

eyes with one handkerchief, and Beckford, who seconded him, cried too, and wiped with two handkerchiefs at once, which was very moving. The third was about General Amherst, and in commendation of the industry and ardour of our American commanders, very spirited and eloquent.

If Gray had felt the death of Wolfe deeply, could he have inserted the little scoff about the handkerchiefs? In the following January (23) he writes again to Wharton:—

You ask after Quebec. Gen. Townsend says, it is much like Richmond Hill, and the river as fine (but bigger), and the vale as *riant*, as rich, and as well cultivated. No great matters are attributed to his conduct. The officer who brought over the news, when the Prince of Wales asked, how long Gen. Townsend commanded in the action after Wolfe's death answered, 'A minute, sir.' It is certain, he was not at all well with Wolfe, who for some time had not cared to consult with him, or communicate any of his designs to him.

EDWARD E. MORRIS.

THE FRENCH EAST-INDIAN EXPEDITION AT THE CAPE IN 1803.

IN searching the archives of our War Office (Intelligence, no. 425) I have found the following letters, which have not been published in the official records of Cape Colony. The first two are from English residents at the Cape, the others are from the chiefs of the East Indian expedition which the First Consul despatched early in 1803. At that time our government restored the Cape to the Batavian republic, in pursuance of the terms of the treaty of Amiens, but after a long delay, occasioned by the almost complete rupture brought about by Bonaparte's high-handed intervention in Switzerland in the previous autumn. The position was severely strained when, early in 1803, Sebastiani's report on the state of Egypt and the Levant was published in the *Moniteur*. That this action was more than mere bluster is evident from the very important secret instructions issued by the First Consul to his general of division Decaen, whom he appointed to be *capitaine général des établissements français au-delà du Cap de Bonne-Espérance*. They were dated 11 *nivôse*, an XI (1 Jan. 1803), and have been printed in full by M. Dumas in the 'Précis des Événements Militaires' (vol. xi. pp. 185-90), and in the *Revue Historique* of 1879 and of 1881. But the following extracts are here cited in order to explain the importance which Bonaparte and his officers then attached to the possession of the Cape. I may add that Decaen was noted for his hostility to England, while Admiral Linois was soon to be the scourge of British commerce in the eastern seas:—

Pour nourrir la guerre aux Indes plusieurs campagnes, il faut raisonner dans l'hypothèse que nous ne serions pas maîtres des mers, et que nous aurions à espérer peu de secours considérables.

Il paraît difficile qu'avec un corps d'armée on pût longtemps résister aux forces considérables que peuvent opposer les Anglais, sans alliances et sans une place servant de point d'appui, où dans un cas extrême on pût capituler et se trouver encore maître de se faire transporter en France ou à l'Île de France avec armes et bagages, sans être prisonniers et sans compromettre l'honneur et un corps considérable de Français.

Un point d'appui doit avoir le caractère d'être fortifié, et d'avoir une rade ou un port où des frégates ou des vaisseaux de commerce soient à l'abri d'une force supérieure. Quelle que soit la nation à laquelle appartient cette place, portugaise, hollandaise ou anglaise, le premier objet paraît devoir tendre à s'en emparer dès les premiers mois, en calculant sur l'effet de l'arrivée d'une force européenne inattendue et incalculée. . . .

Si la guerre venait à se déclarer entre la France et l'Angleterre avant le 1^{er} vendémiaire an XIII [29 Sept. 1804], et que le capitaine général en fût prévenu avant de recevoir les ordres du gouvernement, il a carte blanche, est autorisé à se reposer sur l'Île de France et le Cap, ou à rester dans la presqu'île [de l'Inde], selon les circonstances où il se trouvera et les espérances qu'il pourrait concevoir. . . .

On ne conçoit pas aujourd'hui que nous puissions avoir la guerre avec l'Angleterre sans y entraîner la Hollande. Un des premiers soins du capitaine général sera de s'assurer de la situation des établissements hollandais, portugais, espagnols, et des ressources qu'ils pourraient offrir.

La mission du capitaine général est d'abord une mission d'observation sous les rapports politique et militaire, avec le peu de forces qu'il mène, et une occupation de comptoirs pour notre commerce; mais le premier consul, bien instruit par lui, et par l'exécution ponctuelle des instructions qui précèdent, pourra peut-être le mettre à même d'acquérir un jour la grande gloire qui prolonge la mémoire des hommes au-delà de la durée des siècles.

British War Office Intelligence.

I. Extract from a Letter from Cape Town.

11 April 1803.

This morning 45 of the Batavian horse soldiers were carried from the Barracks to the cells in the Castle, having mutinied & dangerously wounded two of their officers: this is a bad beginning, & worse, I fear, will follow. Every inhabitant seems dissatisfied with the proceedings of Government & I make no doubt that was [*sic*] an English fleet to appear off the Cape, three parts out of four would immediately join them: the troops are all murmuring & daily complaints of bad food & that in such small quantities that it is scarcely sufficient for them to exist with, & their pay is exceedingly trifling. Heaven only knows how it will end: the Commissary General has modestly made known to the Inhabitants they must make up their minds to feed cloth [*sic*], & pay every expence of, the Army & navy, the Batavian Republic not having it in their power to support them: the monied men are all preparing for evacuating the Colony.

II.

Cape Town, May 14. 1803.

There are three French frigates & a Seventy-Four arrived in Simon's Bay with a General & Troops for the Cape; the Dutch say, for Pondicherry; but there seems to be only one opinion about that; everything is ordered for them in the name of the Batavian Republic. I am afraid all is not yet understood in Europe, for one of the Frigates on making the inner bay, stood off again, on not seeing the Dutch colours, which by some means had been neglected to be hoisted, & made a private signal from the outer bay to the hill, which on being answered, she stood up into Simon's Bay: however, all is quiet, & it never required any gift of prophecy to foretel that this would be the case.

III.

[Copie.]

Du Cap de Bonne Espérance, False Bay
le 30 Floréal, an XI
[20 Mai, 1803]

Au Ministre de la Marine,—[After describing his wound, &c., he refers to the fortifications at Cape Town, of which he says] les Anglais n'en ont point augmenté. . . Ils ont eu dans cette Colonie jusqu'à 4820 hommes dont ils ont fait passer graduellement la plus grande partie dans l'Inde. Ce qui est à observer c'est qu'ils ont expédié le 61^e Régiment, composé de 850 hommes, pour la Mer Rouge à l'époque de 20 Avril 1801 sous les ordres de Sir Home Popham. Je n'entrerais pas dans d'autres détails, persuadé que le Général De Caen ne vous laisse rien ignorer de ce qui concerne cette Colonie, et de la conduite qu'y ont tenue les Anglais. Il en résulte, en dernière analyse, qu'ils y ont laissé une grande influence par les Guinées qu'ils y ont répandues. Tout y est doublé de prix depuis leur séjour. Il me paroît, par les renseignements que je me suis procurés, qu'ils y ont beaucoup de Partisans. L'importance de cette Colonie ne peut manquer de fixer l'attention de notre Gouvernement éclairé.

Je serai fort exact à vous transmettre après mon arrivée dans l'Inde la situation actuelle des Anglois. Je serai bientôt au fait, par mes anciennes relations répandues dans tous les points du Continent de tout ce qui les concerne. . . . Salut et Respect,
MONTIGNY.

IV.

[Copie.]

à bord du Marengo, en rade à Simons Baye
le 1^{er} Prairial, an XI
[21 Mai 1803]

Au Ministre de la Marine,—J'ai eu l'honneur de vous rendre compte par mes précédentes dépêches, qu'après une heureuse traversée de 63 jours, j'avois mouillé le 19 Floréal à Simons Baye dans la Baie de False (sic), avec la fregatte La Sémillante. J'y ai trouvé l'Atalanta, arrivée depuis deux jours.

La Belle Poule, transportant le Préfet Colonial Léger, et que j'avois expédiée en avant de la hauteur de Madère, n'a point paru en cette Baye,

et je ne doute pas que des vents forcés du N.O. l'ayant empêché d'attrapper le mouillage, le Cap^{ne} Bruillac se sera déterminé à passer outre, se proposant la relâche de Madagascar, pour y renouveler son eau, attendu que je lui ai défendu impérativement la relâche de l'Île de France dans les instructions que je lui ai données.

Quant aux transports, la *Côte d'Or* et la *Marie Françoise*, dont nous avons été séparés la nuit du départ, par suite du coup de vent que nous avons essuyé, je le suppose encore à l'arrière.

Mon eau étant faite, je pars demain, si le vent est favorable pour me rendre à ma destination. Harmonie, joie, et santé règnent parmi les équipages et passagers de la division.

L'accueil le plus prévenant et le plus obligeant nous a été fait ici par les autorités bataves : je me réfère au surplus aux détails renfermés dans ma précédente dépêche. (Signé) LINOIS.

P.S. J'ouvre ma lettre, général ministre, pour vous annoncer l'arrivée en cette baie du transport le *Côte d'Or*, qui a relâché assez inutilement aux Canaries. Il n'y a point de malade à son bord. Je ne l'attendrai pas pour appareiller, si les vents deviennent favorables pour mon départ. Cette lettre doit vous parvenir par le vaisseau anglois *Cambrian*, Cap^{ne} Gordon, allant à Londres ; c'est un bâtiment de commerce.

[Pencilled on back, 'received Jan. 29 1804.']

The letter of General Decaen is of similar tenor. It is clear that these letters were taken direct to our War Office by Captain Gordon when he found that war had broken out. But the fact that the French officers entrusted letters to our East Indiaman shows that when they left Brest (1 March 1803) the approach of war was not considered imminent. Napoleon evidently considered that a year and a half would be needed for the completion of his preparations for the overthrow of our Indian power ; and the letter of Captain Montigny shows that the French took every care to examine the fortifications at the Cape, which Decaen's secret instructions warned him to secure as a necessary *point d'appui*. Is it too much to presume that the despatch of this expedition, under the command of a pronounced Anglophobe, decided our government to thwart Napoleon's plans by an immediate declaration of war ? That our government thenceforth attached the greatest importance to the acquisition of the Cape is clear from our Foreign Office records. In 'Prussia,' no. 70, there is a draft of a proposed treaty with that power dated 27 Oct. 1805, the third article of which stipulates that, at the end of the present war against Napoleon, no question should be raised by our allies as to the retention by Great Britain of Malta and of the Cape of Good Hope. I believe that that is the earliest indication of our fixed determination to reconquer and to keep that colony, the importance of which had been so unmistakably pointed out by Decaen's expedition.

J. HOLLAND ROSE.

Reviews of Books

The Philosophical Theory of the State. By BERNARD BOSANQUET.
(London: Macmillan & Co., Limited. 1899.)

SINCE T. H. Green lectured on political obligation no English philosopher has materially advanced the theory of the state. The ideas which he laboured to express and to justify have indeed been fruitful in stimulus, but no one has ventured before Mr. Bosanquet in this volume to give system and completion to the work which fell too early from his hands. Mr. Bosanquet, then, is primarily to be regarded as carrying on the tradition and teaching of his master, T. H. Green, but he has two special reasons for desiring to express himself independently.

One of these is to be found in my attempt to apply the conceptions of recent psychology to the theory of state coercion and of the real or general will, and to explain the relation of social philosophy to sociological psychology. . . . My other reason lay in the conviction that the time has gone by for the scrupulous caution which Green displayed in estimating the value of the state to its members.¹

It is unnecessary to speak of Mr. Bosanquet's qualifications for the task he has undertaken; it is more pertinent to thank him, in the name of all serious students of political philosophy, for having achieved it. In these pages any detailed exposition and review of fundamental philosophical conceptions would be out of place; it is only possible to draw attention to the masterly criticism, in the second chapter, of the various methods by which the study of politics has been pursued—mathematical, juristic, biological, sociological, psychological—and the justification of philosophy's claim to welcome their contribution while reserving her arbitrament; or, again, to chapter viii., on the end and limits of state action, a chapter which, pronouncing judgment on the false issue raised by individualism and socialism, only restates and develops the author's previously expressed view, and is and must remain, so one would think, final, both in thought and definition.

It is rather from Mr. Bosanquet's interpretation of the history of the state and the history of its theory that we shall illustrate the philosophical attitude adopted and defended in this book. Political philosophy may be said to end, as it began, with some attempt to answer the question, Why should I obey the state? Briefly Mr. Bosanquet replies, Because in obeying the state you obey your larger, your real and permanent self, because, in the language of Rousseau's paradox, the state exists to make you free. And so he finds the root of the matter to

lie in the paradox of self-government, in which true freedom consists. Now this paradox is after all no greater in politics than in ethics. The real—or collective—will of a people is just as genuine and operative a conception as the identity of the individual's purpose through changing moods of caprice and illusion; as hard to grasp, but no harder. 'The claim to obey only yourself is a claim essential to humanity; and the further significance of it rests upon what you mean by "yourself."' "

Now any such doctrine will be branded at once as metaphysical and 'unenglish.' It will have to overcome the rooted national distrust of the state; the view which regards the government as a necessary evil, but evil none the less; the temperament which calls upon the individual to reform the state, and finds the proper sphere of pre-eminent virtue in opposition to the claims of society and the coercion of the state. The Englishman is by nature a grumbler; popular thought is impressed by the exceptional rather than the normal; even the philosopher has failed 'to seize the greatness and reality of life in its commonest actual phases.' Some such mental attitude is at once the source and product of those peculiarly English '*prima facie* theories,' or 'theories of the first look,' which it is Mr. Bosanquet's object to explode. And yet there is some risk of unduly discrediting them; Hobbes, Locke, Bentham, Mill, Spencer, and Huxley witness to overmastering historical forces and deep-seated instincts. Modern political speculation took its rise in the sixteenth century out of the question of the right of resistance. Round this dominant debate theory crystallised, *vires acquirit eundo*. For good or for evil freedom and the state were forced into antithesis; systems of political philosophy all agreed to rear themselves on a basis of abstract individualism. And yet it is easy to do less than justice to this order of speculation; and Mr. Bosanquet's scorn of the superficial leads him at times into language unduly severe. To most of these thinkers, with their 'theories of limit and resistance,' freedom was, just as much as to Rousseau and Hegel, the essential good for man. While we turn to Hegel to learn that freedom is the *raison d'être* of the state we shall find at least an equal conviction in Locke that freedom is so inseparable from all human worth, so fundamental to character, that the value of human institutions is only to be tested by their foundation in freedom; a tenet which led in his eyes necessarily to the conclusion that consent must have gone to the making of a state, since only in consent could its preservation be justified. Here is the same appeal to reason; un-historical, artificial, we have learnt to call it, and rightly. But the mistake is not one of principle; it is, in fact, the principle which redeems the theory and still arouses an answer of sympathy. After all Locke did attempt to adjust law and liberty by clear sober reasoning, and that though he started from that blank negative conception of liberty which Mr. Bosanquet trenchantly criticises.

But it is with a very different tradition of speculation that Mr. Bosanquet, as a constructive philosopher, is concerned. Just as to him the real interest of history lies in the emergence and manifestation of a social will, so the value of political theories is to be measured by their recognition and interpretation of that will. This will, the real will, as he prefers to style it, springs from the heart of society to work in and

through the form of social organisation, the state. Society is organic, rests on a community of mind; the state is organisation, and in the human sphere organism and organisation cannot be separated. The vital question, then, is not, Under what limitations shall I obey the state? but, What makes a people a people? What are the profounder psychical implications in the fact, and organized human association? This view of the political problem, owing its rise to Plato and Aristotle, preserved, but embalmed in scholasticism, emerging with acute but perplexed consciousness in Rousseau, powerfully influencing Kant and Fichte, dominating Hegel—all this Mr. Bosanquet has traced with a master hand, rendering by the way to Rousseau the appreciative justice for which he has waited so long. A stimulating chapter of psychological illustration is inserted to buttress the doctrine of the real or collective will; and at the summit of his argument Mr. Bosanquet commits himself entirely to the guidance of Hegel in the analysis of the state. If any one holds the secret of Hegel, and is qualified to reveal it, it is certainly Mr. Bosanquet. Equally loyal to ideas and to facts, endowed with a store of personal experience which Hegel himself did not possess, he performs the function of interpreter with incomparable skill and sanity. It may fairly be doubted whether Hegel himself, in his lifelong protest against abstraction and distinction, did not often purchase concreteness at the price of clearness. It is certain that Hegel has been to many a stumbling-block, to many a shibboleth. His knowledge of history would not bear the fabric of his philosophy; but it by no means follows that his philosophy does not contain the clue to the interpretation of all history. It is in a patient, hopeful, and sincere spirit that Mr. Bosanquet applies Hegel, never concealing a difficulty, but always claiming that on the deeper study of fact the solution will be found. Much faith and something of optimism is postulated. The state whose theory we are in search of is assumed to be a normal state—a state responsive to public opinion, and yet something more permanent than and paramount over any particular phase of public opinion. It is 'the operative criticism of all institutions,' summoning by right force to its aid; demanding and receiving recognition on the individual consciousness, representative and guardian of the rights of society. The state, then, is not the government, as Hobbes asserted; it is not the will of the majority elicited by representation or referendum; it is not a mere political machine. It is 'society as a unit, recognised as rightly exercising control over its members, through absolute physical power' (p. 184). It is 'not a number of persons, but a working conception of life' (pp. 150-1); it is, in fact, the real will. But what is the vehicle of this real will, and are we permitted to speak of the state as an institution which embodies it? *Who* represent the state at any given moment? *Whose* purpose is the real will the state exists to realise? Shall we apply the direct test of responsibility to discover the state? For what actions must the state be held responsible, for what not? Or must the state be sometimes held responsible for actions which are not its actions? And so we shall certainly be led, to meet extreme cases, to distinguish between the government and the people—the will of the men in office and the will of the nation. And the will of the nation is not necessarily the right will, which alone is the real will. 'We

always want what we will, but what we will is not always what would satisfy each want' (p. 146). Neither the lawyer nor the political casuist nor the plain man will be satisfied. And yet there is a real will, a will which is neither a transcendent abstract will nor a merely unconscious purpose. It is in society, yet it does not make society, but society makes it. It is never realised, yet always operative; a mystery of faith, but a mystery which philosophy compels faith to grasp.

W. G. POGSON SMITH.

Authority and Archæology, Sacred and Profane. Edited by D. G. HOGARTH. (London: Murray. 1899.)

THE intention of this collection of essays is to enable us, now that we are nearing the close of the century which has witnessed such enormous archæological discoveries and such progress in the science of archæology itself, to realise where we stand with regard to the effects of those discoveries on our conception and knowledge of ancient history, whether biblical or classical. It is difficult to imagine an enterprise of the kind more successfully carried out. The names of the writers would be of themselves a sufficient guarantee for the adequacy of the treatment. But it is with increasing admiration that we realise (and this is specially true of the more important essays) their combination of breadth of view with completeness of detail, and the sobriety as well as the precision of their statements and judgments.

We can hardly do more than refer to Professor Driver's remarkable contribution, which comes first in the book—'Hebrew Authority.' It is the longest of all the essays, and, as might be expected from the nature of the subject, the most polemical. But we do not think that Dr. Driver can be accused of having said a word too much about those who confuse the distinction between what he calls 'the direct and the indirect testimony of archæology.' With this as his thesis he goes steadily through the Old Testament history, pointing out where archæological discoveries on the one hand confirm or contradict its statements, and on the other merely illustrate them or increase their probability. The treatment of the story of Joseph is typical. The monuments provide parallels and illustrations for nearly every important incident in it. But we search them in vain for any direct proof of the existence of an historical Joseph. At the same time it can be said that 'the inherent nature of the events recorded [viz. the story of Joseph] . . . makes it exceedingly difficult to believe that they do not rest upon a foundation of fact.'

If Professor Sayce has been somewhat severely handled by Dr. Driver, he will find nothing but consolation in Mr. Griffith's section on Egypt, which strikingly confirms the main contentions of the famous attack on the veracity of Herodotus.

Hopelessly astray as regards the order [of the early kings] . . . Herodotus has no knowledge even of the most important phases of the history. . . It is only with the actual accession of Psammetichus that the work of Herodotus enters on its new phase of comparative accuracy. . . It is the frequent absence of even superficial knowledge that tries our belief in the veracity of Herodotus. . . His complete ignorance of Egypt above Memphis . . . How isolated is this gen of

veracity [viz. the description of the ibis]! . . . 'Hardly Herodotus,' one would say, on reading its wondrous context.

Such are some characteristic specimens of Mr. Griffith's judgment on the Greek historian tested by modern Egyptology. He has indeed some excuses to offer for him. Herodotus was in the hands of the priests, and one of the most striking features in the essay is the evidence for the 'utter lack of historical knowledge among the educated classes in Egypt.' Manetho is a typical case.

If a native priest commissioned to write history by the king, having access to temple records and surrounded by inscriptions of historical importance, the meaning of which he could readily gather . . . failed to collect materials better than those provided by tradition and popular legend, it is not to be wondered at that the priests and guides consulted by Herodotus should have led him far from the truth.

The section on Babylonia and Assyria is hardly more favourable to Herodotus. Mr. Griffith concludes with some valuable pages on the 'Reconstruction of Ancient History.' The classical writings on oriental history may not be very valuable as sources of information, but they were the starting-point for the modern interest in those subjects. 'It has been reserved for us to draw forth the true history of Egypt and Babylonia straight from their soil and ruins.' And we are beginning to realise what this means now that Mr. Petrie has succeeded in tracing a continuous tradition of human culture in the Nile valley back to the stone age.

Mr. Hogarth's section on prehistoric Greece reminds us, above all things, what rapid changes have taken place in our knowledge and conception of the origin and character of early Greek culture since Schliemann's discoveries, now a quarter of a century old. Formerly everything used to be explained by the Phœnicians. Now we are told that 'they carried away from Mycenæ as much as they brought.' Our view of the relation between prehistoric Greece and the east has been radically altered by the idea of an Aegean civilisation stretching back 'far into the third millennium B.C. at the very least, and more probably much earlier still,' which, while it was able to assimilate all that it borrowed, was intensely individual in the style of its products. It is the continuity of this artistic tradition which explains the rapid development of the art of historic Greece. In fact, we must look for the origins of the Greek spirit, in matters of art at least, much further back than we ever imagined. In another direction a new prospect is opened by the recognition of the influence exercised by the Aegean culture over the art of Central Europe, and ultimately that of the Keltic race. We are probably far from being at the end of our discoveries in the world of prehistoric Greece. But what a revolution has been already achieved when it can be said that 'we have probably to deal with a total period of civilisation in the Aegean not much shorter than in the Nile valley'! Professor Ernest Gardner's section on historic Greece is, from the nature of the subject, less startling. Yet here too we realise that our knowledge has been immensely increased by two great series of results. On the one hand there has been the steady excavation of the chief historical sites, above

all of Olympia, Delphi, and the Athenian Acropolis; and, on the other, it has become possible to construct a systematic history of the two most important departments of Greek art, sculpture and vase-painting.

In the 'Roman World' Mr. Haverfield has perhaps the hardest task of all assigned to him. Within the limits of thirty-five pages to suggest or even allude to all that archæology has contributed to our knowledge of that vast and complex subject, the origin and growth of the empire of Rome, which at last becomes coextensive with the civilised world itself—to do this satisfactorily was practically impossible. Much has been omitted of the highest interest and importance. Some might have looked for fuller information about the subject of Roman Britain, which Mr. Haverfield, though he has done so much to increase and consolidate our knowledge of it, has, with a due sense of proportion, confined to the severest limits. Others again might expect a more prominent place for the story of the recovery since 1870 of so much of the buried city of Rome. But he has wisely restricted himself to an attempt to give a general idea of the two great subjects about which archæology has most to tell us—prehistoric Italy and the imperial administration. Into these he has skilfully worked the results of the discoveries, the bulk of which belong to our own time. The systematic study of Roman antiquities has indeed been in progress ever since the Renaissance, but the latter half of the present century has seen an unprecedented increase in the archæological material; while in one department, that of the prehistoric remains in Italy, it can claim a monopoly. We are now able to trace a distinctive Italian civilisation back to the earliest settlements of immigrants in the valley of the Po, to watch its gradual diffusion over the peninsula, and to distinguish the elements in it which were original from those which it borrowed from the Aegean culture. Later there comes the Etruscan episode; and here it is interesting to notice that, as in other cases, tradition is confirmed by the evidence of archæology.

The ancients told how the Etruscans came from the east: archæological evidence is now accumulating to confirm the legends. . . . Researches in Etruria prove that the earliest Etruscan civilisation resembled that which prevailed in the eastern Mediterranean in the last days of the Aegean period.

'The bulk of what we know about the Roman empire is supplied by archæological evidence.' Mr. Haverfield describes the way in which this evidence has been accumulated and organised. First and foremost comes the 'Corpus of Inscriptions,' 'the greatest work of learning executed during the nineteenth century.' Then there is the record of exploration in the vast area which is included within the empire, embracing such different subjects as town life at Pompeii or in northern Africa, and the frontier defences as seen in the Germanic 'Limes' or the camp towns on the Danube. Finally, in a series of select examples, Mr. Haverfield shows how this evidence has built up our knowledge of the empire. These are, the officials of the imperial service; the development of an absolute monarch out of the *princeps*, as illustrated by the growth of the palace on the Palatine; the extension of municipalities in the provinces, accompanied, in the west, by a uniformity of culture; and the organised defence of the frontiers. The picture thus constructed, though necessarily imperfect

(religion, *e.g.*, is barely alluded to), is very successful in bringing together all that was best and most important in the imperial system.

The subject of early Christianity as affected by archæology naturally falls into two parts, the historical criticism of the New Testament and the condition of the church in the time before its recognition by the state. In neither case is the evidence abundant, but in some respects it is more so for the former than the latter; and here it is curious that a considerable proportion of it is literary. The recently discovered 'Sayings of Jesus' is an example. The importance of the papyri, however, consists rather in the possibilities of future discoveries than in any very positive gain at present. The rest of the evidence is largely, as we saw was the case with the Old Testament, indirect. Here some of the most important contributions are those of Professor Ramsay, and Mr. Headlam has made the most of them. In one case, that of Ramsay's theory about the date of the Nativity and the census of Quirinius, he is almost too ready to accept an argument which, to us personally, always appeared rather suggestive than convincing. The bulk of the archæological evidence about the early church is in the form of inscriptions. As compared with those that illustrate other departments of ancient life their number is disappointingly small and the results often inconclusive. How little historical information does an early Christian epitaph generally contain as compared with the tombstone of a Roman soldier or state official! Later, of course, they become comparatively abundant and instructive, but for the period about which we know least they are painfully rare and meagre. Professor Ramsay's finds in Phrygia (which Mr. Headlam describes in his second section) would add materially to our knowledge if the epitaphs, *e.g.*, of Eumeneia could be confidently accepted as Christian. At present, in our humble opinion, that must be regarded as doubtful. Finally there is the mass of epitaphs from the Roman catacombs, supplemented by the wall paintings, of which Mr. Headlam gives a short sketch.

The statements in the book, as might be expected from the contributors, are practically free from errors. The deficiencies, if there are any, are in the form of omissions. But it is not easy to blame where the task of selection becomes so difficult. One instance that occurs to us is that of the exploration of Jerusalem and Palestine, especially as affecting the later Jewish history. Generally we can feel nothing but admiration for the amount of fact and suggestion which has been brought together in the volume.

G. McN. RUSHFORTH.

Egyptian Chronology. An Attempt to conciliate the ancient Schemes and to educe a rational System. By F. G. FLEAY. (London: David Nutt. 1899.)

DOUBTLESS it would be of very great interest to decide finally whether Menes began to reign in the sixth or the third millennium B.C., to settle the main outlines of Egyptian chronology from his time to the eighth century B.C., and to present a table of contemporary events in early times in Egypt, the Mesopotamian valley, and Syria. But how is it to be done? Most Egyptologists have learnt to distrust 'utterly' the evidence of the

Greek writers in regard to dates beyond the last eight hundred years B.C. Manetho has been an invaluable guide in the arrangement of kings and dynasties, canons of which were handed down from ancient days, and wherever the monumental evidence is available it confirms the order of succession as given by him. But for absolute chronology he is entirely untrustworthy, and as to questions of contemporaneity of reign he is silent. Of his chronicle of events the excerptors from his work give little, but what they have preserved shows that his sources of 'history' were not the monuments which surrounded him, but idle legends of which samples remain to us on papyri of all ages to illustrate his statements and his stories. How, then, is the chronology to be ascertained? Egyptian records are dated merely by regnal years, and apparently regardless of co-regencies. Such datings we may collect; for some periods they are numerous, and there are cases in which we know from contemporary documents the precise duration of a reign. Further, if the famous Turin papyrus had come down to us complete we should have had a comparatively early, and probably in many cases a correct, statement of the length of each reign down to, perhaps, the beginning of the nineteenth dynasty. But out of some four hundred preceding reigns the shattered papyrus gives us, the duration of some two dozen only. If any fortunate accident were to reveal another complete copy of the canon, the historical gain from the discovery would be enormous; but to compile the chronology we should still require to know how far the reigns were contemporaneous, and apparently the Turin papyrus gave no information on this head. Here again the contemporary monuments occasionally come to our aid, but, except for one or two of the most brilliant dynasties—the twelfth and eighteenth, for example—there is no solidity about our information; at the best there are obscure points involving differences of many years for a dynasty. In 'Memphis and Mycenae' Mr. Cecil Torr has made a careful statement of the monumental evidence reaching back to the beginning of the twelfth dynasty. Many additions and corrections might, however, be made, and to the present writer that author seems decidedly too niggard in his allowance of probabilities even for *minimum* dates.

There is still another quarter towards which we look for help. Astronomy can fix absolutely the dates of recurrence and periods of change in celestial phenomena, and if we can furnish a record of any such events dated in the Egyptian manner astronomers can give us a date to correspond, or a series of dates from which to select the most likely. This method has long been practised, and not without success; the most conspicuous and promising instances of its application concern the heliacal rising of the Dog Star. With this event the Egyptian year properly began; but as that year was only 365 days long instead of 365½ it lost a day in every four years, a month in every 120, and so on until the agricultural seasons no longer corresponded with their proper months: after a period of 1,460 years the beginnings of the official and agricultural years would again exactly coincide. This year of 365 days was in regular use for dating at least from the twelfth dynasty onwards, and earlier traces leave little doubt that it was so throughout Egyptian history. The festival of the 'Coming Forth of Sothis'—or the Dog star—is with the greatest probability supposed to have been held yearly on the occasion of

the heliacal rising, and we now have one regnal date in the eighteenth dynasty, and another in the twelfth—the latter discovered only last year—on which the festival was held. In the first instance it fell on the ninth day of the third month of summer; and, as we know the equivalent of this date in our modern calendar for several centuries B.C., it is calculated that this particular heliacal rising of the Dog star in the eighteenth dynasty must have happened in 1546 B.C.—in the reign of Amenhotep I. Perhaps the underlying assumption that the Egyptians were never induced to readjust their calendar to the seasons is hardly justifiable; if such readjustments were permitted the calculation is, of course, hopelessly vitiated. However, the date for the eighteenth dynasty obtained by this calculation is in very reasonable accord with the sequence of Egyptian history. But the date of 1876 B.C., which is now similarly obtained for Usertesen II, of the twelfth dynasty, will surely stir up strife among Egyptologists. In any attempt to fix the dates by astronomical data from Egyptian records two large assumptions are made: first, that the record in question is correctly interpreted, apart from the mere literal meaning; secondly, that no arbitrary interference was ever made with the steady movement of the Egyptian calendar. It is obvious that a great increase of material is required before certainty can be arrived at through the mutual confirmation of different astronomical data.

Mr. Fleay's chronological scheme is based on other considerations, and is for the most part an adjustment of the Greek numbers with the monumental evidence. A century hence it will be of some interest to posterity to note how far those numbers tally with the historical facts which will then be ascertained; but in the meantime it seems, to the present writer at least, labour in vain to argue from them for a true chronology. For his Egyptian material Mr. Fleay has had to depend on data provided by others. The real purport of the 'Sed festivals,' or *τριακονταετηρίδες*, is very obscure. Apparently Mr. Fleay assumes them to have marked periods of twenty-eight years, in the course of which the calendar would alter by a week. We do not, however, find that seven days had a calendrical importance in Egypt, nor any recognition of the lunar month of twenty-eight days; thirty years, or, so to speak, a month of years, seems more in accord both with Egyptian practice and with the Greek term *τριακονταετηρίς*, giving also seven and a half days' shifting of the calendar—i.e. one quarter of the calendar month. Moreover Sed festivals were generally celebrated in, or close upon, the thirtieth year of a king, apparently as a jubilee is reckoned from an accession, not from any astronomical occurrence; sometimes, if the reign were long, it was renewed at intervals of three years. In one case—that of Queen Hatshepsut—it was celebrated in the fifteenth year of a reign, perhaps as a kind of 'silver' jubilee. It has been conjectured that the Sed festival was counted from the proclamation of the king as *heir* to the throne. In some instances no satisfactory explanation of its occurrence is forthcoming. The matter requires thorough investigation. Another unproved assumption pressed into the service of Mr. Fleay's argument is that in the Old Kingdom the year was of 360 days only. To prove the assumption wrong is perhaps at present impossible, for scarcely any dates exist on contemporary monuments. Many will be interested to

follow Mr. Fleay's ingenious reasoning, and his explanations of the Greek numbers, in order to see what can be done with them. But it will prove somewhat of a drawback to their comfort that he supposes them to be acquainted with the bibliography of the subject, and consequently gives scarcely any references.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Industrie et du Commerce en France.
Par GUSTAVE FAGNIEZ. (Paris: Picard. 1898.)

THIS is a volume in the well-known 'Collection de Textes pour servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire,' and is fully entitled to a place in that good company. In the space of three hundred pages M. Fagniez gives two hundred and eighty extracts and documents illustrative of Gallie and French industry and commerce between the second century before and the fourteenth after the Christian era. The editor's name is enough to assure us that the selection is well made, and his chosen documents make us feel the darkness of the dark ages as no amount of picturesque narration could. The tenth century is represented by only two extracts; the one relates to the decoration of a church, the other to the manufacture of soap. When the morning dawns and the signs of industry become more numerous, then we begin to receive from M. Fagniez documents for which English students should be very grateful, for some of them were heretofore to be found only among the proceedings of antiquarian societies, or in other places where an Englishman is not likely to look. Clearly France, or rather southern France, was far ahead of contemporary England in the development of mercantile documents.

Not the least interesting extract consists of the very ancient statutes of the gild merchant of Saint-Omer (p. 105), and as these are important to us in this country we will venture to question the correctness of the text, even at the risk of noticing some mere misprints. The statutes begin thus (our emendation stands in brackets):—

Si quis mercator manens in villa nostra vel in suburbio in gildam nostram intrare voluerit [noluerit] et pergens alicubi deturbatus fuerit vel res suas amiserit vel ad duellum fuerit provocatus, omnino nostro carebit auxilio.

The merchant of this town who will *not* join our gild, and who goes elsewhere and there gets into trouble, must not expect any help from us. Here is one reason why a man should join our gild. Another is given in the next sentence, and of this sentence M. Fagniez thinks worse than we think. If a man who has not the gild sets a price on any wares with a view to purchasing them (*aliquam waram . . . taxaverit*), and a man who has the gild comes up, then this 'merchant' (that is, this member of the gild) may buy what the non-gildsman has 'taxed,' although the non-gildsman protests (*eo nolente mercator quod ipse taxaverat emet*). Grammar notwithstanding, we submit that *ipse* is not the *mercator*; but M. Fagniez seems to think that the sentence, as it stands, is nonsense, and proposes what looks like an unnecessary amendment. Then the next sentence deals with the case in which a gildsman is buying and another gildsman intervenes. In that case the latter can claim a share in the