely related as to make the thesis of Milton's independence ridiculous. In the matter of phrasing take but one extract:

"The angel of my birth descending,  
My dropping courage once more stayed." (Vondel.)

"Send thee the angel of thy birth to stand  
Fast by thy side." (Milton.)

Such reduplication is not infrequent in the course of the poem.

Nevertheless, the author has, we think, weakened his case by over-stating it and leaning too often on slight parallelisms. He does not question, it should be said, Milton's supreme poetic faculty; and, after all, it seems to us that Milton has "bettered what he borrowed," and this he held to be a sufficient defence. Vondel, as he appears here, is a poet primarily of fancy, very literal in his imagery, very fertile in invention; but even when Milton approaches nearest the Dutch original, his affluence in beauty and sublimity in imagination and splendor of expression make him to Vondel as the eagle to the wren. Milton's laurel will not shed a leaf nor deaden its green ever so faintly for this exhibition of what one is compelled to accept as a leading influence in his later poems. The volume is of great interest, but the reader closes it with a stray line of Lowell's running in his head, which is the sum and substance of the whole matter of plagiarism and originality—"Tis his at last who says it best."

*Anthropoid Apes.* By Robert Hartmann, Professor in the University of Berlin. [International Scientific Series, vol. lii.] Appletons. 1886.

THE anthropoid, or manlike or tailless, apes include the gorilla and chimpanzee of tropical Africa, the orang of Borneo and Sumatra, and the gibbons of the East Indies, India, and some other parts of Asia. The author of the present work has given much attention to the group, has made himself familiar with most of the literature, and has published original observations upon the habits and structure of the gorilla especially. After an account of the history of our acquaintance with the anthropoids, from the year 470 B. C., when the Carthaginians under Hanno found in Sierra Leone creatures which they called "gorillai," but which were probably chimpanzees, he considers in turn their external form and their structure, their varieties, their geographical distribution, and their habits, both wild and in captivity. He then discusses their zoological position and relations, and concludes with an instructive summary. There is a full index, and an appendix contains the titles of 116 books and papers, which would be more useful if the writers' names were always given and alphabetically arranged. The translator or American editor should have completed the list to date, and especially for American works, and should have seen that the first name of the anatomist, Wyman, was spelled Jeffries instead of Jeffrys, as in both the appendix and the text.

The author regards man, apes, and monkeys as constituting a single order, Primates, excluding therefrom the Lemurs. He quotes, with approval, Huxley's statement that the lowest monkeys are further removed from the highest apes than the latter are from man. The brains of anthropoids are somewhat fully described and figured. Although never so large as man's, and never to be mistaken for it, they present certain features of resemblance thereto which not only justify all that has been said of their human-like behavior, but lead us to anticipate more startling approximations whenever it is possible (as, for example, by the care bestowed upon the chimpanzee now at the Central Park Menagerie) to rear anthropoids and observe the effects of education upon several successive generations. For the present, however, notwithstanding the existence of the subfrontal gyre (Broca's convolution), which is certainly connected closely with the faculty of language, the anthropoids do not "talk" any more than other animals. Our author's views upon these points may be gathered from the following paragraph:

"It would, for instance, be a grave mistake to compare a tiger with a bloodthirsty executioner of the Reign of Terror, since the former only satisfies his natural appetite in preying on other animals. The atrocities of the trials for witchcraft . . . find no parallel in the habits of animals in their savage state. And such a comparison is, above all, impossible in the case of anthropoids, which display no hostility toward men or other animals unless they are first attacked. In this respect the anthropoid ape stands on a higher plane than many men. A great chasm between men and anthropoids is constituted, as I believe, by the fact that the human race is capable of education, and is able to acquire the highest mental culture, while the most intelligent anthropoid ape can only receive a certain mechanical training. . . . No anthropoid now in existence has shown itself capable of adapting stones, etc., to his personal use."

Like most living zoölogists, the author is an evolutionist, and holds that "man cannot have descended from any of the fossil species which have hitherto come under our notice, nor yet from any of the species now extant; it is more probable that both types have been produced from a common ground-form" which has become extinct. There is much yet to be learned of the anatomy of the anthropoids, especially of the brain; and their embryonic stages are almost entirely unknown to science. No fact respecting these, our "poor relations," is without its significance in determining our present affinities and common ancestry.

Most of the figures in this book are well chosen and well executed; but (especially in view of the somewhat extended consideration of the mooted point as to the overlapping of the cerebellum by the cerebrum) what is the intelligent layman to infer from the contrast between the orang's brain (fig. 56), which has nearly its natural shape, and that of the gorilla (fig. 60), which any unprejudiced anatomist can see had been distorted in the process of hardening, yet is not so described in the text? The skeletons of man and gorilla, and the facial muscles of the same, are instructively placed on opposite pages, but in two cases detailed anatomical descriptions of unfamiliar parts occur before the figures by which alone they are rendered intelligible to the unprofessional reader, and without reference to them. Like the other volumes of this series, the book is attractive in appearance; but there are numerous evidences of careless proof-reading, and several passages (notably on pp. 194, 198, 199, 110, 310) indicate that the translator (who is not named) had too little familiarity with the subject.

*The History of the Anti-Slavery Cause in State and Nation.* By Rev. Austin Willey. Portland, Maine: Brown Thurston. 1886. 12mo, pp. 503.

THE size of this book corrects at a glance the extravagance of the "Publisher's Notice" on the opening page, viz., that this is "the most complete and perspicuous history of the cause ever written, or that ever can be written." It is but just to the author to say that he makes no such absurd pretension. He has written seriously, in good faith, and to the best of his ability, but he is not a historian: he remains what he was, a combatant. He worked as a journalist and lecturer devotedly and unselfishly in a remote field, the State of Maine, from which he emerged occasionally to visit the great cities at the time of anniversary or nominating conventions. He naturally tells more and has more to tell, in quantity and in value, of the local movement with which he was identified than of the national movement, though this is sketched crudely and confusedly down to the outbreak of the rebellion. Mr. Willey began Abolitionist, in the technical sense, as President of the Anti-Slavery Society of the Bangor Theological Seminary, and

later became one of the officers of the State Society, which, as a result of the sectarian schism in 1840, cut loose from the American Anti-Slavery Society, and passed, by steps which are not here recorded distinctly, into the political movement initiated by the Liberty party. Mr. Willey's account of the causes of this separation is not trustworthy, but the facts have meanwhile been laid before the public in another work, and have not been controverted. The same bias leads him to neglect totally, after the date mentioned, the body which rightly retained the name of Abolitionists, continued uninterruptedly the moral agitation, and was most conspicuous for zeal, activity, talent, eloquence, and conversions.

Mr. Willey was and is one of the most thorough-going believers in the efficacy of the ballot to effect a moral revolution, despising every other instrumentality in comparison. This view was the corner-stone of the Liberty party. It is instructive, therefore, to find our author admitting "that not one-half so many anti-slavery papers were taken in Maine in proportion to its Liberty votes, including those published out of the State, as were taken in many other States" (p. 407); and that the "Free Democracy" of 1853 in Maine could not have lived had it not made an alliance with prohibition (p. 419). This points clearly to the fact that, for Maine at least, the Liberty party was organized too soon, or, as used to be said, got itself prematurely counted. We can imagine a similar predicament if the Mugwumps, dissatisfied with inspiring fear in both parties and holding the balance of power, had come out as a separate party, and, after a vain effort to establish themselves on a pure civil-service reform basis, had attached revenue reform or currency reform to their platform. Mr. Willey shows, by the way, unconsciously and incidentally, how vulnerable is the myth which identifies, as parts of one continuous political growth, the Liberty, Free-Soil, and Republican parties. Third-partyism never flourished in this country, and it was only the disbandment (*i. e.*, the anti-slavery conversion, or, as our slang phrase is, capture) of the Whig party which permitted a national candidate to be elected in the person of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Willey is faithful now, as in the militant past, in denouncing the complicity of the American churches with slavery. His profession, of course, gives great weight to his utterances on this head, which are numerous and unsparing. That necessary alliance which he affirms between the anti-slavery and the temperance ballot, leads him to trace the fortunes of prohibition in Maine until it became the shibboleth of both parties and the fundamental law of the State. Hence a portrait of Neal Dow is included among the very interesting and valuable series, chiefly anti-slavery, which alone would make this book a desideratum in every public or special library. Most important of these is the benevolent face of the philanthropic Ebenezer Dole, the early prop of the *Liberator*; and next, the fine head of Gen. Samuel Fessenden. But Mr. Willey has succeeded in thus preserving the features of no fewer than nine founders of the Maine Anti-Slavery Society.

*The Chersonese with the Gilding Off.* By Emily Innes. 2 vols. London: R. Bentley & Son. 1885. 8vo.

THE readers of Miss Bird's 'Golden Chersonese' will find much to interest and amuse them in Mrs. Innes's lively account of her experiences in the same country. Her husband being appointed Collector in the Malay State of Salangore, she determined to accompany him, although assured that it was "perfectly impossible" for an Eng-