

'La petite Fadette,' 'François le Champi,' 'Jean de la Roche,' and 'Mlle. la Quintinie.' Of Balzac, the *Lecture* writer views with favor only 'Eugénie Grandet.' Three novels by About are recommended, though "we are far from placing him very high as a novelist; but his clear and rapid style is profitable to study." These are 'Tolla,' 'Germaine,' and 'Le Roi des Montagnes.' Of these, the first two are less entertaining, and, it seems to us, much more *scabreux*, than some of the author's other works, 'Trente et Quarante,' for instance. Of Sandeau's tales we find praised: 'La Maison de Penarvan' and 'Mlle. de Seiglière,' and Mrs. Craven's books are recommended, in spite of obvious faults. "But we do not counsel their perusal, *without commentary*, by romantic or excitable natures," and 'Le Mot de l'Énigme' is strongly condemned. Against certain authors of the day mothers are especially warned: Theuriet, for instance, "is a master, and has preserved the tradition of healthful fiction; but he is *de race gau'oise*, and there are too evident signs of it in his writings." The same is true of Daudet's novels, except "'Le Petit Chose,' which was written especially for children, and some of his stories." Some other novelists have written one or two charming books for the young, but mothers must be on their guard against letting this serve as guaranty for the wholesomeness of their other writings. Thus, Malot's 'Romain Kalbris' and 'Sans Famille,' and Assolant's 'Montluc le Rouge' and 'Le Capitain Corcoran' are deemed worthy of high praise, in spite of the bad character of most of their authors' productions.

—The *Gegenwart*, for February 7, publishes an interesting article on the government of Hamburg, from which our own municipal reformers might get valuable hints. The Government consists of two branches, the Senate and the "Bürgerschaft." The second body is formed of one hundred and sixty members, of whom eighty are chosen by manhood-suffrage, forty by real-estate owners, and forty by those citizens who are, or who have been, members of the administrative boards, the courts, or the board of trade. The Senate consists of eighteen members chosen for life, of whom nine are lawyers and nine merchants. When a vacancy takes place the remaining members and the Bürgerschaft appoint each four electors, who select four persons to be voted upon; of these the Senate rejects two, and the Bürgerschaft one of those remaining. But the part of the Hamburg constitution which interests us is the organization of the administrative boards. These are nine in number: Finance, Trade, Public Works, Military Affairs, Schools, Justice, Police, Charities, and Foreign Affairs. At the head of each of these boards stands a senator chosen by the Senate and removable at will. The most important of these bodies is the Board of Finance, formed of two senators, besides the president, and ten citizens. The latter are chosen for ten years, one going out annually. To fill such a vacancy the ten citizen-members propose to the Bürgerschaft three names from which to choose; if none of these suits, the elective body may substitute a fourth by a two-thirds majority. The presiding senator is practically the minister of finance; the other two senators his assistants and substitutes. The branches of the administration, such as the public debt, the treasury, etc., are assigned to the different citizen-members, and no draft on the treasury is honored unless countersigned by the member having charge of the department into which it comes, and who thus acts as auditor. One or more of these citizen-members sit also as delegates of the Board of Finance in each of the other boards, in order to give it the benefit of their advice and later to represent its interests in their own body. The citizen-representatives in these boards are, for the most part, merchants—*i. e.*, heads of the great trading houses—who bring their wide commercial experience to bear upon the interests of the city. Legislation usually originates in the boards, and is, in all cases, decided by the Senate. Finally, a person chosen to any office can decline to fill it only on the ground of other public duties, or of advanced age; but the public spirit in the Hamburg merchant class is said to be so great as to make this regulation superfluous.

—The material for the study of aboriginal languages has just been increased by the welcome accession of a 'Dictionary and Grammar of the Aimará Language,' spoken in the interior and southern portion of Peru by the Collas (*pron. Cóljas*) and cognate tribes. This language is closely related to the Quichua, and at the present period its area is topographically surrounded on all sides by various (Keclua or) Quichua dialects. Though highly developed in forms, Aimará is much less studied by scientists than the Quichua, the latter having had the privilege of being the court idiom of the Incas and of the ruling portion of the Peruvians before Pizarro invaded their vast domain. Many grammatic, derivational, and lexical forms are more archaic in Aimará than in Quichua and in

other cognate dialects, and to write a comparative grammar of this southern family would be impossible without a close study of the special dialect. The work alluded to above is a republication of the 'Arte y Vocabulario de la Lengua Aymara, compuesto por el P(adre) Ludovico Bertonio' (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1879. 3 vols. 8vo). Bertonio's work, dating as far back as 1603 and 1612, is here reproduced in a fac-simile edition by Mr. Julius Platzmann, a scientist favorably known by his republication of ancient materials for the study of Brazilian languages and other works of a kindred character. The Aimará dictionary consists of two parts: Spanish-Aimará and Aimará-Spanish, and contains over twelve thousand terms of the language.

ERASMUS DARWIN.*

THIS volume is made up of two parts very different in character and purpose. Dr. Krause's account of the author of the 'Loves of the Plants' is a scientific essay originally published in *Kosmos*. Dr. Charles Darwin's "preliminary notice" is a brief biography of his grandfather, written partly with a view of correcting some glaring errors and misrepresentations to be found in Miss Seward's 'Memoirs.' This book, once so well known, has in the progress of time lost its interest for the general public, and it now seems probable that posterity, instead of relying for their knowledge of Dr. Darwin upon his early biographer, will owe what they care to remember of Miss Seward to the connection between her name and that of her slandered friend. For the facts of the case leave little doubt in the mind of the reader that many of the statements made in the 'Memoirs' were suggested by that peculiar sort of feminine malice often inspired by disappointed affection. Miss Seward was a biographer of a type now happily less frequent than it once was. She allowed herself liberties in narration which, tried by our modern standards, are surprising. She invented an interesting death-bed scene, in which persons figure who were not present at the death of Erasmus Darwin; she misstates his age at the time of his death; she declares that on hearing of the suicide of a favorite son he behaved with unparalleled inhumanity, which she sarcastically describes as "self-command," and she does not hesitate throughout the book to put long speeches into the mouths of her characters which cannot possibly have really been ever spoken. When asked for her authority as to Dr. Darwin's behavior on the death of his son, "she owned that it had been given merely on a report at a distant place, without any enquiry having been made from a single person who could have really known what happened."

Erasmus Darwin was born in 1731. His father, Robert, was the first member of the family who developed the intellectual tastes so strongly marked in the later generations. This Robert Darwin, if we may judge from his singular litaney, praying deliverance

"From a morning that doth shine,
From a boy that drinketh wine,
From a wife that talketh Latine."

was in his own way a poet, and to judge by a paper of the antiquarian Dr. Stukeley, quoted by his present biographer, based on "an account from my friend Robert Darwin, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, a person of Curiosity, of a human Sceleton, impressed in Stone, found lately by the Rector of Elston," he had some taste for science. He had four sons, of whom Erasmus was the youngest. For an account of the childhood and early youth of Erasmus the materials are scanty. Of this portion of his life a curious and amusing memorial is preserved in a letter from his sister Susannah, written at the age of eighteen, and his reply written at the age of sixteen. His sister sends him an account of her "abstinence this Lent" and begs to be informed in reply what his "temperance" has been, and asks his opinion on the following difficult point:

"As soon as we kill our hog, I intend to take part thereof with ye Family, for I'm informed by a learned Divine y^t Hogs Flesh is Fish, and has been so ever since ye Devil entered into y^m and they ran into ye Sea; if you and the rest of the Casuists in your neighborhood are of ye same oppinion, it will be a greater satisfaction to me, in resolving so knotty a point of Conscience."

To this her brother playfully replies:

"I must inform you that we unanimously agree in ye Opinion of ye Learned Divine you mention, that Swine may indeed be fish but they are a devillish sort of fish, and we can prove from ye same authority that all fish is flesh, whence we affirm Porck not only to be flesh but a devillish Sort of flesh; and I would advise you for conscience sake altogether to abstain from tasting it as I can assure you I have done, tho'

* Erasmus Darwin. By Ernst Krause. Translated from the German by W. S. Dallas. With a preliminary notice by Charles Darwin. Portrait and woodcuts. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1887.

roast Pork has come to Table several Times; and for my own part have lived upon puding, milk and vegetables all this Lent; but don't mistake me, I don't mean that I have not touch'd roast beef, mutton, veal, goose, fowl, etc., for what are all these? All flesh is grass!"

His sister's Lenten Diary gives what is, we presume, an exact picture of the observance of a fast by a conscientious young English girl in the middle of the last century. The following is the account given of one day:

"Feb'y 8. Wednesday Morning a little before seven I got up; said my prayers; worked till eight; yⁿ took a walk, came in again and eate a farthing Loaf, yⁿ dress'd me, red a chapter in y^e Bible, and spun till One, yⁿ dined temperately, viz: on Puddin, Bread and Cheese; spun again till Fore, took a walk, yⁿ spun till half an hour past Five; eat an Apple, Chattered round y^e Fire; and at Seven a little boy'd Milk; and yⁿ (takeing my leave of Cards y^e night before) spun till nine; drank a Glass of Wine for y^e Stomack sake; and at Ten retired into my Chamber to Prayers; drew up my Clock and set my Larum betwixt Six and Seven."

In November, 1756, Erasmus Darwin began practice as a physician; in 1781 he moved to Derby. He soon got some practice, which grew steadily year by year until it reached the figure, which for any one but a London physician must at that time have been very large, of £1,000 a year. His life was uneventful throughout, and it is a strong proof of the attractiveness of his character as well as of the charm of his biographer's style that this "notice" should be such entertaining and agreeable reading. From a variety of anecdotes, extracts from letters, and other slight details we get a very good picture of a man who played an interesting and important part in the early development of modern science. Dr. Krause regards him as the "intellectual precursor" of his grandson, and cites several passages from his works in proof of this. In the 'Economy of Vegetation,' for instance, we find the following important queries: "Were all the ammoniæ destroyed when the continents were raised? Or do some genera of animals perish by the increasing power of their enemies? Or do they still reside at inaccessible depths in the sea? Or do some animals change their forms gradually and become new genera?" Again, on the subject of rudimentary organs: "There are, likewise, some apparently useless or incomplete appendages to plants and animals which seem to show that they have gradually undergone changes from their original state. . . . Such as the halteres or rudiments of wings of some two-winged insects, and the paps of male animals; thus, swine have four toes, but two of them are imperfectly formed and not long enough for use" Dr. Krause instructively contrasts this with the language of Buffon, who says of the pig that it "does not appear to have been formed upon an original, special, and perfect plan, since it is a compound of other animals; it has evidently useless parts, or rather parts of which it cannot make any use—toes, all the bones of which are perfectly formed, and which nevertheless are of no service to it." As we understand Dr. Krause's view of the progress of this branch of science from the time of Buffon to that of Charles Darwin, we have first the struggle to free science from the incubus of the doctrine of final causes; next we have the ingenious suggestions of Erasmus Darwin as to evolution and descent; finally we have the demonstration by his grandson, supported by a vast array of facts, of the theories which merely floated through the mind of Erasmus as brilliant but unverifiable hypotheses. Indeed, he goes further than this, and maintains that Erasmus Darwin "was the first who proposed and consistently carried out a well-rounded theory with regard to the development of the living world, a merit which shines forth most brilliantly when we compare with it the vacillating and confused attempts of Buffon, Linnæus, and Goethe."

But Erasmus Darwin was not only a man of science. He was a poet, in his day a very popular poet, whose works went through many editions. His stately verses are repugnant to modern taste, and it is hard to imagine them ever becoming popular again. Yet this is in a great measure due to the fact that they are written in a language which is wholly gone by, and which in the ears of those educated in this post-Wordsworthian age sounds stilted and pompous. Byron called the author of the 'Loves of the Plants' a "mighty master of unmeaning rhyme," but this is unfair. His poetry is anything but unmeaning. It is at times even eloquent. The chief defect that would be found with it nowadays (leaving out of view the Johnsonese vocabulary and style) would be that it is rather rhetorical than poetical.

No one can read Dr. Krause's essay and the preliminary "notice" without feeling that he has been in the society of a man of genius. We may not be able to define precisely what we mean by the term, but there is no mistaking it. We feel it in his boyish letters and in his mature speculations. His mind was distinguished not merely by that intelligent curiosity with regard to the secrets of nature which was a noticeable in-

tellectual feature in most of the educated men of his day, but by that wide grasp and capacity for generalization which is the sure indication of real scientific genius. Of his character his grandson gives a most agreeable picture. There is, as he says, no safer test of character than the continued friendship of good and able men, and we find that a close intimacy existed between Erasmus Darwin and such men as Day (the eccentric author of 'Sandford and Merton,' of whom an entertaining account is given in the memoirs of Mr. Edgeworth), Small, Bolton, Watt, and Wedgwood. The leading trait of his moral character was, undoubtedly, benevolence. A keen sympathy with all forms of suffering pervades his poetry and his correspondence. He was, indeed—if we can use the word without calling up its disagreeable modern associations—a philanthropist. He never lost the opportunity during his active though uneventful life of turning his scientific knowledge to account in the relief of human misery, and his keen sense of injustice and wrong often lends to his verses a passionate and noble energy which, if not true poetry, has upon the reader the effect of true poetry, as, for example, in the familiar lines ending:

"But wrapp'd in might with terrors all his own,
He speaks in thunder when the deed is done,
Hear him, ye Senates! Hear his truth sublime,
He who allows oppression shares the crime."

GENERAL HOOD'S MEMOIRS.*

II.

HOOD'S movement in October to the rear of Sherman's army was every way admirably conceived and admirably executed. It was well calculated to draw Sherman back from Georgia and transfer the war again to Tennessee. It became the occasion of the *coup de grâce* to the Confederacy, because Hood had become so weak in numbers that Sherman could afford to leave him to be disposed of by Thomas with a fraction of the army whilst he himself went to the sea. The popular discussion of the authorship of the idea of the march to Savannah overlooks the thing which alone is important from a military standpoint. It is of no real consequence whether Grant or Sherman or Bishop Simpson first thought of it. What gave it value was the decision to do it when so active and audacious a general as Hood was in the rear with a veteran army of forty thousand men. Sherman's campaign and his military repute depended not merely upon his performing his own movement, but upon his calculation of the means his subordinate could command in Tennessee for the fulfilment of the task to be done there, and to make the general result the astounding success it was. It is in assuming responsibilities of this sort that the metal of a commander is tested, and hosts of men have broken down under it who have led divisions or corps with the utmost brilliancy.

Hood sorrowfully recounts the disappointments and delays which attended his march against Schofield in Southern Tennessee, but as soon as he had begun it, he justified his claim to be considered an able strategist. His march by way of Lawrenceburg upon Columbia on Duck River, where it was essential to Schofield to preserve his communications with Thomas at Nashville, was well conceived and swiftly executed; but so was the counter move, though there was no time to spare. Again he lost no time, but occupied the Union army in front whilst he led Cheatham's and Stewart's corps by a *détour* to Spring Hill, another key-point in the rear. But Schofield also withdrew across the river and put his divisions in *échelon* northward. Hood had, no doubt, the great superiority in force when he reached Spring Hill, and blames severely the failure of Cheatham to make a headlong attack. It is possible, but by no means certain, that he might have gained an advantage by it, and he was right in trying it. Schofield was manœuvring for time. Thomas was collecting and organizing the rest of his army at Nashville and every day's delay was of great value to him. He meant to take the field command in person as soon as his detachments could be concentrated, and Schofield was, under his instructions, holding Hood back, even to the extent of consciously taking grave risks, to prevent his appearance before Nashville sooner than might be convenient for Thomas. The delay at Columbia was therefore purposely made as long as was safe, and it was not an hour too short. Thinking and writing of it, Hood naturally repeats the refrain, "It might have been," but it is not certain that Cheatham could have done more at Spring Hill than Hardee did at Atlanta. The Union army had the thrilling experience of making a flank march by night within rifle-shot of the camp-fires of the enemy, whose sentinels had to

* 'Advance and Retreat. Personal Experiences in the United States and Confederate States Armies. By J. B. Hood, Lieutenant-General in the Confederate Army.' Published for the Hood Orphan Memorial Fund, New Orleans. 8vo, pp. 382.