

Africa, which may be developed into a great cattle-breeding country. We ought to mention that he brought home a fine collection of the fauna and flora of the Kalahari, a description of which is given in an appendix. Among the latter, which has been sent to Kew, are considerable quantities of seeds of the various watermelons, which Mr. Farini thinks could be planted to great advantage in some of our western sand-wastes.

PUBLIC OPINION IN ENGLISH POLITICS.

Public Opinion and Lord Beaconsfield. 1875-80. By Geo. Carslake Thompson, LL.M., of the Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. 2 vols. Macmillan & Co. 1886.

THE preface in which Mr. Carslake Thompson explains the origin of these volumes recalls the account given by Pierre Gringoire, in 'Notre Dame de Paris,' of the play which he was about to exhibit. "C'est moi qui suis l'auteur. . . C'est à dire, nous sommes deux, Jehan Marchant qui à scié les planches et dressé la charpente et la boiserie du théâtre, et moi qui ai fait la pièce." Mr. Carslake Thompson, barrister at law, discloses the fact that in the design of the work and in some degree in its execution he has had the assistance of Mr. Seymour Thompson, Fellow and now Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge, but that this collaboration was, of force, at last abandoned, and that the completion of the book and its final form are due to the writer whose name appears on the title-page. We have used the words completion and final form; but they are not strictly applicable. For the book lacks form, and the organizing mind and finishing touch are missing. There is an elaborate apparatus of arrangement. There are parts and chapters and sections, which exhibit a minute analysis of the various topics to be treated. There is a copious collection of materials, extracts from Parliamentary debates, from platform speeches, from articles in newspapers and magazines. But the matter is not fused perfectly into thought, and the imperfectly fused thought does not flow into the channels elaborately provided for it. If we may recur to the parallel suggested by the dramatic collaborateurs of Victor Hugo's romance, we should say that though Jehan Marchant has done his part, Pierre Gringoire has fallen short in his. The planks have been sawn, the carpentry has been admirably executed, but the play is wanting. The architect has designed the plan, the building materials have been brought together, the scaffolding has been erected. The careless observer may be inclined to take for granted the house behind the scaffolding.

Closer inquiry will lead him to the conclusion that there is no house at all: at best, a frontage has been run up. In other words, Mr. Carslake Thompson and Mr. Seymour Thompson have accomplished between them the design and collected the materials of a valuable work, but the building of a shapely structure has been left to other hands. In doing so, they illustrate a habit of modern writing. The great historians of a past generation were not less industrious in their consultation of authorities than their successors are. The latest and the most hostile editors of Gibbon admit that they rarely discover in his pages a neglected or a misused source of information. But Gibbon absorbed and digested his materials. Where a modern historian displays his authorities in elaborate foot-notes or appendices of citation, dividing the page with the text, or swelling the volume with *pièces justificatives*, Gibbon informed himself with his authorities. They gave tone and color to a sentence, or were worked into the narrative in the way of allusion or illustration. The artistic form of the work was preserved, and the conception of the author was delivered in the most perfect shape

which he could give to it on the mind of the reader. Mr. Carslake Thompson's volumes painfully exhibit a different process and result. The former conductor of a well-known magazine was once described by a dissatisfied critic (and contributor) as editing it with a pitchfork. Mr. Carslake Thompson and his coadjutor have used a process almost as rude.

The book is dedicated to "Prof. J. R. Seeley, whose teaching has been a stimulus to the pursuit of political truth." The author has unfortunately adopted Prof. Seeley's doctrine that historic and political writing need not be interesting, and ought not to be so if it can be helped. A reaction was inevitable some time or other from the exaggerations and falsifications of the graphic and picturesque school, but it has been pushed too far. Carlyle had his fun out of Dryasdust, and now Dryasdust is turning upon Carlyle. Mr. Carslake Thompson's aim is described in the preface. "The book," he says, "is an attempt to discuss briefly, though sufficiently to indicate the point of view adopted, the functions which the genius of the English Constitution assigns to Public Opinion. (2.) To discuss methods of evaluation of Public Opinion, and to analyze Public Opinion on the Eastern Question in particular. (3.) Finally, to show that in the events of 1876-8 Public Opinion was deprived under Lord Beaconsfield of its due influence on the foreign policy of England." The method is sound. To take a general problem, such as the relation of public opinion to government, and to test it by a minute examination of the incidents of a particular controversy or a particular historic period, is a procedure which may fairly be called scientific. It is analogous to the processes of natural history, which studies the type in an individual instance. The first part of Mr. Carslake Thompson's volume is devoted to "the place of public opinion in the English Constitution." It is really an examination of the theory of Cabinet Government, of which Mr. Bagehot's work on the English Constitution gives the recognized and now classic authority, though his doctrine is little more than the development of a pregnant sentence of Macaulay's and a popularization of an argument of J. S. Mill's. The Cabinet, according to Bagehot, represents the sovereignty of public opinion, because the Cabinet is dependent on and falls or stands by the opinion of the House of Commons. A newly elected House of Commons reflects the opinion of the constituencies, that is, to apply the French phrase, the sense of the legal country. In Bagehot's time there was a large public outside the legal public, and public opinion in the more comprehensive sense might be in conflict with public opinion in the more technical one. The political system of 1832 was still in force. The extension given to the franchise in 1867-8 and in 1885, and the near approach made to equality of electoral districts last year, reduces this possibility of conflict to a minimum. Of course, it does not wholly abolish the possibility of it. The mechanism is complicated and may get out of order. Mr. Thompson seems to think that the newspaper press, the platform, and especially the caucuses, local and central, are so many instrumentalities which dispute the claim of the House of Commons to be the organ and representative of opinion. They are rather so many means of bringing public opinion to bear upon the House of Commons, and of correctly informing and inspiring it. They in their turn are liable to error, and if so will infallibly receive correction when the appeal to the country is made.

The fundamental doctrine of Mr. Bagehot's essay, that public opinion governs through the House of Commons and the Cabinet, is therefore, in our view, not less truly descriptive of the facts than it was when he wrote, but in more accurate correspondence with them. It may hap-

pen, of course, that both the Cabinet and the House of Commons will go wrong at a time when the House of Commons has still some sessions of life in it. There may be a momentary divergence of the representative from the represented. But the divergence will not be more than momentary. Indications of the popular opinion and feeling will reach a body sensitive as to its chances of reelection. The caucuses which affect to speak in the name of the several constituencies may go wrong, but in that case public meetings and the drift of casual elections will set them right. In a word, though the machinery may for a time get out of order, and never works with instantaneous and ideal precision, it sooner or later conveys the force impressed upon it to the body to be moved.

Mr. Thompson thinks that towards the close of his Ministry Lord Beaconsfield (about whom there is nothing in the volume to justify the prominent place he occupies on the title-page) established a sort of dictatorship over the House of Commons and in the Cabinet; that he was, to use the phrase which shocked the sensitiveness of Walpole, not only the Prime Minister, but the Sole Minister. The same thing has been said of Mr. Gladstone since. This only means that each of these two eminent men had the confidence of the House of Commons, and commanded the submission of his colleagues in the Cabinet. But this is not a new feature of English political history, and does not represent any dangers to the Constitution of which former generations were not aware. Neither Lord Beaconsfield nor Mr. Gladstone was more powerful in the Cabinet or in the House of Commons than Lord Chatham, and Mr. Gladstone himself never appealed more emphatically from "the classes" to "the masses" — though the political vocabulary of the eighteenth century was not that of the nineteenth — than Chatham did.

Mr. Thompson, in what he calls "the evaluation of public opinion," enumerates the various sentiments or biases which are operative in it — "The Crusading Spirit," "The Historic Spirit," "Humanity," "Nationality," "The Anti-War" feeling, "Legalism," etc. But what he has to say, though often sensible, is rather memoranda of points of discussion than full discussion. The book, though valuable for reference, superseding on its particular subject some half-dozen volumes of the 'Annual Register,' is overweighted by the details of the controversy on the Eastern Question, fatiguing at the time, and almost paralyzing to the mental faculties now.

Memoir of Mrs. Edward Livingston. By Louise Livingston Hunt. Harper & Bros. 1886.

THERE is a delightfully old-fashioned air about this modest book. It is not only that the events it concerns recall a long-past period, though the battle of New Orleans and the crisis of nullification are old history for this generation. It is rather the pictures of simplicity in manners, of moderate ambition, of calm and tender domestic relations, that inspire regret for so much that Americans seem to have outlived.

When Edward Livingston, just after the Louisiana purchase, negotiated by his more distinguished brother, removed from New York to New Orleans, at the age of thirty-eight, to mend his broken fortunes, he found himself in a land where nothing but its new title was American. A tropical climate, civil law, Romish religion, and the traditions and customs of an alien people gave scant welcome to a Northerner. The talent and energy which were his in full measure might have struggled long in vain against such obstacles but for his fortunate meeting with a wife who brought all the conditions wanting to his success. She was a widow twenty years his ju-

nior, of high French lineage, and a refugee from the massacre of St. Domingo. The equal of her husband in mental force, and not less trained by the hard discipline of life, she shared with her compatriots their language, their faith and sympathies. With her great beauty and her inherited distinction of manner, it is easy to conceive the many ways and occasions such a wife could improve to smooth the path of an ambitious and able man in society and politics, among a people with whom personality goes for so much as it does with the French. The regard and affection for her always expressed by Jackson prove her influence over her husband's fortunes where his own countrymen were concerned.

Livingston, more fortunate than most advocates, whose fame is likened to that of actors, perishing in the hearing, left a monument of his genius and sagacity in the Civil Code of Louisiana, which became the law of the State, and in the Penal Code prepared by him, though not enacted. For the perpetuation of this in two languages he is partly indebted to a woman's aid—his daughter having supervised the production of a new edition of all his works on penal law at Paris not many years ago. In everything except the acquisition of wealth Edward Livingston reaped the full fruits of his courage in choosing what was then a foreign home. He became a leader of the bar at New Orleans, always conspicuous for men of mark. He represented Louisiana in the Lower House for six years and in the Senate for two, until appointed by Jackson Secretary of State in 1831. The old soldier saw the coming storm, and chose his political aids as sagaciously as, in the former time at least, he had chosen his military ones. Webster's terrible logic and the President's stern will were formulated by Livingston's eloquence in the famous proclamation denouncing nullification doctrines. South Carolina's attempt at rebellion was crushed, only to rise again and overwhelm her in ruin a generation later.

The position of his wife among the matrons and Senators of the earlier republic is charmingly described. Her house was officially the centre of foreign society, attracted by her fascinating manners, which disarmed even political animosity. When serious questions arose threatening our friendly relations with France, Livingston's peculiar fitness for their discussion led to his appointment, once before declined, as Minister to that country. Randolph wrote a characteristic letter, urging its acceptance, saying, "In Mrs. Livingston you have a most able coadjutor. *Dowdies* won't do for European courts, Paris especially—there she would dazzle and charm." Livingston's political importance at home and his literary repute in Europe—perhaps, too, the remembrance of his brother's great services at the same court—suggested the selection, fully justified by his firm and dignified management of delicate negotiations. These concerned a quarrel inherited from the days of the First Empire, over redress for French spoliation on American commerce. Their result is a matter of history, which continued also for fifty years to record the disgraceful delay of the country in paying over to its own citizens the indemnity recovered from France.

Here for the first time Mrs. Livingston found herself completely at home, as in her native air. Their circle at Paris included all that was most distinguished in statesmanship and literature. The language and manners of the capital were naturally her own. She never forgot that while so much a Frenchwoman she was first of all American, and amusing instances are given of her beating at their own weapon of epigram those who seemed to assail her country. Such was her retort to the Prussian Ambassador, asking what might be the population of Washington village:

"A peu près celle de Potsdam." She was received as an intimate in the royal family circle, and we are given pleasant glimpses of the domestic life and simple ways of the Citizen King, whose Austrian Queen still never forgot, though she never imposed, her rank. At the Hague, where they visited her brother, who held the post of Minister at that court for seventeen years, her graciousness won the regard and attention of the most eminent, already prepossessed in her husband's favor by his achievements as a publicist.

The mention of the Hague recalls a curious anecdote (not appearing in this memoir) of Martin Van Buren, who was presented to the King of Holland during the short stay he made in England in 1831, as a Minister expectant but not confirmed. Van Buren's conversation with the King in his own language drew from him the remark that he spoke Dutch with great purity, but in antiquated style—such Dutch as his ancestors had taken with them from their home two centuries and a half ago: Dutch like that of the early Bible translators.

Livingston's return from France coincided with his retirement from public life. The remainder of his days he intended to devote to perfecting his system of criminal law, but they were closed by sudden illness within a year. His widow survived him for twenty-five years. She pursued with vigor and understanding the task of retrieving her husband's embarrassed affairs. The Louisiana property was in litigation, and the estate on the Hudson seemed threatened with sale. In correspondence with leading lawyers on these interests, and in visits to New Orleans, she showed an intelligence and energy not to be subdued even by her confirmed ill-health. Books were her solace, and works of kindness and charity her relief from trials. She died at the age of seventy-eight, outliving most of her generation, and leaving none to represent her in direct descent. The memoir closes becomingly with the words: "She was an intelligent and useful influence at several epochs of our history. American annals are enriched by many names taken from her sex. It is thought they ought to have some place for Mrs. Livingston's."

Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln. By Distinguished Men of his Time. Collected and edited by Allan Thorndike Rice. North American Publishing Co. 1886.

THIS bulky volume of more than six hundred pages contains papers upon Lincoln by Grant, E. B. Washburne, Julian, Fenton, Usher, Boutwell, B. F. Butler, Coffin, Frederick Douglass, Weldon, Poore, Coffey, Beecher, W. D. Kelley, C. M. Clay, Ingersoll, Markland, Colfax, Voorhees, C. A. Dana, Kasson, Fry, McCulloch, Depew, David R. Locke, Swett, Walt Whitman, Piatt, E. W. Andrews, Welling, Conness, Alley, and Hicks; and there is a supplementary volume to come. Most of these are records of personal reminiscence; but that from Grant is only a few notes by Col. Fred. Grant, those by Ingersoll and Whitman are merely rhetorical, and the one by Welling is largely a discussion of the Emancipation Proclamation. The gathering of such a mass of material is an excellent service, since it contributes to make Lincoln's memory personal instead of merely a great name, and hereafter, when it is sifted for his biography, the usefulness of it will be better appreciated. The character of the contributors apparently forbade much editing by Mr. Rice; as it is, the volume is very diffuse, is marred by frequent and long repetitions of history which did not come under the eye of the writers, by anecdotes at second-hand when the original versions are to be found elsewhere in the book, and by similar defects which generally

it is the duty of an editor to do away with. Mr. Rice himself contributes a paper partly of second-hand reminiscence and partly of criticism; gives a facsimile of the famous Seward despatch in the Trent affair, with Lincoln's corrections—a most interesting paper; and interleaves the separate articles with portraits of many of the authors.

There is a singular unanimity in the judgment of all these writers in respect to the qualities, motives, and purposes of Lincoln, and the transcendence of his character both in leadership, wisdom, and patriotic elevation beyond all other statesmen of the time. Donn Piatt is the only one whose words indicate dissent from the common views, and at the close even he confesses Lincoln's superiority. His unfavorable remarks, however, are amply challenged by the other participants in the work. Thus when he writes that, "descended from the poor whites of a slave State through many generations, he inherited the contempt, if not the hatred, held by that class for the negro," the reader need only turn to Frederick Douglass's account where it is said, "He was the first great man that I talked with in the United States freely who in no single instance reminded me of the difference between himself and myself, of the difference in color, and I thought that all the more remarkable because he came from a State where there were black laws. . . . I felt as though I was in the presence of a big brother." And when Donn Piatt says, "I doubt whether Mr. Lincoln had at all a kind, forgiving nature"; or denies that he felt the "anxiety" which would have broken down men of "delicate mold and sympathetic nature such as Chase or Seward," but, on the contrary, "lived through the awful responsibility of the situation with the high courage and comfort that came of indifference," one is simply lost in wonder at the writer's incapacity. The thing which Donn Piatt did remember was Lincoln's rage, which once descended upon himself, justly, as he acknowledges; and it is evident from Lincoln's tone in the conversations between the two that he had no liking whatever for Donn Piatt. Of this "rage" of Lincoln there are several instances recorded, all of them instructive, and quite sufficient to set him beside Washington in this capacity for unbridled anger on fit occasions.

It will not be expected that we should summarize even what is new in this volume, because it is anecdotal in character and is connected with many matters of detail. Much of the matter is old, but we do not remember to have seen before the remark, "I have never had much to do with bishops where I live, but do you know? Sumner is my idea of a bishop." Perhaps one should be a Westerner to appreciate all that was conveyed by that. Of what is new, it is not unlikely that some capital may be made of Lincoln's use of the public service as a politician. Boutwell takes the occasion to preach the doctrine of the "Places for the Partisans" out-and-out; Julian gives one instance in which the President used the whip in his behalf; Fenton tells the price of office for which Thurlow Weed consented to support him in 1864; and Mr. Rice, on an unnamed authority, discloses that ten thousand Pennsylvania soldiers were furloughed from Meade's and Sheridan's commands to affect the vote in their State by the contagious patriotism of their presence. Nevertheless, it is equally plain that, while Lincoln used every instrument of power he possessed to accomplish his ends, he was also ready to lay down all power; and, in illustration of this, Mr. Rice publishes, on the authority of Col. W. H. Croffut and Thurlow Weed's statements, the story of the embassy of the latter to Gov. Seymour and to Gen. McClellan, in '62-'63, to say that Lincoln would stand aside if they would declare unequivocally for carrying on the war for the Union to the end, and of their failure to meet the required