

the *Berufsgenossenschaft* except to consider them totally disabled, and to give them the maximum pension prescribed for total disability."

Facts of this kind point to the fundamental difficulty which must be faced by this scheme, and by all schemes which try to force an improvement in his condition on the average manual laborer. They may demoralize him, and make him in the end materially also worse off than he was before. In the language of the economists, they tend to remove the preventive checks to population and to lower the standard of living. It is by no means certain that the present German experiment will have this melancholy outcome—every one must hope that it may not; but it is here that the scheme has its weakest point. The higher the standard of self-restraint and self-help already is in a people, the more safely may humane aid be extended to them. Here, as so often in social phenomena, cause and effect interact. Those who see in the present high birth-rate and comparatively high death-rate of Germany a sign of a lack of providence in its population, will watch critically the slow development of the ultimate effect of the present insurance legislation.

A writer in the last issue of the *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung* has put in the plea that these measures are not really opposed to habits of self-restraint or inconsistent with self-help. They give no guarantee of work, and make no provision for the laborer who is out of work. The unaided struggle for existence remains, and continues to exercise its bracing effect. So much is undoubtedly true; and it is conceivable that insurance against occasional bitter need, even though not provided from the workmen's initiative, may raise rather than demoralize his character. But the facts to which reference was made in the preceding paragraphs show that we cannot be confident of the better effect, and that a long time must pass before the final result becomes clear.

MOMMSEN.

ON the thirtieth of this month the historian Mommsen will celebrate a double anniversary—his seventieth birthday, and the completion of the thirtieth year of his professorship at Berlin. His countrymen, always felicitous in celebrations of this sort, will be prepared to render him due honor; among other things, a bust of him by Begas is to be presented to him. Other nations will not be behindhand in congratulations and homage to the man who has done more than any other living person to unlock the treasures of the past and make them the possession of the present generation.

It is hardly too much to say that our knowledge of the history of Rome, in everything but its most superficial facts, we owe to Theodor Mommsen. This we say without disparagement to the great name of Niebuhr, a man of equal genius, of equally profound and extensive scholarship, and who did a work without which that of Mommsen would have been impossible. Niebuhr cleared the ground for the master-builder, by putting an end for ever to the implicit faith which had until then prevailed in the traditionary history of Rome. His work was critical and destructive—he showed clearly

what Roman history was not; but when it came to determining what it was, he necessarily failed, partly because the materials were inadequate, partly because it was not yet possible to see them in their true relation to each other. A generation had to pass in further investigation, criticism, and attempts at reconstruction on the basis of Niebuhr's work, before the early history of Rome could be seen in its true light. The scholars who performed this rather thankless task, who filled the gaps between Niebuhr and Mommsen—Götting, Bekker, Walter, Huschke, Rubino, and others—rendered a great service to historical science, but, for the most part, rather in special points of detail than in fundamental principles. Moreover, all of them were antiquarians rather than historians. Rubino, indeed, one of the most philosophical and logical minds that have ever devoted themselves to historical study, developed a theory of the early Roman State which is essentially that upon which Mommsen has constructed his history; the distinguished historian is never slow to acknowledge his indebtedness to the obscure Marburg professor. But the work which remained to be done could be accomplished only by one who was at once an antiquarian like Bekker, a philosophical thinker like Rubino, and a man of constructive historical imagination.

It is the combination of these three qualities that has made Mommsen the foremost historian of his time, and enabled him to accomplish a work which will never have to be done over again. For we have no hesitation in saying, not that he is right in every particular, but that the conception of the history of Rome which he has made familiar will hold its place as the correct one. What this conception is it would take too long to define in its completeness; but perhaps the best tribute we can render to the great man is to point out its leading features—those in which his genius is most conspicuously seen.

In the busy field of scholarship it is rash to assert for any individual worker absolute originality in any particular part of his work. The merit of each consists largely in the skilful use of the results reached by others. But we think we are not wrong in claiming for Mommsen the credit of having been the first to apply to historical science the comparative method which had just been elaborated in the field of philology. Just here we find an especially interesting point of comparison with Niebuhr, for whom the comparative method was impossible, because, when he wrote, the science of comparative philology did not exist. One of Niebuhr's most plausible attempts at reconstruction—his famous Pelasgian theory—could never have been advanced after the relations of the Indo-European languages to one another had become established. Where Niebuhr begins with this fascinating but unsound theory, Mommsen opens with a discussion of the stages in civilization reached by the Italian nations and their ancestors at successive periods; his theory being based upon a comparison of languages somewhat similar to that upon which Niebuhr founded his hypothesis. These paragraphs may seem trite and inadequate at the present day; but they were the first attempt to arrive at historical truth by this method, and they display a degree of sobriety as well as ingenuity which are unusual in discussions of this kind.

The early institutions of Rome are represented by Mommsen from the point of view of primitive tribal society—a point of view familiar enough now, but then novel and imperfectly developed. If it may be said that it is just in these early institutions that Mommsen's

theory has been most modified by later investigations, and just this part of his work that has come nearest to being superseded, it must not be forgotten that he was the pioneer in this field too, and that the subsequent advance has been made upon the lines traced by him. The general outlines of the political system firmly sketched in his first book remain unaltered, and it would be hard to give the substance of this matter more clearly and correctly than it is given there. The most that could be done would be to supplement it in certain respects and modify some details.

One theory of Mommsen's in relation to the foundation of Rome excited great discussion at the time of its appearance, and was very generally rejected, but is now tacitly assumed as a matter of course—the early commercial activity of Rome. It was upon this fact, first brought out by Mommsen, that Mr. Goldwin Smith's admirable article a few years ago in the *Contemporary Review* was based, and it forms the controlling idea in the treatment of the early Republic by Nitzsch, the writer who has, perhaps, more than any other supplemented Mommsen for this period.

The theories which we have spoken of above were presented in his first edition (in 1854) with as much fulness and definiteness as in the enlarged work familiar to the readers of the present day. When it comes to the sketch of the political constitution of the Monarchy and early Republic, on the other hand, we note a marked change. At first Mommsen was—as who at that time could fail to be?—very much under the influence of Niebuhr. But as the subject dwelt in his mind, he came by degrees to depart more and more from Niebuhr's view, and, after some slight modifications in successive editions, the fourth edition (1864) may almost be said to represent a revolution in the theory of Roman history. The publication of the fourth edition was the turning-point in his work as an historian. Since that time his attention has chiefly been given to the period of the Empire, and his labors have been principally in the nature of preparation for the continuation of his history. The successive editions of the published work have shown very little change.

It is, we suppose, generally believed that Mommsen is the most revolutionary and arbitrary of all historians of Rome. But this opinion comes from the fact of his radical departure from Niebuhr's views, which had got possession of the field, especially in England, and might, at the time that Mommsen wrote, be fairly regarded as the accepted views. But, as a matter of fact, Mommsen is conservative in a high degree, and his theories of Roman history, more than those of any of his rivals, rest upon positive statements of the ancients themselves, and not upon pure hypothesis. "If we cannot accept this statement," he says somewhere—we quote from memory—"we may as well give up concerning ourselves with historical inquiry at all." It is generally believed, too, that he presents his novel theories bluntly and arbitrarily, without informing the reader of the authority upon which they rest or the reasons for his changes of opinion. It is true they are so presented in his history; but in his numerous essays and monographs—the most important of which have been collected in a volume, under the title, 'Römische Forschungen'—detailed and substantial arguments can be found by those who choose to study the subject. His readers may at any rate be assured that even his most radical and startling positions rest upon solid foundations. We may not accept them all, but much the largest part of them appear to us established beyond question.

Among the new views advanced in the fourth

edition, along with the increased emphasis placed upon the aristocratic features of the primitive constitution (Mommsen associating in this himself distinctly with the school of Rubino) are the following: The admission of plebeians to the Senate upon the first establishment of the Republic, but with inferior powers, so that from this time the patrician Senators formed, as it were, a distinct body with special powers; the admission of the plebeians at the same date to the *curia*; and their tribal organization, on the basis of property in land, by the Publilian Law of 471. This last event he regards as the turning-point in their history; since now, for the first time, they formed a coherent, compact body, in which their natural leaders, the rich rural plebeians, occupied a controlling place. From this time begin their political aspirations and their contest for political equality. All of these views, familiar to students of the completed work, are not found, or are found only in the germ, in the earlier editions.

The most important feature of Mommsen's history of the early Republic is not, it is true, a novelty of the fourth edition, although it is more fully worked out there than elsewhere. It is, however, a stumbling-block to many, even at the present day; and for this reason, believing it, as we do, to rest upon a most profound insight into the character of early society and early institutions, we will draw especial attention to it. The early contests of the Roman Republic were not, he says, political, between patricians and plebeians, but social, between rich and poor. The plebeians had, as we have seen, obtained what, at the time, were considerable political privileges; but they inured to the benefit only of the rich and influential among them. But the poor, who were all plebeians, were exposed to great hardships and abuses, by reason of the severe military requirements and the harsh laws of debt. The tribunate was therefore designed, not to protect plebeians against patricians, but poor citizens against the abuses of magisterial power—for it is well known that patricians who needed it, as well as plebeians, could call upon the tribunes for assistance. It was not until the Publilian Law had reorganized the plebeiate upon a more aristocratic basis that it occurred to the rich plebeians to make of it an agency to obtain complete political equality.

In regard to the later history of the Republic, Mommsen is accused, perhaps rightly, of leaving too much to the side of power—of worshipping success. It is certain that he has a great, perhaps overweening, respect for efficiency; his heartiest contempt and condemnation are given to weak and inefficient governments. But he has a hearty respect, too, for free institutions—so they be genuine and really free. What he shows conclusively, in the last century of the Republic, is that there were no free institutions left—that it was a choice between different forms of despotism. The question of sympathy or approval hardly enters into consideration. It is the delineation of an historical situation, the narrative of an historical event. The Republic fell because it could no longer stand; and the Empire succeeded to it as a natural and necessary outgrowth of the situation.

The original publication, in three volumes, reached the fall of the Roman Republic, by the battle of Thapsus, in B. C. 46. Since that time—a period of thirty-six years—the author has been assiduously gathering materials and making preparations for its continuation, in the history of the Empire. It is true, the first ten years of this period were given in good part to revising the original work and bringing it to perfection; but even in those years in part, and

since then chiefly, his work has lain in the field of the Empire—in the collection and editing of inscriptions, in countless special articles and treatises, and in the careful analysis of its fundamental principles of government. For it is plain that even in the most important single publication of these years—the 'Staatsrecht'—his chief interest was in the volume which treated of the Empire. When that was off his hands, he appears to have ceased to give attention to the subject; at least we see no signs of the important volume on the Senate and the assemblies. This long-continued and minute preparation is nothing new to him. His earliest treatise, on the Roman tribes, was a study of the most fundamental administrative institution of the Republic; his work on the South-Italian dialects gave him materials for the ethnology of Italy; his treatise on Roman coins helped elucidate at once the economic history and the municipal system of the Republic.

Mommsen is evidently approaching the term of his labors. The instalment of his history of the Empire published in 1885 as volume v. (known in the translation as 'The Provinces of the Roman Empire') is a sure sign that the history of the Empire itself is soon to follow. And in this work, standing, as it does, nominally as a fragment, but substantially as an independent treatise, the great historian has again done a work which will not need to be done over. His treatment of the Empire is as novel and original as that of the Republic, for he makes plain, what no one saw clearly before him, that the provinces were not a mere appendage of the city, but were the Empire itself. With the organization of the new Government, the history of Rome ends and that of the Empire begins. We call it the Roman Empire, but it was in truth the Empire of the World. Rome, from being a city-republic, sinks by degrees to the rank of a municipality—always supreme in dignity, always the seat of empire, but no longer the Empire itself.

It is not without some impatience and some apprehension that we see the historian reach his three-score years and ten, with his great task still unfinished. But every year that delays the work makes it more perfect. German scholars are a long-lived race, and if Ranke could be taken as a type, Mommsen would have still twenty working years before him. So we will trust and take courage.

THE QUEEN OF WESTPHALIA.—II.

PARIS, October 31.

WE left the Queen of Westphalia in Paris in November, 1809, with her husband, and expecting her father, the King of Würtemberg. Even in Paris she sent little notes to her father after his arrival; they were always written in French. On the point of going to the Trianon to see the Emperor, she writes: "All I know is that the Emperor *est d'une humeur de chien*, and that nobody can conceive why. I suppose you know the news of the day? The Queen of Holland has become the protectress of the houses of education for young girls." This is sarcastical, as Artemus Ward would say; the Queen of Holland was Queen Hortense—not exactly the best patron for young girls.

The King of Würtemberg returned to Stuttgart after a brief visit to Paris, and the Queen of Westphalia was again in Cassel in the beginning of 1810. She was obliged to return to France for the ceremonies of the marriage of Napoleon with Marie Louise. Before the arrival of the Archduchess, she writes:

"You cannot imagine, my dear father, how Napoleon is in love with his future wife; his head is turned to a degree which I could not

have imagined and which I can hardly express. Every day he sends one of his chamberlains, charged, like Mercury, with the missives of Jupiter. . . . I will not enumerate to you all the presents which he is preparing; I will only tell you that he said to me that, when he was married, he would give peace to the world, 'and the rest of his time to Zaire' [a quotation from Voltaire's 'Zaire']. . . . To prove to you how much the Emperor is occupied with his future wife, I will tell you that he has sent for tailor and shoemaker, so as to be dressed as well as possible, and is learning to waltz. You and I could not have imagined such things."

Napoleon ordered all the pictures which represented his victories over Austria to be removed from the gallery of Diana at Compiègne, where the court waited for the Empress. Queen Catharine and her husband were invited to follow Napoleon and his new wife to Laeken, near Brussels, and to Antwerp. The Emperor inspected this great port and came back to Paris; seeing on his way Dunkirk, Calais, Boulogne. During this journey she became intimate with the Empress, and on her return to Paris was one of the witnesses of the catastrophe which ended a feast given by Schwarzenberg, the Austrian Ambassador. The ball-room was suddenly in flames; Jerome was able to save his wife; the Emperor took care of the Empress and dragged her out of the room.

The brothers whom Napoleon had placed on various thrones were treated by him as mere subjects. The King of Holland resigned. The King of Spain threatened to abdicate if Napoleon did not take his forces out of Catalonia and insisted on holding the left bank of the Ebro against the faith of treaties; to which the Emperor is said to have answered in these words: "If you cross the Pyrenees, I will have you shot." The Queen somewhat innocently adds: "It is to be hoped that such severe answers are exaggerated." The château of Cassel was completely destroyed by a fire in November, 1811, and the Queen could only save her diamonds. The King was nearly stifled by the smoke, and was found half dead. When he came to himself, he thought at first that there had been a conspiracy and an attempt to assassinate him. There was constant uneasiness in his mind. The Queen, speaking of her happiness, said: "Nothing could alter it if we lived in a more quiet time and in a docile country. You, my father, are infinitely more happy than we can be. You rule over the good Swabians attached to our house; our positions cannot be compared." The kingdoms of Napoleon were artificial creations, and Queen Catharine was better able to see this than anybody. The *grand écuyer* of the King was assassinated in December, 1811, by a man of the people. She was often afraid that Jerome himself would fall under the hand of an assassin.

A new war was preparing in 1812. "We are assured that Germany will not be its theatre, and in that case we shall remain quiet at Cassel." Jerome was summoned very unexpectedly on the 9th of March, and left the Queen; she did not even know why he was leaving her. "The most complete obscurity covers the present designs. The greatness of the preparations and the ignorance of the object puzzle the most clever politicians. . . . The soul gets really tired of this continual uncertainty, this impossibility of counting on to-morrow." Jerome made a journey incognito to Paris; Vandamme arrived at Cassel; Napoleon himself came to Dresden, and Queen Catharine had to go to that city. In the night of the 5th of April, Jerome left for Glogau, where he joined the army. During his absence his wife was made Regent of Westphalia. She asked Napoleon at Dresden: "Sire, will you not allow Jerome to come here, so that I can see him once more?" To