PROBLEMS IN

CLIO, A MUSE & OTHER ESSAYS

(INCLUDING THE MIDDLE MARCHES)

WITH

ANALYTICAL SUMMARIES,
QUESTIONS, ANSWERS &
ANNOTATIONS

BY

N. J. DEVADAS, M.A.

A TRICHY TUTORIAL PUBLICATION

PROBLEMS IN

CLIO, A MUSE & OTHER ESSAYS

(INCLUDING THE MIDDLE MARCHES)

WITH

ANALYTICAL SUMMARIES,
QUESTIONS, ANSWERS &
ANNOTATIONS

BY

N. J. DEVADAS, M.A.

A TRICHY TUTORIAL PUBLICATION

PRICE RUPEE ONE.

WALKING.

Introduction :—

Walking seems to be quite a favourite subject among English essayists. Sterne, Stevenson, Sidgwick, Hazlitt, Gardiner and others have written on it. In this essay Trevelyan has recorded his random thoughts, his own experiences and likings. As he himself says in conclusion there is no orthodoxy in walking. Week-end walks and long walking tours, road-walking and cross-country walking, the medicinal use of walking as a cure for the blue devils, the pleasures of walk, and variety of scenery, weather and bodily motion, company and talk are the questions treated in this essay. The author writes of his own experiences in Central Italy and the coast of Devon and Cornwall in England. Rich in historical allusions and enlivened by occasional touches of humour, Trevelyan's essay is entertaining, though the student may find it a bit heavy on first reading.

Summary.

Medicinal use of Walking :—

When body and mind are out of gear, the right and left legs are the two doctors. There are times when one's soul is choked up with bad thoughts or useless worries. Arnold Bennet prescribes a course of mental "Swedish exercises" for this depressed state of mind: he would like us to concentrate our thought away from useless passions and direct it

into clearer channels. But this is not possible on certain occasions and it is then that a long walk should be taken.

At the end of the walk we feel composed and calm and capable of concentration for any purpose. When we start out on the walk our thoughts may be unruly as bloodstained mutineers. But at nightfall, after a day's walk, they are as cheerful and ready to obey as happy little Boy Scouts. Short walks, undertaken as a recipe for the blue devils, require good company, cheerful laughter and interchange of good-humoured and off hand verdicts on the topics of the day. Trevelyan, therefore, suggests that informal walking societies may be formed for week-end or Sabbath walks; for there can be no better talk than in these moving Parliaments".

There are times when one feels choked with the miseries of life, when he has "the great vision of Earth as Hell". Then let him walk grimly wherever he is and whatever the weather. Let him walk till he is weary and avoid the sight of men which he cannot bear in this daemonic mood. When he is tired at dusk, his grief would have melted and he would feel that Mother Earth, his sole companion, shares his grief. He would feel mysteriously comforted and he will have strange visions. Evidently, walks in such desperate moods have to be undertaken alone.

Company and talk —

In his *Walking Essays*, Sidgwick condemns company and talk. The body may be refreshed and the mind exercised when we walk, talking and discussing. But, says Sidgwick,

the soul will be starved; it can get its proper nutriment only through the agency of a quiet mind and co-ordinated body. And company and talk make walking merely a blind swing of the legs below and a "fruitless flickering of the mind above".

Sidgwick is evidently thinking of the ultimate end of perfect walking which should be silent and solitary. Silence and solitude are essential for the perfect walk. But during Sunday tramps company and talk are necessary. Besides, one can walk and talk. Nursery lore tells us that Charles I walked and talked half-an-hour after his head was cut off. And Carlyle talked well when he walked with others and hence he thought and felt all the more when he walked alone. Carlyle was alone during the longest walk he ever made: he covered fifty-four miles, from Muirkirk to Dumfries, in a day.

It is thus clear that talk and company are good during short Sunday tramps while silence and solitude are essential for a perfect walk. During a real and perfect walk, such irksome considerations as the pace of the companion, his whims and above all the possibility that he may begin to talk disturb the harmony of body, mind and soul; they jar on the mystic union we feel with the earth and the beauties of Nature. But even during such perfect walks a companion who likes us and our pace and who shares the ecstasies of our mind and body may be good. Trevelyan remembers how he enjoyed company on at least three occasions: when he walked towards San Marino in rain, stripped to the waist; when he made the steep ascent to Volterra with the stars

above and the smell of almond blossom in the air; and when he suddenly came upon the view of Lake Trasimene.

Wine and Tea :—

In Italy wine is like tea in England. In Italy wine refreshes but does not intoxicate. One cannot walk the last ten miles for the day without tea. In Italy, since one cannot get tea, he takes wine. In this country, wine is not a luxury but a necessary part of food. "And if you have walked twenty-five miles and are going on again afterwards, you can imbibe Falstaffian potions and still be as lithe and ready for the field as Prince Hal at Shrewsbury." In remote Tuscan villages, there are wines which a cardinal might envy.

If Trevelyan likes wine in Italy, he likes tea in England much more. It cheers and refreshes the walker without intoxicating. There is nothing like boiled eggs with tea at four in the evening for one who has walked from morning and wants to resume his walk after an hour's perfect rest and recovery. There is true luxury of mind and body in resting after tea and in reading a well-thumbed and weather-beaten volume. And when the walk is resumed we find that the 'charmed cup' of tea "prolongs the pleasure of the walk and its actual distance by the last, best spell of miles." Trevelyan cannot imagine the perfection of walking without tea. In the old days, since there was no tea, the perfection of walking was impossible. Trevelyan remarks, humorously, that Rosalind and Touchstone, in *As You Like It*, would have gone on walking merrily

till they found the exile Duke at dinner if only Corin, the shepherd, had given them a pot of tea. "In that scene Shakespeare put his unerring finger on the want of his age—tea for walkers at evening".

Variety :—

Variety is essential for a perfect walk—variety of scenery, variety of bodily motion and variety of weather.

It is because of its *variety of scenery* that Trevelyan calls Central Italy a paradise for the walker. "It is a land of hills and mountains, unenclosed, open in all directions to the wanderer at will, unlike some British mountain game-preserves." Again, in Italy, even in the plains, the walker is not ordered off the farms as in England. The Italian peasant is hospitable, kind, generous and helpful. April and May are the best months for walking in Italy. The walker should carry water in a flask since for miles together it may not be available. He can enjoy a siesta in the midday heat for three or four hours lulled by the melodies of cicadas or nightingales. He will have to start early and walk in the night to the tune of the frogs celebrated by Aristophanes, with the stars shining lustrously above.

"It is well to seek as much variety as is possible in twelve hours. Road and track, field and wood, mountain, hill, and plain should follow each other in shifting vision." The effect of such variation in a day's walk has been best described by Meredith, in his fine poem, *Orchard and the Heath*. Generally, the districts along the foot of mountain

ranges are best for walking since they are the most varied in feature, combining the delights of plains and hills, fields and tracks. The Sub-Lake district seen in Pisgahview from Bowfell or the Old Man, is, for the same reason, a fine place for walking.

It is from the point of view of variety that cross-country walking is better than road-walking. The road is invaluable for pace and swing and enables the walker to cover a respectable distance. Trevelyan calls the road-walkers the Puritans of the religion, with a strain of fine ascetic rigour in them. Stevenson is *par excellence* their bard and Edward Bowen was the king of the roads. The road is good for test walking. Any one who can walk from St. Mary's College, Oxford, to St. Mary's, Cambridge—a distance of eighty miles—ranks with Edward Bowen and only a few more. But test walking is not perfect walking. A walk through moors and mountain, wood and field path is preferable to road walking. "The secret beauties of nature are unveiled only to the cross-country, walker. Pan would not have appeared to Pheidipides on a road." It is only the cross-country walker who enjoys *variety of bodily motion* scaling a stone wall, jumping a stream, rushing down a mountain—side, and taking a plunge in the pool below a waterfall. It may here be mentioned that the 'soft' road—by which Trevelyan means grass lanes, moorland roads, farm tracks and derelict roads—is a blessing to the walker since it combines the speed and smooth surface of the harder road with much at least of the softness to the foot, the romance and the beauty of the cross-country routes"

Variety can be obtained by losing the way. Losing the way, as falling in love, can never be deliberate. There is a joyous mystery in roaming recklessly. One sees lonely and beautiful places, fairy glens as it were, which cannot be found in the survey map. There is a quality of magic and aloofness in the country which one has never seen. In England, fairy glens with this quality of magic and aloofness, lie for the most part west of Avon. West of Avon is a hilly and variegated country thickly strewn with old houses and scenes unchanged since Tudor times. Such scenes make one sceptic of the famous sentence at the beginning of the third chapter of Macaulay's *History*: "Could the England of 1685 be, by some magical process, set before our eyes, we should not know one landscape in a hundred, or one building in ten thousand."

Variety of bodily motion is obtained by scrambling. Scrambling is an integral part of walking, when the high ground is kept all day in a mountain region. It is only when we cling to the rocks and scramble that we really know and love their texture. One should be able to scramble and to haul himself up a rock in order to reach the most secret places. Indeed, scrambling and climbing are the essence of walking made perfect. In this connection, Trevelyan condemns the dog - in - the - manager policy of the British who close the moors and thus shut off the walker from the most beautiful grounds for the sake of the game. "If the Alps were British they would long ago have been closed on account of the chamois" The mountains and seas are a common pleasure ground and the energetic walker can despise notice

boards and avoid gamekeepers on the moors, provided he abides by the dictum: "Give no man, woman or child just reason to complain of your passage". He should not be rude to farmers. He should not break fences, leave gates open, walk through hay or crops. He should avoid private gardens and the vicinity of inhabited houses. And he should never profane the most retired, beautiful nooks with fragments of lunch.

Change in weather should be made as welcome as change in scenery. The fight against fierce wind and snowstorm exalts the walker into ecstasy very quickly. Meredith has superbly described the delight of walking soaked through by rain. To keep to the path or to lose and find it in a mist on the mountains is the greatest delight of the walker: it is a primaeval game and puts on the stretch every bit of instinct and hill knowledge. Trevelyan once did an eight days' walking alone in the Pyrennes and had sunshine for only one half-day and he treasured it most. "When we see the mists sweeping up to play with us as we walk the mountain crests we should "rejoice" as it was the custom of Cromwell's soldiers to do when they saw the enemy. "George Meredith once told Trevelyan that we should "love all changes of weather". That is a true word for walkers.

The pleasures of walking :—

Whether one is sad or joyful, young or middle-aged, at the end of a long solitary day's walk, he experiences strange casual moments, vivid and unforgettable, of sight and

feeling. Wordsworth frequently experienced such moments in his boyhood he experienced them more easily than others and he had the power of expressing them in words. As De Quincey points out, Wordsworth was indebted, for his unclouded happiness and the excellence of his poetry, to his daily walks. In his life time, he must have walked 175,000 or 180,000 English miles.

The best part of a walk comes when it is carried on into the night. The quiet soul of the walker is then most awake, whether he is alone or has a fit companion. Intoxicated with pure health, the body feels one with the physical nature that surrounds it; while the mind is simply conscious of calm delight. As Meredith says in his poem, *Night walk*, the silences are then most sweet.

Besides physical weariness, the only reason for not walking at night is the desire of the walker to enjoy the leisurely occupation of the hamlet which he has chosen by chance or whim. The walker strolls after supper, calm, contemplative and feeling himself one with the universe.

After a day's walk, everything has twice its value—food, drink, and books. A day's walk renders one's faculties and senses alert. Healthy hunger gives an unusual joy in one's food and drink. A receptive mind keenly relishes books: the books read at the end of a day's walk acquire the richness of the walker's then condition. Shakespeare, Carlyle, Boswell's immortal biography or the favourite novelist of the walker are appropriate for the occasion. The walker should never waste his precious hours on magazines.

As already pointed out, there is true luxury of body and mind in resting after tea and in reading a well-thumbed volume. Similarly in a walking tour lasting a week, it is better to take a whole day off in the middle in a well-chosen hamlet. After three days of strenuous walking, a day of complete rest is necessary for enjoying the walking during the following three days. It is also good in itself just like the evening at the end of a day's walk. During such halts, the walker spends the day in perfect laziness, with his body asleep like a healthy infant and with the powers of his mind and soul at their topmost strength but left in perfect peace and rest. As Trevelyan says: "Our modern life requires such days of anti—worry", and they are only to be obtained when the body has been walked to a standstill."

Essay.

What are the conditions of a perfect walk and the pleasures thereof?

The perfect walk should be distinguished from the Sunday tramp which is an effective recipe for the blue devils and which requires good company, cheerful laughter and light talk. The perfect walk should also be distinguished from what may be called the lonely medicinal walk which should be undertaken in a desperate and daemonic mood when one is choked with the miseries of life and has "the great vision of Earth as Hell."

The perfect walk is a long walking tour spread over days. Silence and solitude are essential for such a walk; for, company, involving, as it often does, talk and difference in pace and taste, disturbs the internal harmony of body, mind and soul in the walker and jars on the mystic union he feels with the Earth and Nature. But a proper companion with the walker's taste and pace, is good even during a perfect walk.

Variety of scenery, of bodily motion, and of weather is essential for a perfect walk. Generally the districts along the foot of mountain ranges are varied in feature: they combine the delights of plains and hills, fields and tracks. Central Italy and the country west of Avon are instances in point. Variety of scenery, and the discovery of the secret beauties of nature are within the reach of the cross-country walker who tramps through moor and mountain, wood and field path. The hard, beaten road is good only for speed: "Pan would not have appeared to Phedippides on a road. Thus, for a perfect walk, a start on the hard road, followed by a dash through the country, is ideal. A bit of scrambling and climbing is essential for a perfect walk since they lend variety of bodily motion. Again, a walk through changes of weather is preferable. For instance, sunshine after mist or rain is doubly welcome to the walker. The fight against fierce wind and snowstorm exalts the walker into ecstasy very quickly.

There is nothing like boiled eggs with tea at four in the evening. It is preferable to even the rare wines the walker gets in Italy—wine which refreshes but does not intoxicate. There is true luxury of mind and body in resting after tea and in reading a well-thumbed and weather-beaten volume. In a walking tour lasting a week, it is necessary to take a whole day off in the middle: such halt is good in itself and is necessary for enjoying the walk in the following days. During such halts, the walker spends the day in perfect laziness, with his body asleep like a healthy infant, and with the powers of his mind and soul at the topmost of their strength, but left in perfect peace and rest. "Our modern life requires such days of "anti-worry", and they are only to be obtained when the body has been walked to a standstill".

The best part of a day's walk comes when it is carried on into the night. Then the walker's soul is most awake; his body, intoxicated with pure health, feels itself one with the universe; and his mind is simply conscious of calm delight. If the walker chooses to spend the night in a hamlet, he takes a stroll after supper, calm, contemplative and feeling himself one with the lowliest as well the highest. Food and drink give him an unusually poignant pleasure since his senses are keen and alert. Books and poetry have a new richness for him.

Whether one is sad or joyful, young or middle-aged, at the end of a long solitary day's walk, he experiences, like Wordsworth, vivid moments of sight and feeling.

John Woolman.

Introduction :—

John Woolman was a preacher. He was a Quaker. He started life as a clerk in a store. From his twenty-third year he was an itinerant preacher, rousing the conscience of the people against slave-trade and persuading them to give it up. As Trevelyan remarks, this God-fearing and unassuming Quaker Socrates achieved far greater success than his Greek prototype of an earlier age. Utterly free from any tinge of religious fanaticism or intolerance, he moved among the Red Indians at a time when they were on the "war-path" and preached to them. Trevelyan compares Woolman to St. Augustine and to Rousseau and points out that it would have been far better if the world had taken Woolman as an example in religion and politics instead of St. Augustine and Rousseau. It may here be remarked that Trevelyan is unjust when he gibes at Rousseau's weaknesses, forgetting the life-long and bitter repentance and self-reproach of Rousseau.

The Quakers were otherwise known as the Friends and they were noted for their simple life, plainness of speech, disbelief in priestdom and sacrament. They were opposed to war and slavery.

St. Dominic, St. Ignatius (Para 2) are cited as examples of the fanatic, crusading saints of the Catholic Church.

Summary.

St. Augustine, Rousseau and Woolman :—

The *Confessions* of St. Augustine and of Rousseau and the *Journal* of Woolman are three great religious autobiographies. Each one of these men had a wealth of spiritual life and experience and the power to express it. And each set in motion a movement that was of importance to the whole world. St. Augustine gave impetus to the Mediaeval Church, Rosseau, to the French Revolution and John Woolman, to the Anti-Slavery Movement. Of these three men Woolman is the most attractive.

St. Augustine :—

St. Augustine was intent on saving his soul. There is an element of self in his finest ecstasies. He was the opposite of St. Francis of Assi who loved his fellow creatures and who had not an iota of self righteousness. But St. Augustine, with his self righteousness and fanaticism, for the first time, gave a religious motive to persecution, and thus " turned God Himself into Moloch In the name of God men persecuted and tortured their fellow human beings and it was through St. Augustine that the Church drank the poison of intolerance. And only a 'good' man like St. Augustine could have done it. After Augustine, the church had its crusading fanatics like St. Dominic and St. Ignatius in every age till the eighteenth century which was an age of rationalism and seepticism. These crusading fanatics were usually 'good' men at least after their conversion. But, unlike them, John Woolman was good all through his life.

Rousseau :—

Rousseau cannot be called 'good'. Indeed, this great spiritual reformer admits, in his *Confessions*, common weaknesses which he describes on a grand scale. Hence we get the illusion that we are morally superior to him. Rousseau advocated naturalism in religion and there was an ironic appropriateness in the author of the *Social Contract* leaving his babies at the door of the foundling asylum. Yet it is strange how Rousseau's great strength was born out of his weaknesses: he started the French Revolution, championed the cause of the poor and shook down empires. Rousseau did not understand himself and has hence puzzled his biographers like Morley. Carlyle did not understand him but between these two uncouth rebellious children of nature —Rousseau and Carlyle—there is to be found some affinity. Rousseau provoked some of the typical outbursts of grim Carlylean humour. Carlyle states exultingly that the rulers of France did not know what to do with Rousseau. He could be laughed at as a maniac and caged as a wild beast. But nothing could hinder him from setting the world on fire and his speculations fermented the French Revolution. With grim satisfaction and glee, Carlyle adds that Rousseau knew what to do with the rulers of France: "what he could do with them is unhappily clear enough,—*guillotine* a great many of them." Because Rousseau was convinced that these rulers were responsible for the miseries of the poor. Another example of the grim humour Rousseau provoked in Carlyle may be given. After listening a long while at a

dinner table with bored indifference to a gathering of self-satisfied, reactionary middle-class men who consoled themselves with the doctrine that "political theories make no difference to practice", Carlyle growled out: "There was once a man called Rousseau. He printed a book of polilical theories, and the nobles of that land laughed. But the next edition was bound in their skins". Carlyle thus disillusioned them about the non-efficacy of political theories and chuckled with satisfaction over their embarrasment.

John Woolman : the Quaker Socrates :—

Woolman was a contemporary of Rousseau and the Time-Spirit spoke throughhim also. If Rousseau gave impulse to the French Revolution, Woolman quietly prepared the ground for what may be called the Anglo-Saxon Revolution, *viz.*, the abolition of Negro slavery. This American Quaker Socrates went about rousing the conscience of the Friends (Quakers), with his simple and searching questions and his love, patience and argumentative fairness convinced them that holding their fellow men as property was unjust. Unlike his Greek prototype of an earlier age, Woolman was amazingly successful: the Friends instead of condemning him as an anarchist and imprisoning or poisoning him, set free their slaves!

Woolman was good all through :—

Unlike St. Augustine who was 'good' only after his conversion, Woolman was good all through. Woolman's religious experience, unlike St. Augustine's religious experience

which most concerned the salvation of his soul, concerned, from first to last, his love and duty towards his fellow-creatures. He did not undergo any formal conversion like St. Augustine. An incident in his childhood for ever fixed in his mind the ideal of love and duty towards his fellow creatures. He records how he hit a robin with a stone and killed it when it was anxiously hovering about its young ones. Though a youngster, Woolman at once realised that the young ones would perish without their mother to nourish them. He was pained by this thought and killed the young ones too, convinced that a quick death was a much better fate for them than a slow, miserable death through pining. He felt that, in this case, the scripture proverb that " The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel " was fulfilled.

His 'conversion', his love of fellow-creatures, and his humility :—

Woolman's conversion, if conversion it may be called, dated from this incident which Woolmen has recorded in his *Journal*. Thenceforth love for his fellow-creatures was such a great driving force that he was simply unconscious of danger and suffering when he was engaged in his work. At a time when the Red Indians were at war with the Whites and were actually bringing the latters' scalps, and when travelling was rendered more difficult than usual by wet weather, Woolman went into the midst of the Red Indians. He considered these obstacles of rain and hostilities conducive to the seasoning of his mind and

bringing him into a closer sympathy with the Red Indians. Woolman went to the Red Indians, not in the self-righteous attitude of a St. Augustine, but prompted by love and with a desire to feel and understand the life of the Red Indians and the spirit in which they lived. What was more, he wanted to learn from them if possible and to help them if he could. The spirit in which Woolman went to the Red Indians may be expressed as a desire to exchange with them "Varieties of religious experiences."

Woolman's attitude to the rich and the 'good':—

Woolman denied himself all luxuries and even common comforts which he regarded as luxuries. He was a man of slender means. His objections to luxury were not based on any ascetic feeling. He objected to luxuries on the ground that luxurious living made men greedy and induced them to grind and oppress the poor. He held the rich responsible for the miseries of the poor. He similarly held the so-called 'good' people responsible for the sins of the reprobate, *i.e.*, the confirmed sinners who were beyond redemption. For, the intolerance of the 'good', denying the sinner all hope of salvation, always strengthens the sinners in error. He said: "The law of Christ consisted in tenderness towards our fellow-creatures, and a concern so to walk that our conduct may not be the means of strengthening them in error."

Woolman was simple and tender.

The world would be better if only it could take Woolman as an example in politics and religion instead of Rousseau and St. Augustine. Usually reformers are either too clever or too violent. They have a fear of appearing simple and hence confuse us with contradictions. If they are candid and simple, they are violent and would baptize us in blood and fire to usher us into the new and better order. But Woolman was simple and tender. To emphasise Woolman's tender nature, Trevelyan remarks: "They say John Brown in the ghost went marching along in front of the Northern armies. Then I guess John Woolman was bringing up the ambulance behind. He may have lent a spiritual hand to Walt Whitman in the flesh, bandaging up those poor fellows."

Importance of Woolman's work :—

The majority of slave owners in Anglo-Saxon America were not Quakers. Hence they did not listen to his words Hence in the next (the nineteenth) century the abolition of slavery required John Brown, "who could knock up families at night and lead out the fathers and husbands to execution, or be hung himself, with an equal sense of duty done" and who was "undaunted, true and brave." After John Brown, came Grant, the eighteenth President of the United States, who fought on the side of the North against the South over the slavery question. In this war the flower of the Anglo-Saxon race in America perished and consequently the race was emaciated beyond complete repair.

In England, the abolition of slavery was achieved peacefully and characteristically enough this revolution was effected by purchase : the slaves were set free and the slave-owners were compensated. It was a good thing that George III did not keep the English colonies in the South when he lost New England. If he had retained the Southern colonies, England would have been wedded to slavery due to the influence of those colonies where slavery had taken deep roots. Thus England become John Woolman's best pupil by abolishing slavery.

The Anti-Slavery Movement was quite as important as the French Revolution. And Woolman started it just in the nick of time before the industrial revolution, with its mechanization of industry, had been devoloped fully, all the world over. If the poor Quaker clerk (Woolman) had kept to himself his queer questionings about holding fellow men as property, the large scale mechanized industries would have made Central America, Africa, India and China one hell. The black and brown men of these continents and countries would have been held as slaves and exploited by the white men of Europe. And then the vested interests in Slave trade would have become too vast and wide-spread to be successfully tackled. But Woolman started the Anti-Slavery Movement in Anglo-Saxon America in the eighteenth century before the Industrial Revolution had been fully devoloped. And Wilberforce, in England, set the current of world opinion against slave-trade.

Conclusion :—

Woolman was not a great personage in his day. Nor will he be a celebrity in history. If there be an all-judging, perfect and impartial God, surely Woolman will have his well-deserved fame. Even if there be no such infallible judge, we need not worry ourselves about Woolman's fame. For Woolman did not work for fame either in this or the other world.

Essay.

An estimate of Woolman and his work :—

Woolman was not a great personage in his day. Not will he be a celebrity in history. He was a Quaker clerk of slender means who went about preaching. But the simple, searching questions that he put to the Quaker Friends about holding fellow-men as property proved of tremendous importance to the history of the world. He was the precursor and pioneer of the Anti-Slavery Movement which was quite as important as the French Revolution. Had this Quaker Socrates kept his queer questionings to himself, Central America, Africa, India and China would have become a stud-farm for the breeding of slaves to be exploited as cattle or machines by the people of Europe. Due to Woolman, the Anti-Slavery Movements had its humble beginnings in the nick of time before the mass scale mechanised industry, ushered in by the Industrial Revolution, had fully developed and spread all the world over; before slave-holding had

become too vast and wide-spread a vested interest to be tackled successfully. In Anglo-Saxon America, only the Quakers, who 'always were an odd people', listened to him and set free their slaves without even asking for any compensation. But the majority of slave-owners, not being Quakers, did not listen to him. Hence the militant John Brown and Grant, the soldier President of the United States, followed and, over the question of slavery, the North waged with the South a war, in which the flower of the Anglo-Saxon race in America perished, thus leaving the race irreparably weakened. In England, Wilberforce set the current of world opinion against slavery and the abolition of slavery was achieved by purchase: the English slave-owners were compensated for setting free their slaves. Thus by this peaceful revolution by purchase, England became Woolman's best pupil.

Woolman thus gave the impulse to the Anti-Slavery Movement even as St. Augustine gave the impulse to the Mediæval Church and Rousseau, to the French Revolution. All these three men had soul-life abundantly and the power of recording their experiences. But of the three Woolman is the most attractive. St. Augustine's finest religious ecstasies have an element of self in them. He was the first to inject the poison of fanaticism into the Church and to make it militant. He was one of the first to supply the religious motive to persecution, thus turning God Himself into Moloch. Rousseau, on the other hand, set the world on fire and by his semi-delirious speculations on the miseries of civilised

life, helped well to produce a whole delirium in France generally. St. Augustine was 'good' only after his conversion and Rousseau was not 'good.' But Woolman was good all through. He was neither too clever nor too violent. His religious experience concerned only his love and duty toward his fellow-creatures. Never did it concern the selfish salvation of his soul. His love and duty towards his fellow-creatures were such a powerful impelling force that, when engaged in the work dictated by it, he was simply unconscious of danger and suffering. At a time when the Red Indians were on the war path, actually bringing the scalps of white men as trophies, he went into their midst in all the spiritual humility of one who is as eager to learn from others as to help them forward. He led an extremely abstemious life. His objections to luxury were based, not on any ascetic feeling, but on the conviction that love of luxury makes men greedy and induces them to oppress and grind the poor. He held the rich responsible for the miseries of the poor and the intolerant 'good' men, for the sins of the reprobate. He was tender to the sinners and believed in winning them over to virtue by tolerance, sympathy and love.

Charles Lamb said: "Get the writings of John Woolman by heart." It is sound advice not only for lovers of good books but also for would-be reformers.

JOHN BUNYAN

—o—

1. THE OPENING PASSAGE OF PILGRIM'S PROGRESS.

The opening passage in **Pilgrim's Progress** instantly places the reader in the heart of action. Homer, Milton, Dante, Shakespeare—none of these has an opening to his credit, which better performs the author's initial task. The magic of these first few words transports the reader to a world of spiritual values and impresses on his mind that nothing less than the fate of a man's soul is the issue at stake. It creates an allegoric and yet intensely human atmosphere. The **Pilgrim's Progress,** for all its power of vision, is deeply rooted in human nature and in the real social and economic life of seventeenth-century England. And Bunyan was not only a great religious enthusiast and a great writer: he was also an Englishman, who had his full share of domestic and social life and who was by no means devoid of humour. Hence when he wrote the **Pilgrim's Progress,** he founded the English novel though his intention was to win for Christ poor souls lost in the dark. Bunyan was a great artist and in his **Pilgrim's Progress** he recorded his religious experiences long after their violence had subsided. If, as Wordsworth said, poetry is emotion recollected in tranquility, **Pilgrim's Progress** is undoubtedly a great poem. When he wrote this great book in the Bedford Jail, he had attained spiritual tran-

quility and could calmly look upon his former self—the man who stood in solitary places with a book in his hand and a great burden upon his back. weeping, trembling and crying lamentably " What shall I do ?"

2. The 'Pilgrim's Progress' as the perfect representation of evangelical religion or Puritanism.

The lonely figure of the first paragraph of the **Pilgrim's Progress**—the man with the book and the burden and the lamentable cry—is not only Bunyan, the author. He represents the poor man seeking salvation with tears and with no other guidance than the Bible. He represents the prime motive force of Puritanism, which had come to its moment of greatest force and vigour in all aspects of national life and of which Bunyan was the most faithful mirror in literature as Cromwell in action. The gospel was preached to the poor. It was by means of this great force—Puritanism—that Cromwell, George Fox and John Wesley wrought their wonders in their respective fields of action and the Whigs remained in power for a long time thus achieving a delicate balancing of political forces, symbolic of freedom and responsible for progress. It was the same force that inspired Milton and Bunyan.

3. The History of Puritanism.

Bible reading and the preaching of the gospel to the poor by the poor had been an element in the religous life of England ever since Wycliff's Lollards (14th century). It was a native element and had not been imported from abroad.

This element of popular Protestantism had a steady, though slow, growth in England. In Tudor times, it did not so completely conquer England as it conquered Scotland under John Knox. Popular Protestantism was only one, though the most important, of the causes of the Reformation. Hatred of priests, national pride and the greed of kings and courtiers were the other causes. During Mary's reign, when the Protestents were ruthlessly persecuted, it was only the cheerful martyrdom of hundreds of clergymen and poor, common people that for ever made the Protestant tradition of England. The gentry and spoilers of monasteries did not do anything for the strengthening of Protestantism. In the reign of Elizabeth, popular Protestantism, tolerated to a certain extent within the Established Church, rapidly grew in strength.

It was when Archbishop Laud tried (early in the 17th century) to suppress this popular Protestantism that the force of Puritan enthusiasm exploded and destroyed churches, lordships and kings. Laud acted on the principle that the poor, being ignorant, should take their religion from the learned. This contempt of Laud for the religion of the unlearned was answered, not by his execution, but by the lives and works of Fox and Bunyan. Fox founded Quakerism. Bunyan, whose learning was limited almost to the Bible, Foxe's **Book of Martyrs** and Luther's **Commentary on Galatians,** founded the sect known as the **Baptists** or Independents. These two men—Bunyan and Fox—represented that personal and congregational religion, which is based, not on a doctrinal system, or learning and tradition, but upon a moral con-

ception and upon the religious instincts of man's heart and soul and which are the very essence of the popular Protestanism of England.

It was Cromwell's victory at the Battle of Naseby that saved the personal religion and popular Protestantism of Bunyan and Fox from being overwhelmed by the principle of Laud. Cromwell protected the right of the common man to derive solace from the Bible and to interpret it not only from Laud but also from another enemy—viz. the Presbyterians of Scotland who constituted one-half of his Roundhead party. The Presbyterians, while they admitted the equality between the learned and unlearned in the eyes of god, insisted on the unlearned taking their religion from the learned Presbyterian ministers. The attitude of the Presbyterians, like that of Laud, struck at the very roots of the religion of a man's own heart, of popular Protestantism, represented by Fox and Bunyan. Cromwell and his Ironsides were with Fox and Bunyan; and to them new Presbyter was but old Priest writ large." And Cromwell and his men got the upper hand inside the Puritan party, kept the ring clear for experiments in personal religion and saw to it that popular Protestantism was not confined to Scottish Presbyterianism or Calvinism. "Both Bunyan and Fox were the products of that rapid seed-time and harvest of religious experiment that intervened between the battle of Naseby and the Restoration." The future of personal religion like that of Bunyan and popular Protestantism in general was assured.

But the Puritan rule, intolerable to the Anglicans and many others, collapsed on the death of Cromwell. The Restoration was followed by a period of repression and reprisal. The Puritans were persecuted and John Bunyan spent a dozen years in prison.

It was only after the bloodless Revolution of 1688 that Puritanism was harnessed serviceably to the welfare of the commonweal. In the shape of Nonconformity outside the Established Church and of Evangelicalism within it, popular Protestantism became part and parcel of the English national character and life on a legal and parliamentary basis. Thereafter it toned up the morals of the nation, and by its inexhaustible energy and flair for action, contributed most to the spread of philanthropic work and to the commercial prosperity of the nation.

4. 'Pilgrim's Progress' as a novel: its literary qualities.

The **Pilgrims's Progress** is not only the most perfect representation of evengelical religion. It has been hailed as the first Enlish novel. Bunyan was not only a great writer and a powerful religious teacher, but also an Englishman who had mixed in all the common traffic of humanity and who was endowed with humour and a power of shrewd observation. Bunyan was an artist with profound religious experience. Summing up Buyan's equipment as an author, Macaulay observes: "A keen mother wit, a great command

of the homely mother tongue, an intimate knowledge of the English Bible, and a vast and dearly-bought spiritual experience."

If poetry is "emotion recollected in tranquility," **Pilgrim's Progress** is a great poem. Bunyan recorded in it his religious experiences after their violence had subsided and after he had reached a spiritual haven from which he could look back calmly and detachedly on his past sufferings, tribulations, doubts and agonies. This profound spirituality Bunyan owed to the influence of nature. In the days of Bunyan, the beauty and solitude of nature were within the reach of even the town-dweller; and this fact largely accounts for the strength and imaginative quality of English religion, language, literature, thought and feeling. In those days men were much left alone with nature, with themselves and with God. The flats, the lanes and the woodland denes of Bedfordshire had been the nurse of Bunyan and of all the strivings and visions of his youth and he translated them all into **Pilgrim's Progress**.

In **Pilgrim's Progress** Bunyan enshrined for all time the rural England of his days with all its beauty and merriment and the language, as it was spoken in his own time, in all its Anglo-Saxon purity and raciness. The picture that we get in this great book is of rural England as Shakespeare found it. Only the Puritanism of Bunyan's days is superadded. Hence Trevelyan observes: " Autolycus might accost the Pilgrims on the footpath way and we

should feel no surprise. Falstaff might send Bardolph to bid them join him in the wayside tavern." The country through which Christian, and later his wife and children travel, is the countryside, the roads and lanes of the English east Midlands, with which Bunyan was familiar. The sloughs, the robbers and the other accidents and dangers of the road described in **Pilgrim's Progress** were the real facts of life in England in the seventeenth century when roads were bad and infested with highwaymen. The giants and dragons in the book had, of course, no counterparts in the real life of the day: but even these Bunyan got from ballads and legends that freely circulated among the common people.

In **Pilgrim's Progress** we not only taste the old rural life with its songs and " Country mirth ", but we also hear the sound of the English language, which had already come to perfection in Bunyan's time but had not yet been defiled. For the language **Pilgrim's Progress,** Bunyan was indebted to the Bible and to the pure, crisp, telling English then spoken by the common people. It may be noted that the English translators of the Bibles had themselves been indebted to racy, pure Anglo-saxon language as spoken by the people. " The vocabulary of **Pilgrim's Progress** is the vocabulary of the common people." A few examples of felicitous turns of phrases and pithy expressions may be given " You have gone a good stitch, you may well be aweary "; A saint abroad and a devil at home "; and finally the remark of Greatheart to Honest, " By this I know thou art a cock of the right kind

Two other qualities in **Pilgrim's Progress** contribute to its charm : the cheerful endurance of suffering and injustice that pervades the book and its freedon from politics. Bunyan's long incarceration and separation from his wife and family whom he loved, far from embittering him, actually increased the sweetness of his temper and the happiness of his outlook. Though **Pilgrim's Progress** was written by Bunyan in prison to which he had been consigned by Cavalier vengeance, it has been read with unalloyed pleasure by Anglicans as well as Puritans. Whig and Tory have equally rejoiced in it : Southey and Macaulay united to press its claims on the notice of the literary world. Bunyan could be bitter and even scurrilous in docritinal controversies : but he kept the spirit of controversy out of **Pilgrim's Progress.** Like Shakespeare, he turned a dead and indifferent eye on politics throughout his life. His only political act was his very last act and that was a negative act. He turned down the flattering offers of James II to enter politics as a supporter of the royal policy which was to temporarily exalt the Puritan sects at the expense of the Established Church with the ultimate objective of undermining English Protestantism.

5. Conclusion.

Bunyan had no other ambition, in writing **Pilgrim's Progress,** save to turn poor sinners to repentance. As a record of profound spiritual experiences, the book is a great religious tract. Because of the faithful picture it contains of

old rural England with its songs and merriment, bad roads and highwayman, beautiful scenery and pure, crisp, telling Anglo-Saxon as spoken by the common people, it is the first English novel, The spirit of cheerful endurance of suffering and injustice which pervades the book and its universal appeal by its freedom from politics have enhanced its charm. To-day, more than three-hundred years after his death, Bunyan shines one of the brightest stars in the firmament of English literature. Seldom has there been such an exaltation of the humble and the meek.

Questions.

I. Discuss the religious and literary qualitles of Pilgrim's Progress.

— or —

Show how **Pilgrim's Progress** is not only the most perfect representation of evangelical religion, but also the first English novel.

Answer.

Reproduce Summery, omitting section 3.

II. Trace the history of popular Protestantism.

Answer.

Reproduce section 3.

POETRY AND REBELLION

1. An estimate of the book by Brandes on the Romantic Poets.

(A) General.

Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature:: IV Naturalism in England, by George Brandes, the Danish writer, who has previously written on Shakespeare, concerns itself with the poetical constellation, consisting of Wordsworth Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Scott, Byron and, those lesser planets, Southey, Moore, Campbell, Landor. Blake seems to have escaped the attention of Brandes. The rare combination of poetic genius, great personal eccentricity and power, great principles come to issue in politics, and the picturesque surroundings of the old world enhances the value and interest of the stories of these poets. If we were to be confronted with a choice between Shakespeare and the Romantics, we would surely choose the latter, for they are six giants against one colossus. Besides, precious little is known about Shakespeare, while there is a great wealth of biographical material about the Romantics. Above all, Shakespeare seems to have been a wise and prudent bourgeois, keeping himself aloof from the great events of his day like the gunpowder plot. But the Romantics were a vital part of their stirring age. Southey was busy forming Pantisocratic Societies; Wordsworth and Coleridge, plotting the downfall of Pope, are believed to have been spied upon by the Government; the splendour of mediaveal

Toryism was celebrated by Scott; Byron and Shelley defied the Holy Alliance, denounced despotism and tyranny and incited rebellion; and especially, Byron took an active part in the Carbonari movement in Italy and in Greek fight for independance. For generations mankind will look back to the funeral pyre of Shelley on the shore of the blue Mediterranean as the prayer of old Europe for liberty and new life. Such romance England had never before given to mankind. Nor has she so far.

Brandes has thus been happy in the choice of the period and the poets. Equally happy has he been in determining the scope of his book. He has limited the range of his enquiry to the outward suits and trappings of poetry, its historical, political and personal accidents. His book is a brilliant survey and analysis of those external accompaniments of poetry. Brandes is concerned only with the contents of the poetry in question. He never attempts to judge the style. The proportion of importance he attaches to the various poets is based, not on their merits as poets, but on their effectiveness as revolutionaries. Hence it is that Byron has seven whole chapters to himself, while none other has more than two. Brandes appraises each poet according as he adds some new element to the rebellious growth of literary, religious or political "naturalism". According to Brandes, Wordsworth began the return to nature, Coleridge added "naturalistic romanticism," Scott, "historical naturalism," Keats, "all-embracing sensuousness", Landor, "republician

humanism" and Shelley, "radical naturalism". In thus analysing and defining each new element and describing each character and personality, Brandes has shown unfailing sympathy and insight. Only in the case of Wordsworth does Brandes' sympathy fail him.

The method adopted by Brandes in his book is that of talking all round the subject of poetry but never plucking its heart. He gives a full and vivid picture of the historical background against which the great poets of the age acted and which inspired their poetry. He also gives us revealing glimpses into the temperament and character of the poets. His analysis of the contents of the poetry is brilliant and suggestive and supported by many long and well-chosen quotations. The method of Brandes is interesting and picturesque, alive and vivid, and best fitted to stimulate the love of poetry in the young. He has done well in leaving to the reader the final judgment of the poetry; for appreciation of poetry is ultimately based on depth of feeling varying with individuals.

The book by Brandes is the best existing introduction to the poets and poetry of the Romantic period. It is bound to add something new to the stock of ideas now possessed by the literary public in England. Incidentally it contains some views not altogether English, and is, therefore, all the more valuable for Englishmen. None can do justice to the merits of Shelley and Byron without understanding the system of political and religious persecution prevalent in their day. Of

this system, the best and the most dispassionate exposition is to be found in Brandes' book.

There are, of course, certain errors in the book. But they are not such as could possibly deceive the present day literary public. Brandes has effectively safeguarded himself against serious errors in judgment by limiting himself to an analysis of the contents of poetry and by refraining from offering his opinions as to the merits and style of the poetry. If he were asked to give his opinion, Brandes would surely regard Byron's poems—**Cain** or **Don Juan** for instance,—as the culmination not only of "naturalism", but also of English poetry. Inspite of the sane and strict limitation of the range of his inquiry, Brandes lets it slip out that Burns was a much more gifted poet than Wordsworth. But these views are of no consequence, because they are not obtruded.

(B) Brandes's estimate of Byron.

It has been remarked how Brandes places the writers, not in order of their merit as poets, but in order of their effectiveness as revolutionaries. Wordsworth is given prominence only as the tyrannicide who slew Pope but he is cast aside when he invests himself in the "straight-jacket of orthodox piety". Byron is regarded as the culmination of "naturalism" and seven whole chapters are devoted to him. But in all these seven chapters, Brandes does not find space to mention that Byron, inspite of the generosity of his political passions, took a cynical view of private morals.

Undoubtedly Byron understood the rights of man. But his attitude to women was old-fashioned and as reactionary as that of Lord Eldon or George III. Mary Woolstoncraft, in her **Rights of Women**, advocated the idea that the relation of the sexes must be essentially intellectual and moral, not sensual and trivial. This idea appeared ridiculous to the creator of Juan and Haidee—ie, Byron—who endowed his heroines with beauty and refinement joined to great simplicity and want of education. In matters concerning the fair sex, Byron was but a dandy and a grand seigneur. He regarded women as beautiful creatures who should be sheltered and dressed well and amused with such baubles as mirrors, nuts and cosmetics. As Travelyan would put it, the deliverer of Greece had not "doubled Cape Turk"; his attitude to women was as reactionary as that of the Turk who, in those days, shut up his women in the harem and treated them as mere chattel. On this serious defect in Byron's equipment as rebel—viz his reactionary attitude to women—Brandes has not a word to say. Byron, in one of his letters, observes how, as a result of his love affair with the Countess Guiccioli, he will in honour be bound to marry her, *since she is his equal in birth and rank.* This clearly shows that Byron cared not a straw for women of humbler rank who might suffer on account of his "affairs". There can be no better proof of Byron's cynical view of private morals.

Brandes has committed another serious error in treating the Byronic philosophy of life with the same respect with

which he treats the Byronic politics. He forgets that, Byron was a poseur par excellence. Byron's poetry, despite its tremendous, destuctive force against political and religious tyranny and hypocrisy, has not exerted a lasting influence on England since it lacks the religion of a purer humanity. Even the English Liberals have confessed that the " thunder's roll " of Byron's poetry have " taught them little ". Brandes recognises this but is unwilling to mention it. Again some of the pages he has devoted to the content of Byron's nature poetry might have been better devoted to Wordsworth. Surely, Coleridg's **Hymn to Mont Blance,** Shelly's **Prometheus** (Act II, Sc. 3), and the sixth book of the **Prelude** contain far truer and better nature poetry than Byron's **Manfred,** which is praised by Brandes as being " matchless as an Alpine landscape ".

Barring these two serious errors of omission and commission, Brandes's appraisal of Byron is correct, He is certainly right in admiring Byron for the dauntless courage with which he defied tyranny and despotism as symbolished in the most unholy combination—of Austria, Russia and Prussia—ironically named the Holy Alliance. And, what is more, Lord Byron flung the gauntlet boldly and defiantly in the face of his own people. It is only a proper understanding of the political blackground of the times that will enable anyone to understand, though not to accept as correct, the high importance and value which Brandes attaches to Byron's place in history. At a time when repression was universal and tyranny and despotism stalked Europe triumphantly, Byron

proudly hoisted the banner of Freedom and sounded the note of everlasting defiance which reverberated throughout the continent and even further beyond. That was the great service he rendered to mankind. Lord Byron was a strange compound of aristocratic pride and democratic sympathy with the poor, of egoistic self-assertion and a generous rage for public justice. His true splendour lay in his instinct to rebellion. He was an Arch Rebel and was called Satanic because of his pride and fearlessness. His rank and personal prestige, his glamour and his literary fame, and the tremendous force of his satires combined to make him formidable. Tyrants and despots, however mighty, looked pitable and evoked scorn and laughter, when Byron thundered against them or ridiculed them. The Government dared not silence him.

It is this magnificent and glamarous aspect of Lord Byron as an arch rebel that seems to have fascinated Brandes so much as to make him overestimate Byron's place in history and to maintain silence as regards his defects, viz., his reactionary attitude to women and his lack of a positive and pure religion of humanity.

(C) The Central idea in Brandes' book: Liberty and the Relation between Poetry and Rebellion.

Trevelyan finds the clue to Brandes' conception of Liberty and Rebellion in relation to poetry in the latter's overestimation of Byron. The heart of Brandes is stirred most by the note of rebellion; Byron, the rebel, fascinates

him most. Hence after doing full justice to Coleridge, Scott, Keats and Shelley, he dwells longer and more lovingly on Byron. Witness his remark: "In the first canto of **Childe Harolde,** we find the *love of freedom* exalted as the one force, capable of emancipating from the despair with which universal misery has overwhelmed the soul." This remark raises the various questions: What is Liberty What is the importance of Liberty and Rebellion in Poetry? and What is the true function of Poetry?

If Brandes overestimates the value of Byron and the content of his poetry, he in no way underestimates the value of the content of Shelley's poetry. He aptly remarks that Shelley's "life was to be of greater and more enduring significance in the emancipation of the human mind" than all the activities of the revolutionary leaders in France in 1792. Mathew Arnold was wrong in calling Shelley an "ineffectual," angel; for Shelley does not, like Byron, deal with politics and daily life. He lived in a world of his own and his poetry died like faint music over the heads of despots whereas Byron's poetry crashed like thunder on their heads. But Europe is not to-day what it was in the time of Byron. Matterneich and Castlereagh are no more. Garibaldi is hailed as a hero. Freedom is not brutally oppressed as in the days of Byron. Europe now has comparatively larger liberties and subtler supressions. The "thunder's roll" of Byron's poetry, tremendous in its destructive force, might have been necessary and appropriate in his own day. But the conception of Freedom found in his poetry cannot be an abiding

source of inspiration. It is in Shelley's poetry that we feel the atmosphere which can truly be called Freedom—viz., the zeal for the unfettered pursuit of truth and of justiee and of beauty. Thus Shelley's conception of Freedom is not negative and militant as Byron's, but positive and fruitful —viz., as the spark of heavenly fire which Prometheus placed in the human breast and without which life would be dark as the grave and cold as the stone. Brandes has clearly understood this idea as his own words show.

But what Brandes fails to understand is Liberty, the indispensable condition of any noble function of the soul, *is not the end of life but the means.* Liberty in not the last, but the first, word in human affairs. Poetry is the essence of life ; and so the condition of poetry is freedom, but its content should not be confined to freedom. Poetry must speak not merely, or even chiefly, as Brandes seems to think, of liberty : it should speak of all that the human spirit, desires and fears. It should speak of joy, sorrow, beauty love and the unknown powers that govern his destiny. Shelley's goddess Liberty is a perennial source of inspiration since he created her in the image of all these things. This then, is the positive and fruitful conception of liberty. The spirit of liberty must envelop the poet and preserve him from decaying as Wordsworth and Tennyson decayed. But the poet's eye must be fixed on things of more positive value. This spirit of Liberty must perforce materialise into rebellion in times of tyranny and hypocrisy. Byron lived in such

times and his love of Liberty materialised into rebellion; but he denied or pretended to deny the positive values for which Liberty is but a means. What is the use of overthrowing tyranny, if the hard-won freedom is not to be used as a means for perfection? The chief value of the work of a poet lies not in the wars he wages, but in the things for which alone it is worth while to wage war. Wordsworth and Coleridge triumphed not by rebellion but by creation. Both plotted the overthrow of Pope. But they did not stop there. Coleridge produced **The Ancient Mariner** and Wordsworth, TINTERN **Abbey**. Wordsworth did more for the happiness and perfection of mankind than the Pantisocratic Society planned by Southey. And Byron did nothing.

It is thus clear that Brandes overestimates the importance of rebellion in poetry and seems to believe that freedom is the end of life and the chief theme of poetry. But Trevelyan maintains that, as in life so in poetry, freedom is the means and the condition; and hence the greatest poetry is not so much the poetry of rebellion—though it is necessary on certain occasions—as that kind of poetry which treats of the hopes and fears, thoughts and feelings of man and which contributes to his happiness and perfection. And to use his words: "the Truce of Poetry should be observed whenever the spirit of liberty can honestly exist without open rebellion." It is the function of poetry to unite where all other writing divides. The greatest poetry should be the common ground of all creeds and of all parties. Poetry offers the highest

pleasures which the human spirit can enjoy and to the extent to which it is widely understood and loved will there be mutal understanding. There is indeed much truth in the old saying to the effect that the songs of the people are more important than their laws.

II. The Political Background.

The political background as painted by Brandes is true and dispassionate. Brandes admires the Englishman and understands his love of personal independence. He observes how political and religious persecution and tyranny were the main features of English life. The effect of oppression was to render the neutral qualities of the British national character into bad ones and to over-develop the national bad qualities. Self-esteem became selfishness in the commercial classes; firmness was transformed into hard-heartedness in the aristocracy; loyalty was excited into servility; and patrotism, into hatred of other nations. The desire for outward decorum, a bad national quality, developed into hypocrisy in the domain of morality; and adherence to established religion was fanned either into hypocrisy or active intolerance.

These statements are amply borne out by facts. In politics and religion a through-going persecution of free thought was energetically carried on. This system of persecution had two periods of activity. The first was the last decade of the eighteenth century—the radical days of Wordsworth. The second period of repression consisted of the years that

followed the Battle of Waterloo—the days of Shelley and Byron. During the interval (1800—1815) radicalism could not show its head due to the threat of Napoleonic invasion. Trevelyan is concerned with the first period of repression, which he terms the heroic age of tyranny, since, during the second period, oppression was continued on the principles and laws of the first period.

Under the influence of the French Revolution, the agitation for Parliamentary Reform spread to the lower classes in London. The panic-stricken aristocracy which was in power punished such agitation with death or transporation. The press was gagged, the Liberal politicians were driven back to private life, and were even there dogged by Government spies. Only George Fox raised his voice against the repressive legislation brought by Pitt, the Prime Minister. Similarly the Church, aided by the State, relentlessly persecuted the slightest traces of free thought, as illustrated in the cases of Williams, the publisher of Thomas Paine's **Age of Reason** and of Priestley, the scientist of European reputation, whose faults were that he was a Soconian and that he celebrated the fall of the Bastille.

In the political field, the Tories claimed the custody of morals and persecuted the Jacobins on moral grounds. In fact the Tory courtiers were notorious for their immorality. But men like Coleridge and Lamb were pilloried as wreckers of family life. The low standard of morality in the Continent was ascribed to Jacobinism. Godwin's **Political Justice** was

condemned on the ground of immorality. Another form of hypocrisy was to talk of freedom while depriving the people of the liberties by such pieces of legislation as the Seditious Meetings Bill. The English Tories condemned the French Revolution on the ground of inhumanity while they were torturing the Irish by flogging and pitch-capping as a regular system.

Similarly, in the religious field, a profligate and vice-ridden clergy persecuted free thought as vice and immorality as illustrated in the case of **the Rights of man,** and in this it was aided by the State. The Nonconformists were legally and socially persecuted. In 1803 Pitt seriously thought of annulling the Toleration Act of 1688 and would have done so but for the intervention of Wilberforce. That is symbolic of the spirit of the age.

Thus Jacobins and Nonconformists, all who stood for free thought, were ruthelessly suppressed and that too by a profligate clergy and aristocracy, which glibly raised the cry that the foundations of morality were in danger. It was, therefore, no wonder that Byron, when he attacked tyranny and hypocrisy, also attacked morality : he confused the hearth with the altar and the throne. After the Battle of Waterloo, radicalism got a stimulus from the sting of the economic miseries of the common people. But it was stamped down by repressive measures, the chief of which were the notorious " Six Acts " introduced into the House of commons by

Castlerleagh. It was then that Lord Byron became a force in politics.

Q. Give an estimate of Brandes' book on the Romantic poets.

Ans. Reproduce sections I A. & B.

Q. Criticise Brandes' estimate of Byron.

Ans. Section I B.

Q. What is Brandes' conception of liberty and his idea of the relation between Poetry & Rebellion.

Ans. Section I C.

Q. Briefly sketch the political background of the Romantic Poets.

Ans. Section II.

HISTORY AND FICTION

—o—

HISTORICAL FICTION

Historical fiction as distinguished from history.

Historical fiction is not history, though it springs from history and reacts upon it. It is the function of history to deal with the real facts of past and to make the events of the past live. But even the greatest of historical novels cannot do the specific work of history. They do not, except occasionally, deal with the real facts and recorded events of the past. They attempt to make the past live by creating, in all the colours of life, typical cases imitated from the recorded facts.

The Requisites of an historical novelist:

A historical mind and a power of creative imagination are the two qualities that a historical novelist should possess. He should have an aptness to study the records of a period and the capacity to reproduce the knowledge he has acquired in a picture which has all the colours of life.

(A) Historical fiction proper.

Sir Walter Scott was the first great historical novelist. He combined in him the flair for antiquarian researches with a Shakespearean wealth of imagination and breadth of sympathy. His **Ivanhoe** was the first attempt at presenting

the people of the Middle Ages as human beings. But it was in his Scottish novels that he was at his best. The themes of **The Legend of Montrose, Old Mortality and Waverly** belong to a period not far removed from Scott's own time. In these novels, the introduction of the language and character of the vigorous Scots whom he knew so well in daily life is not inappropriate; and the incongruity of modern characters and language in antique setting is not to be found in them. The thought, feelings and language of Scotland in the 19th century modified by sound antiquarian knowledge, do well enough; for character and language can be safely transferred back a century or so.

Stevenson's eighteenth century stories, togeter with **St. Iver, Heathercat,** and **Weir of Hermiston** succeeded for the same reasons; in these stories, Stevenson has transferred back the Scots whom he actually knew. Similarly in **War and Peace**, perhaps the greatest of all historical novels, **Tolstoy** has transferred back to the Napoleonic period the Russians whom he knew; and in **A Tale of Two Cities, Dickens** has transferred back to the time of French Revolution, the Modern Cockney. But Stevenson's **Black Arrow** and **The Sire of de Maletroit's Door** are not successful, since the characters and motives are too conventional or modern for the setting, viz, fifteenth century France. But **A Lodging for the Night** is a successful tale because the character of Villon has been portrayed out of Villon's poems though the scene is laid in fifteenth century France.

Besides Scott and Stevenson, some other writers have done valuable work by exploiting carefully the results of modern historical scholarship with the help of imagination. In other words, they combine antiquarian study with creative imagination. These writers are **Charlotte Young, Charles Reade, Stanley Weyman, Mr. John Buchan,** and **Mrs. Naomi Mitchison.** But in the early historical novels of **Sir Arthur Quiller Couch**—like **The Blue Pavillions** and **The Splendid Spur**—, though the historical setting is well-informed, imagination plays the greater part; he seems to have chosen the times of Charles I or William III in order that his humour and fancy may run wild and that his freakish imagination may have full scope.

Charles Kingsley and **Kipling** had the gift of imagination and the capacity to reproduce the past in the brightest living colours. But their characters are too modern in thought and motive. The background for Kingsley's novels is the Saxon and the Tudor times but his heroes are, in thought and motive, muscular Christians of the Victorian generation, representing Kingsley's attitude to Christianity and physical well-being. And Kipling's Romans and Normans are the jingoist subalterns fresh from Harrow and Sandhurst. This fault of "modernizing" character and motive is no doubt inevitable when we deal with times so remote that we cannot know what the people were really like. Even Scott and Stevenson sometimes had this failing. **Shaw's St. Joan** also suffers from this defect. Kipling's **The Finest**

Story in the World steers clear of this defect since " it stops on the threshold of the unknown ", i. e., since it is timeless and has no definite setting. But **Puck of Pook's Hill,** by the same author, suffers from " modernizing " since it paints to us vividly the Roman and the Norman periods but introduces characters modern in motive and language.

Thackeray's Henry Esmond is one of the finest English historical novels. In it " a feeling for the spirit and details of a period in the past is most perfectly blended with the human interest The historical setting is accurate and vivid and the characters perfectly harmonise with it. Undoubtebly, **Hardy's Dynasts** is the greatest work of historical fiction of our time on an epic scale; it deals with the Napoleonic age.

(b) Contemporary Historical Fiction.

Fiction that looks backward by the help of imagination and antiquarian study is historical fiction proper. But there is another class of fiction which deals with contemporory manners and acquires historical value only by the passsge of time. Such fiction—epic, drama or novel—may be called " contemporary " fiction. As historical evidence, it has a value which the historical novel can never have. It gives evidence, not, indeed, as to particular events, but as to contemporary manners, thought and customs, " revealing just those psychological shades in which chronicles and legal or

economic records are deficient." Thus portrayal of contemporary life by great writers and poets is transformed by time into historical evidence.

At the head of the works of "contemporary" historical fiction stand **Homer's Lays.** As Prof. Gilbert Murray has observed, even if the **Iliad** and the **Odyssey** were all fiction, we should still learn from them a great deal about early Greek customs, manners and mode of living. Homer has rendered the daily life and thought of the Greeks, who lived twenty-seven centuries ago, more familiar and intimate than the lives of Englishmen prior to the time of Chaucer. **Chaucer** himself has given us a vivid picture of social life in the fourteenth-century England in his CANTERBURY TALES. After Chaucer, the Elizabethan dramas throw invaluable light on the social conditions of the age; for instance **Beaumont and Fletcher's The Knight of the Burning Pestle,** though it contains very little of historical truth, gives us a lively picture of the care-free life of the London apprentice. **Ben Jonson** is valued to day, not so much for his scholarly comedies as for his social and political satires.

In the eighteenth century, there were SMOLLET, FIELDING and JANE AUSTEN whose novels are now of immense historical value. These novels vividly portray the manners of the squierarchy in South England in the early eighteenth century and of the other classes in the same part of England late in the same century. "Jane Austen has not only written great psychological novels for all time; she has also

enabled the people of the eighteenth century to look back into the minds and hearts of their analogues in the last years of George III, in a manner entirely beyond the scope of the historian." **Galt's Annals of the Parish** does a similar service in respect to Scotland under George III. Similarly **Balzac** has, in his novels, left us a great historical document on France in the eighteen thirties.

Among England's most priceless national archives are **Peter Simple** and **Midshipman Easy**, two novels of the sea and the merchant marine by **Captain Marryat**, who was himself a midshipman and later a captain in the Royal Navy and who had fought at the famous Battle of Trafalgar. Based on personal experience and observation, these novels are of great historical value.

Of equally great historical value is **Meredith's Vittoria**, which is partly an historical novel looking back to the past and partly a work of contemporary fiction that has by process of time become historical. The scene of **Vittoria** is laid in the Italy of 1848 and in this book Meredith aims at recapturing the spirit of the rebellion of 1848, of which Mazzini was the inspiration. Meredith wrote it in the eighteen sixties and hence it is a historical novel looking back to the past. But in the sixties, as a correspondent of the "Morning Post" in the Koniggratz Campaign, Meredith acquired first-hand knowledge of Italian patriots and Austrian officers and therefore, **Vittoria** is contemporary fiction, though this first-hand knowledge was acquired after the book had been written.

This book is the best existing exposition of the Italian character and the programme of the constitutional party and it gives the finest and truest picture of Mazzini.

II. THE RELATION BETWEEN HISTORICAL FICTION AND HISTORY.

(A) The value of Historical Fiction proper to History

or

The Service Rendered by Scott to History

History deals with recorded events and facts and makes them live. Historical fiction does not deal with real facts except occasionally and its function is to make the past live by creating, in all the colours of life, typical cases imitated from the recorded facts of history. Thus, historical fiction though it is not history, springs from history and reacts upon it.

Historical fiction proper has done much to make history popular and to give it value, for it has stimulated historical imagination. In this connection, we have to note how Scott, by his lays and novels, completely altered men's conception of the past and revolutionised history. In his boyhood, Scott found history composed of two elements — patient antiquarianism and superficial analysis or sentitious generalization. This method of historical art had reached its perfection under Gibbon. It was characteristic of the eighteenth century, the age of common sense, and it was utterly lacking in

sympathy. Under this method, history could never understand what a revolutionist or a religious fanatic was really like. Gibbon, the greatest master of this method, had traced the history of the Roman Empire during fourteen calamitous centuries in a cold and frigid manner without any living human interest. The pages of Gibbon's History, due to lack of emotion, remind one of the figures sculptured in marble in the Parthenon. Only the events change, but the people remain the same throughout—divided into classes and labelled, retaining the same generalized character, and unchanging as formulae.

It was Scott who first showed that the people change, not only in their clothes and weapons, but also in their thought and morals. He took a human interest in the past. As Trevelyan puts it, "To him the pageant of history was more like a Walpurgis night than a Parthenon procession." He brought to bear upon the results of his antiquarian researches his Shakespearean wealth of imagination and breadth of sympathy. To the cold, cynical Gibbon humanity remained just the same through the ages: this was the classicist's attitude to history. But Scott, the romanticist, was fascinated by the transient nature of the noblest manifestations of the external world. The chorus in Shelly's **Hellas** beginning with the lines

Worlds on worlds are rolling ever

From creation to decay

was, as it were, an etherialized version of Scott's view of history.

In his lays and novels, Scott recaptured whatever was colourful, picturesque and human in the past. For the first time he introduced imagination and emotion in the treatment of the past. Instead of an all too simple and superficial analysis of the past, Scott gave a vivid picture of human life in the past in all its colours and complexities. History could no more remain perfect and static as Gibbon had left it. It became complex and dynamic. Scott found history like the figures in the frieze of the Parthenon. But he "left it, what it has ever been since, an eager aspiration, destined to perpetual change, doomed to everlasting imperfection, but living, complex, broad as humanity itself". As Macaulay observed, Scott used the "fragments of truth" which the sedate and stately historians of the eighteenth century—Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon—had thrown behind them viz., "Everything that is intimate everything that is passionate, everything also that is of trivial or daily occurrence, all the colour and all the infinite variety of the past". Thus, by his pioneer work and infectious example, Scott enlarged the sphere of historians. Historians who came after Scott thought quite differently about the past from those who came before him. Macaulay and Carlyle benefited most by the example of Scott and both delighted and revelled in recapturing the picturesque and the colourful in the past. But Scott did it more throughly.

(B) The value of Contemporary historical fiction to history.

Historical fiction proper may not have any historical truth, but it has done much to make history popular and it has stimulated historical imagination. But contemporary historical fiction—the epic, drama or novel of contemporary life—has a value as historical evidence, which the historical novel utterly lacks. Contemporary historical fiction gives evidence, not as to particular events, but as to thought, customs, manners and the psychology of the people at a given time. On this intimate aspect of human nature, history has rarely any light to throw. Hence the importance to history of the lays of Homer, the Elizabethan dramas, the novels of Smollet, Fielding, Jane Austen and Captain Marryat and Meredith's **Vittoria.** For instance, the difference between Fielding's Squire Western in **Tom Jones** and Jane Austen's polished gentleman of the same country fifty years later is a problem of importance to historians; it throws light on the widespread movement among rural gentry to improve their manners. Beau Nash was the leader of this movement. Similarly the novels of Captain Marryat are the authentic picture of life in the merchant marine and the royal Navy, even as Beaumont and Fletcher's **Knight of the Burning Pestle** gives us a lively picture of apprentice life in England. Meredith's **Vittoria** contains the finest and truest picture of Mazzini and the best exposition of the spirit of the rebellion of 1848 and of the Italian character.

Contemporary fiction thus deals with aspects of human life and nature which are too subtle for history. Naturally, when it is great literature, contemporary fiction usurps the place of history in our thoughts about the past. For instance, at Bath, Trevelyan was most anxious to identify the room where Catherine first saw Tilney at the dance; he was not so much interested in the Pump room which Dr. Johnson and Beau Nash had visited. Though Catherine and Tilney are only characters in Jane Austen's **Northanger Abbey,** we are more interested in them than in real persons like Johnson and Beau Nash. For Catherine and Tilney are, like us, common people, and, in delineating their character, Jane Austen has revealed to us the hearts and minds of common people like ourselves who lived two centuries ago. History can tell us comparatively little about common, humble people. By contemporary fiction our historical knowledge is immensely enlarged.

Such being the value of contemporary fiction to pure history, there is an intellectual pleasure in comparing the aspects of society emphasised by the contemporary novelist and by the modern social historian who analyses retrospectively. There can be no better proof of the importance of contemporary fiction to history than the fact that social historians—like Prof. Clapham and Mr. Mrs. Hammond—more and more treat old novels as a form of evidence to be collated with other sources.

Incidentally, it may be observed that historical knowledge enables one to fully understand and appreciate great works of contemporary fiction which are becoming historical by the passage of time. Historical knowledge enables us to understand words and references scattered haphazard in the pages of contemporary historical fiction; when Squire Western's sister tells him "things look so well in the North," it gives us a perceptible glow of pleasure to be able to identify in the word "North" the political jargon in the early eighteenth century for the countries around Sweden. Historical knowledge also adds to our enjoyment of contemporary picture of bygone classes and types in great novels: to fully understand Squire Western's denunciation of the Whig lords, we should know the hostility that existed between the ancient Tory squierarchy and the newly created Whig aristocracy which dominated the Upper House.

III THE RELATION BETWEEN HISTORY AND LITERATURE:

In the classical culture that prevailed throughout Europe for four centuries since the Renaissance, Literature and History were considered as sister arts and both flourished. Now, that classical culture is yielding place to a modern culture and in this modern education also history and literature should be regarded as sisters. Otherwise it will fare ill with both of them. If isolated from one another, history and literature will cease to appeal to the best intellects and highest imaginations.

It is gratifying to note that in schools and colleges, study of Modern Literature is closely associated with study of history. At Cambridge literature and history are taught side by side. Teachers find an " historical background " indispensable, to explain to the students the poets or prose-men of any age. For instance the poetry of Shelley and Byron will never be fully understood and appreciated except against the background of the French Revolution and the Holy Alliance. As Mr. R. B. Mckerrow has pointed out, literature is conditioned and coloured by the main religious, political, and social currents of the age, and these should be known before the literature of the past is fully understood and appreciated. Even as the study of literature requires an " historical back-ground ", so also most periods of civilised history have their literary background", Without the "literary background ", the study of history will lose much of its meaning and value. No one who is ignorant of the literary and classical atmosphere can be fascinated by the state of society in the eighteenth century England. The majestic eloquence of Chatham should be traced to the fact that study of the classics was the fashion of the day. It was an age of political corruption, personal bickerings, and bitter party controversies. But the services of the most eminent writers such as Addition and Swift were requisitioned in these controversies; and to-day we are so much attracted by these writings that we willingly forgive the political corruption which characterised the age.

History and Literature are thus allied and they are each indispensable for the other. They are allied in yet another way. The motive that really draws men and women to study history is poetic. No doubt history is judged by the criterion of truth and in that sense it may be considered scientific. But the motive that drives us to study history is poetic; the chief attraction of history is that it reconstructs the past and portrays our forefathers as they really were, and enables us to understand the ever-changing and complicated system of custom and law, of society and politics which governed and coloured their lives. There is no better sign of civilization than this attempt to reconstruct the past. And we do so because we want to be assured that the past was as real as the present. History starts with the astonishing proposition that there is no difference in degree of reality between past and present. " We are all food for history. No one century, not even the twentieth, is more real than any other." This is a truth at once the most hackneyed and yet the most mysterious. This idea is common to all religions, all philosophies and all poetry. The Elizabethan poets called it " mortality." Hamlet gives expression to this idea in the opening scene of the final act. Only, Hamlet is concerned with the fact that all will soon be as dead as Alexander or Yorick, whereas History presents the other cheerful side of the proposition that Alexander and Yorick were once as live and real persons as ourselves. The reality of the past is then the fundemental poetic idea of History which attracts us to it. And realising this, Carlyle observed truly : " History is after all true poetry. And Reality, if rightly interpreted, is greater than Fiction."

ENGLISHMEN AND ITALIANS

Anglo-Italian Friendship.

In this paper Trevelyan proposes to analyse some of the causes for the close friendship that existed between Englishmen and Italians in the year 1859—a friendship that helped the creation of United Italy and led to the participation of Italy in the last Great War on the side of the allies.

In the middle nineteenth century, England's foreign policy was a failure in general. England's attitude to Turkey at the time of the Crimean War and to America at the time of the Civil War was prompted by ignorance of the latter two countries. But Lord John Russel's Italian policy was a striking exception to the general failure: because the statesmen and public of England had an intimate and personal knowledge of Italy. The sympathy which the Englishman showed to the Italian was cultural and political and the interest they took in Italy drew its origin from the cultural associations and from the devotion to the literature and fine arts of ancient, mediaeval and modern Italy, inherited from the eighteenth century.

Relations between Englishmen and Italians from the time of Caesar to the 18th century.

The history of the cultural relations between England and Italy is mainly the story of England's debt to Italy. Many words in the English language, and many forms and much of

the spirit of English literature are ultimately Italian in origin. This cultural debt of England to Italy, which can never be repaid, was derived from three sources. The first was the study of the ancient Roman language, law, religion, art, political ideas and classics. The second was the influence, in the Norman and Plantagent times, of the French civilization, which was itself Roman in origin. The third was the influence of the great Italian civilization of the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance period directly on English literature; consequently the native Anglo-Saxon alliterative verse was abandoned; the English language was adapted to the French and Italian forms of verse and prose; and English writers chose themes mainly Italian. Chaucer took many of his stories from Boccacio and half the personages of Shakespeare's dramas bore Italian names. In the Renaissance period, Italy was to England " the glass of fashion and the mould of form."

In the seventeenth century, Milton composed not only in Latin but also in Italian. He was a friend of Galileo. The scientific men of that century down to Newton were in correspondence with the scientific men of Italy. The latter were to a great extent the masters of the former.

Even in the realm of political ideas, England owed a good deal to Ancient Rome. The conservative idea of respect for law and of the sovereign regal power was derived from the Roman concepts of **Lex, Rex** and **Imperator.** Besides, the Republicanism of the Puritans drew its inspiration from the Roman Republican heroes described by Plutarch, Levy and

Tacitus. Later, Whiggism had Brutus and Cato as examples. Besides the concepts of monarchy and liberty, the English conception of patriotism was in no small measure due to the study, by countless generation of English school boys, of the lives of Regulus and Cincinnates. Throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, English statesmen considered Rome as the hearth of their political civilization. They had the models and inspirations of their own eloquence in ancient Rome. It was, therefore, no wonder that, in the nineteenth century, the ruins of the Forum were as familiar, sacred and moving to Russel and Gladstone as to Mazzini and Garibaldi.

Italy in the Eighteenth Century. The eighteenth century was characterised by **the belief in the primacy of things Italian.** It was a time when Italy lay dead and degenerate after two centuries of tyranny of foreigners, priests and petty despots. Only the peasants, the great masters of music a few men of science, a few poets and, above all, the genius of Piranesi kept alive the spirit of Italy. Though decadent, Italy interested England more than Germany or any other country except France. English education and culture were still exclusively based on the classics. But the travels of Englishmen did not extend to the Isles of Greece. In those days, the Grand Tour that gave a finishing touch to the university education of an English youth included France and Italy. To Statesmen like Horace Walpole, travel in Italy meant tasting to full the typical Italian life of the day, with its operas and masked balls, connoisseurs and virtuosos, and

the hospitality of the small courts and native aristocracy. To the Englishmen who stayed at home Italy was the last word in painting and sculpture and music. In the realm of literature, the classics, the French writers and the Italian poets, were the most important, barring Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton whose works abounded in references to Italy. The Italian poets, like Dante and Petrarch, were widely familiar in the original, especially among the ladies. In 1796, when the young Buonaparte was overrunning the Italian fields, Charles Fox and Lord Holland, two prominent English statesmen, were carrying on a correspondence in choice Italian, discussing the rival merits of various Italian authors and poets. And Edward Grey has left a translation, in his own handwriting, of **the Banks of Allan water** into Italian.

In short, at the end of the eighteenth century, when the French Revolution broke out, "the educated English owed at least as much to Italy as to France, and there was no third rival". It was this Italianate culture that the nineteenth century inherited as a legacy from the eighteenth" Shelley and Byron, Russel and Gladstone, the Brownings and Meredith were all, in the nineteenth century, influenced by it.

If English sympathy for the Italian cause in the day of her resurrection was not only passionate, but also constant, intimate, well informed and wisely directed, it was because that sympathy was not only political but also cultural, profound and personal.

The first phase of the Italian movement towards unity or the Risorgimento : the Napoleonic phase of great hopes. (1796—1815)

Napoleon brought with him to Italy not only the armies but also the ideas of ths French Revolution. His conquest swept away the triple tyranny of Austria, of the Catholic Church and of petty despots. The greater part of the Italian peninsula was governed as a nation—albeit as a part of the Napoleonic French Empire. The **Code Napoleon** replaced the mediaeval laws. Education was freed from clerical obscurantism and was re-fashioned on scientific and military lines. In the place of the arbitrary whims of despots by right divine, an efficient bureaucracy functioned. Careers were no longer the close preserve of the elect but were thrown open to professional and middle classmen of talent and merit. In short, Italy was for the first time, after two centuries of death-trance, united as a nation. In this unity and sense of nation-hood lay the seeds of rebellion and fight for national freedom.

Such was the service rendered by Napoleon to his mother, Italy. Addressing Napoleon as the liberator, Ugo Foscolo, the first great poet of the Italian Resurrection, says, in an ode, that Napoleon looked on Italy from the heights of the Alps and plunged down on wings to the sound of drum and trumpet ; France sounded and wafted forth the name of liberty and the sea and the sky echoed back "liberty." But Ugo Foscolo, was not unconscious of the defect of the Napoleonic regime in Italy. Napoleon, though he had freed Italy from

foreign rule and from the tyranny of priests and despots, had also suppressed effectively the liberties of the people. Ugo Foscolo expressed this idea figuratively to John Cam Hobhouse, friend of Byron, as follows. "Napoleon's dominion was like a July day in Egypt—all clear, brilliant, and blazing; but all silent, not a voice heard, the stillness of the grave!"

Nevertheless, Napoleon laid the foundations for Italian unity in future by giving them a common code of laws and a fair system of government. He woke the Italians from their lethargy and easy-going submission to tyranny. The French Revolution and the advent of Napoleon not only created vast hopes of a Golden Age of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity but also revealed to the Italians the horror and cruelty and oppression of the *ancien regime* under which they had been living. Napoleon saved Italy from being ever again content under misrule. The despair and the rage of the post-Napoleonic era, which bore fruit in rebellion, provides us with a measure of the work that Napoleon did for Italy.

The second phase of the Risorgimento: the phase of rampant reaction and dark despair, (1815—1849).

The downfall of Napoleon, begun by the Battle of Leipzig, and completed by the Battle of Waterloo, meant, for Italy, the restoration of the *ancien regime*. In 1816, Ugo Foscolo took refuge in England. With him began the long line of friendship between Italian patriots and influential English men and women. He frequented the drawing rooms of the learned, leisured, and liberal aristocrats, and familiarised

them with the Italian aspirations. And these aristocrats, who had inherited the belief in the primacy of things Italian from the eighteenth century, were only too willing to give their sympathy. Ugo Foscolo was thus the first unofficial ambassador of patriotic Italy. The unofficial propoganda begun by him was continued for two generations by succeeding Italian patriots in exile in England and fructified in the decisive diplomatic events of 1859 and 1860.

The first fifteen years after the Battle of Waterloo were years of mere anger and despair, till Mazzini fused the national discontent into the dynamic "Young Italy" movement. This dark despair of the Italian nation in that dreadful epoch between Napoleon's fall and Mazzini's rise was most powerfully expressed by the Italian poet Leopardi. The pessimism of Leopardi was not the pessimism which discourages from action and virtue. It was the pessimism of a man most terribly in earnest; it was the cry of rage that may awaken the souls of the sleepers. That was why Leopardi won the admiration of Gladstone who was at once the most optimistic and the most Christian statesman of the day. Addressing his sister on the occasion of her marriage in 1821, Leopardi used these terible words; "O, my sister, thou must needs bear children to be either unhappy or cowardly; choose then, the unhappy." And the Italian nation, in those dark days of tyranny, nobly chose misery and martyrdom in the cause of freedom in preference to cowardice and submission. The Carbonari of Naples rose in revolt in 1820. England on this occasion remained neutral and Nelson countenanced Austria

in wiping out the Italian rebels and ruthlessly persecuting the best men of the professional and educated classes.

The part played by Byron.

The Neapolitan revolution raised great hopes. At that time there were in Italy two English poets who were the unofficial ambassadors of Britain, working for the Risorgimento—Shelley and Byron. Shelley, in 1820. wrote the **Ode to Naples** in honour of the awakening of Italian liberty. But it was Byron who worked with zeal to change England's attitude to the Italian fight for freedom. Though an outcast sinner in the eyes of his respectable fellow—countrymen, Byron exerted over them an influence greater than even that of the Church. He joined the Carbonari movement in the Romagna which aimed at the overthrow of the degrading Papal yoke and supplied his Carbonari cronies with arms and ammunition. He made practical preparations to fight, and if necessary to die, with his Italian friends. It was only the too easy suppression of the Neopolitan rebellion by the Austrian troops that sent him to die for Greece instead of Italy.

Italy brought out the best as well as the worst in the character of Byron. He discovered and assimilated into his own life the best as well as the worst of what was happening in his land of exile. His intimacy with Italians in Venice proved his bane. But when he moved to Ravenna in 1820, there he met his soul's salvation; for it was there that he not only met Countess Guiccioli but also joined himself to

the Carbonari. Even when his Carbonari cronies, frightened by an order of the Government forbidding possession of arms, endangered his position by dumping in his house all the arms and ammunition he had supplied them with, Byron was only too glad to be sacrificed for the liberation of Italy. "Here was the splendid side of Byron, which more than redeems so much egoism, foppery and vice." Byron was able to cast off his English prejudice in the company of Italians and to understand that in those dark days the Italians had a cause and a purpose of their own. He was the first Englishman, besides Shelley, to recognize that a living Italy was struggling against the Austrian tyranny, known as Matternich's "order". What was more noble, he was prepared to make a present of his life to the Romagnole peasants as he later actually made a present of it to the Greek bandits who fought for the freedom of Greece. No, other Englishman with the wealth, fame and genius of Byron, would have considered it worthwhile sacrificing his life for the sake of the Italians.

Thus the zeal with which Byron took up the Italian cause and gave it his powerful aid stirred the English imagination and made England ultimately abandon her attitude of neutrality. When he went to Greece, the glamour of the mere name of Greece, coupled with that of Byron, sufficed to turn England against the Turk who oppressed Greece, inspite of the fact that personal connections of Englishmen with Greece were very slender as compared to the friendship between English statesmen and distinguished

Italian exiles. In the cases of both Italy and Greece cultural sentiment and sympathy made England take up their cause.

If England countenanced Turkish tyranny in Bulgaria, Serbia and Armenia—all Christian nations—it was because there was neither cultural sympathy nor personal intimacy between England and those nations. With Englishmen, therefore, cultural sympathy is ever stronger than religious feelings. If the foreign policy of England is to be wisely directed, her statesmen and people should seriously and affectionately study foreign lands and cultivate personal friendships.

The Third Phase of the Risorgimento : the rising of 1848 and the decade of repression (1848—1859)

The Revolutions in Italian cities, particularly in Rome, of 1848—'49 are known by the name of Quarantotto. In Rome Garibaldi established a republic which was very short-lived. The Austrians marched on Rome and, after a heroic defence, Garibaldi fled and the republic of Rome fell. This phase of the Italian Risorgimento has received more attention in English literature than any other phase. The poets of England and Meredith, the poetic novelist, not only sang the praises of the Qurantotto but also analysed and criticized its weakness and strength with an insight rarely shown by writers of any country into the affairs of another. Meredith's **Vittoria** is a detailed and accurate analysis of the Italian character because it is a historical novel which sprang from the author's firsthand knowledge of Italian patriots and

Austrian officers. It is the best study of the character of the Italian rebellion in Central Italy. Similarly Mrs. Browning's **Casa Guidi Windows** gives us a sympathetic yet merciless analysis of the revolution in Tuscany with remarkable wisdom and foresight. And Arthur Clough's **Amours de Voyage** gives as a vivid description if Garibaldi's heroic defence of Rome in 1849.

After the failure of the Quarantotto the sympathy with the cause of the suffering Italians became general in England It was no longer confined to the poets and the liberal aristocrats. It spread to the Philistines and became an important factor in middle-class politics. In 1859, the general desire to help Italy was regarded as one of the chief reasons for the fall of the Derby Cabinet.

During this period of the darkness before dawn the primacy of things Italian was maintained, as in the eighteenth century, through education, art and letters. English youth still enjoyed an education exclusively classical. Foreign travel was concentrated on Italy. Italian was still the foreign language learnt after French. English ladies still read modern and mediaeval Italian poets. Classical scholars were more interested in Rome than in Greece. In music and painting, Italy was the fashion. The Italian opera had now become patriotic and "**Viva Verdi**" was the cry of the musical world. Many an English miss learning music from an Italian master was thrilled when she was told that the initials of the cry meant " Viva Vittoria Emanuele Re d'Italia ! " Italy was a great centre of art like Paris. Great numbers of English

painters were employod in copying pictures in Italian churches and museums, particularly at Rome. In original painting the wild mountain scenery of Calabria and its picturesque brigands were the fashion. Edward Lear was just one among many adventurous young artists who travelled and sketched in the strange and rugged lands beyond Vesuvius. The English artists in Italy became great friends with the Italians and were devoted to their cause : for instance Sir Frederick Leighton and Lord Carlisle, friends of Sir Michael Costa, the great Italian composer, were soaked in the spirit of Italy. English travellers in Italy, while admiring the charm of Italy's landscapes, cities and art, could not help sympathising with the Italians groaning under the odious oppression of Austria. In England such distinguished Italian patriots as Mazzini, Panizzi, Saffi, Poerio and Lacaita enjoyed the personal affections of their English hosts.

Thus conditions of literature and scholarship, of society and travel, favoured British sentiment in favour of Italian liberty. It was further enhanced by the fact that the Italian patriotic movement became associated with the parliamentary monarchy of Victor Emmanuel of Piedmont. Nothing could please the English people better than the ideal of constitutional morarchy for the fight for freedom in Italy.

The fourth and the final phase of the Risorgimento : (Triumph 1859—1860)

In 1859 the tide of English sympathy for the Italian cause ran high. But British opinion was bewildered for a few

months. Napoleon III undertook to liberate Italy from Austria and marched his armies into the plain of Lombard in alliance with Victor Emmanuel's Piedmontese. The prospect of another era of Napoleonic conquest in Italy terrified the English, whose fear of France was as strong as their sympathy with the Italian cause. The confusion of the English mind has been superbly satirised by Arnold in **Friendship's Garland** and by Ruskin in **Arrows of the Chase.** The English indeed wished that the Austrians would beat the French, and Italians would beat the Austrians. Anyhow, the result of the war was admirably suited to fulfil English wishes and to promote English policy. The French defeated the Austrians in the battles of Magneta and Solferino. Lombardy was liberated and the liberation of the rest of Italy was made possible in the near future. Napoleon III suddenly terminated the campaign and concluded a treaty with Emperor Joseph, without obtaining the consent of Cavour., the minister of Victor Emmanuel. Besides, the terms of the treaty were unfavourable to Italy. Consequently hatred of France threw Italy into the arms of England which idolized Garibaldi as the Italian national hero and as the enemy of Napoleon III and Austria alike. Cavour, the shrewd Italian statesmen, allowed France and England to bid against each other for Italy's favour. When the opportunity came, he, with the help of Garibaldi and of England, made Italy a united nation and Victor Emmanuel its first monarch.

But even Cavour could not have made Italy but for the fact that Lord John Russel was the foreign minister and that

his action was backed by an enthusiastic and well-informed public opinion. Lord John Russel had inherited from Fox, Holland and Grey their principles of liberalism and their devotion to Italian literature and to the society of cultivated Italians. Throughout the fifties he was following every turn of Italian politics from inside private information. Besides, he was living in his own home, in an atmosphere of well-informed Italian patriotism. That was why he was able to do the right thing as Foreign Minister at every stage of the Crisis of 1860. Lord John Russel's foreign policy was supported by Gladstone, who had been converted to the Italian cause in 1851 after he had seen how political cases were tried in the Neapolitan courts. To Lord John Russel, the advice tendered by Hudson, the British minister at Turin, from time to time was more vital than even the support of Gladstone. Hudson understood perfectly the true interests and opportunities of Italy and carried on private correspondence with Russel, in which he criticized the official policy in the light of every new situation. "Thus and thus only was he (Russel) able to keep British policy moving fast enough to keep pace with the rapidity of events in a year of revolution" But for Hudson, Russel would not have accepted the concession of Nice and Savoy to France: and this concession was the inducement to Napoleon III to permit further portions of Italy. And it was Hudson who prevented Russel from joining in Napoleon's plan to stop Garibaldi at the Straits of Messina: for Hudson knew that Cavour, despite his professed hostility to Garibaldi, secretly wished Garibaldi success.

IF NAPOLEON HAD WON THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO.

Introduction.

In order to appreciate the speculations of Trevelyan in this essay, it is essential to bear in mind the following historical facts.

If the Prussian General Blucher had not eluded Grouchy and joined Wellington, Napoleon might have won the Battle of Waterloo. And during the battle Nepoleon was suffering from acute cancer of the stomach.

After Wellington's victory at Waterloo, the Congress of Vienna sanctioned the partition ot Poland among Austria. Russia, and Prussia. The Holy Roman Empire was not restored. The Confedaration of the German states was established with the stipulation that representative institutions should be established. Lastly, the monarchs in Italy whom Napoleon had driven out were restored.

After Waterloo, France witnessed the rising of 1830, the abdication and flight of Charless X, and the granting of a charter of liberties to the people by his successor. In England, economic distress prevailed, parlimentary agitation grew in strength, the Catholics were freed from civil disabilities in 1829, and the Reform Bill was passed in 1832. In Germany the mandate of the Congress of Vienna regarding the establishment of representative institutions were carried out

only by a few states. Spain was in the throes of a civil war while her American colonies rose in revolt and declared their independence which Great Britain recognized despite the protests of the Holy Alliance. In Italy the downfall of Napoleon meant the triumph of reaction and the freedom movement gathered strength only after 1848 and triumphed twelve years later. On the whole Europe was dominated by Prussia and reaction was triumphant in Germany, Austria and Italy. But everywhere Liberal movements were being sponsored by the professional and educated classes and by the enlightened middle class.

SUMMARY

1. Napoleon

In Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo, he might have perhaps lived longer than he actually did—ie., till 1836. But the post-Waterloo Napoleon would have been very different from the Napoleon in the prime of his life. "A new Napoleon had been evolved, the Napoleon of Peace, a mere shadow, in spiritual and intellectial force, of his former self". Even in the convention of Brussels, he would have with clenched fists, invoked the Goddess of peace", Indeed, in order to remove from the scene of affairs "the paymaster and inveterate instigator of war"—the Duke of Wellington—, Napoleon would have extended unexpected clemency to England and offered facilities for the English general to evacuate the seat of war. Napoleon would have also clinched a deal with the time-serving Matternich of Austria for bringing about a permanent and lasting peace. He would have abandoned the reconquest of Germany and remained content with the Rhine frontier and the bulk of the Italian peninsula, which the wily Matternich would have offered him.

This incredible transformation of Napoleon into an advocate of peace would have been the result of three factors ; the unamimous and intense desire of the French people for peace, the clamour of the soldiers for peace and his own infirmity due to old age. Trevelyan imagines that the French people of all classes and parties unite in sending a deputation to Napoleon requesting him to put an end to the war.

Napoleon does not yet despair, for he is sure of the support of his soldiers for the continuance of the war. But the long shout for "Peace" that runs down the lines of the assembled troops when he goes to review them stuns and dazes him. Without speaking a word of thanks to his soldiers, he rides back as one in a trance and, dismounting, walks to his Cabinet gazing vacantly at his marshals and ministers as if he has never seen them. At the threshold he stops before his faithful Mameluke and, still in a reverie, tells him: "The Franks are tired of war, and we two cannot ride out alone. Besides, we are growing old. One grows old and dies. The Pyramids they grow old, but they do not die". After a short pause, he adds energetically. "Do you think one will be remembered after forty centuries?" Having shot out this question, Napoleon stands for a moment as if for an answer and then dashes in and begins dictating messages of peace to Wellington and the allied sovereigns. These words of Napoleon reveal his soaring and ambitious nature and also his regretful feeling that he is growing old and infirm. Napoleon's physical condition is, therefore, as much responsible for his resolution to establish peace as the attitude of the French army. Indeed, for some time past he has been suffering from accute cancer of the stomach which seems to have diminished his energy and curtailed his waking hours. Hence his failure to follow Blucher and give him a through smashing. Though he does not seem to have been sufficiently conscious of his growing feebleness to delegate his military or political duties, he seems to have felt his incapacity to tackle with both together.

As represented by Trevelyan, Napoleon, in his old age, perseveres in his resolve for peace during the last twenty years of his life due to his "ever-increasing lassitude of body." This valetudinarian Napoleon parades his army and fleet as the expensive toys of his old age. Though infirm, Napoleon is sorely tempted to invade England during the last ten years of his life by the constant massacres and revolts in Ireland. His hatred of Papish tyranny flares forth in his demand on Spain for the abolition of the Inquisition, backed by threat of war. And none dares to propose to Napoleon the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope in Italy. But, to the end, Napoleon remains, as he has been in his youth, the enemy alike of the **ancien regime** and of democratic liberty. According to Trevelyan's speculation, Napoleon would have had Charles Albert, the leader of the clerical forces in Italy and Mazzini, the leader of the liberal forces, executed.

As the years pass by, the energies of Napoleon decrease and he scornfully delegates his powers to ministers more or less sympathetic to the elected legislature. He is indifferent as to who wields the powers so long as he himself cannot exercise them.

With great art and convincing verisimilitide, Trevelyan pictures for us the probable end of Napoleon had he won the battle of Waterloo. It was the evening of 4th June. 1836, Napoleon was presiding at one of his Councils of State with more than his habitual invalid's lethargy. He was sitting silent and distracted, his head sunken on his breast. But

suddenly on the mention of Italy, he looked up with fire in his eyes. "Italy!" he said: "we march tomorrow. The army of the Alps will deserve well of the Republic." Then more distractedly he murmured: "I must leave Josephine behind. She will not care." Evidently in the wandering mind of the Emperor, on the threshold of death, surge fragments and echoes of his youth when he had led the French Republican army into the plains of Italy. Besides, regret over his divorce of Josephine, whom he really loved, seemed to have taken deep roots in his heart. "He had often of late been talking thus of his first Empress, whom he seemed to imagine to be somewhere in the palace, but unwilling to see him." On hearing these words, the ministers, as usual, retired.

The rest of the story is told in the words of an imaginary character, M. Villebois, physican of the Imperial Household. Hearing an unmelodious voice, Villebois, who had been walking in the Tulieries, looked up. He then saw the Emperor standing in the balcony "with the lights behind him framing him like a picture The Emperor was singing, "in a voice of the most penetrating discord," the Marseillaise, the revolutionary hymn which he himself had banned. Fearing the worst, Villebois rushed upstairs and found the ministers and lackeys trembling outside the door. By the time he had pushed open the door, the noise had ceased. But the song sung by the Emperor had been caught by a drunken workman in the Rue de Rivoli who was singing it in a thundering voice. Villebois looked around the room, but could not see the

Emperor. Suddenly he saw Napoleon lying dead at his feet. He then heard the oaths of the workman as the police seized him.

2. The condition of Europe.

General.

If Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo, Europe would have undergone but slight change. The very existence of Napoleon on the French throne would have made maintenance of great standing armies necessary or at least execusable in England, Austria and the German states. Consequently revolution or internal reform would have been rendered impossible. The despotic governments of the old order would not only have been strengthened; but they would even have become somewhat popular as bulwarks against French aggression. Hatred of the "crowned Jacobin" would also have contributed to their popularity.

(a) England.

In England, the cost of maintaining an army and a fleet on a war footing, coupled with the economic blockade of England which Napoleon would have effected, would have brought about keen economic distress. The great army would have come in as a handy instrument for the Tory ministers to defy and suppress ruthlessly the reform movement with; Catholic Emancipation and the First Reform Bill would have been impossible. Shelley would have been incarcerated, Byron would have led a mob movement and been

executed. If reaction would have become triumphant, radicalism would have become violent. Even moderates like Tennyson would have been infected with revolutionary zeal. All the youth would have taken to radicalism and the older Whig creed would have been replaced by a demand for Universal Suffrage, put forth by Whigs and Liberals like Lord John Russel and Mr. Brougham. Grey would never have become Prime Minister. Radicals, excluded from the ancient universites of Oxford and Cambridge, would have established a separate university at Manchester. Starvation and repression would have been the order of the day. On the other hand the reform movement would have become aggressive. Byron and Shelley, the great revolutionaries would have been worshipped. In short England would have been submerged under reaction or violent revolution.

(b) Spain.

In Spain also, the continuance of Napoleon in power would have strengthened the old tyrannical order and liberals and free thinkers would have been extirpated ruthlessly. Perhaps Napoleon might have compelled the Spanish Government to abolish the Inquisition under threat of invasion; but that for which the Inquisition itself stood would have flourished. The reactionary government in England would fain have helped the government of Spain in resisting Napoleon's demand for the abolition of the Inquisition. But Trevelyan imagines that George Barrow, who distributed Protestant Bibles in Spain, would have been arrested and executed by the

reactionary government of a predominantly Catholic population.

(c) The Spanish American Colonies

Napoleon's victory at Waterloo would have meant that England would not have helped the Spanish American colonies in their revolt. On the contrary, the Tory English Government, on purely anti-Jacobin principles, would have even sent an army to suppress the revolt against the wishes of the British merchants who carried on a thriving trade with the Spanish American colonies. But since England would have needed all resources to police England, she could not have effectively aided the Spanish Government in putting down the revolt. Trevelyan imagines that this Spanish American colonies would have become the home of revolutionary exiles especially from England and Italy and fancies Murat leading the Gauchos of the Pampas and the Italian exiles in their guorilla war against the Spanish and the English forces. In this connection Trevelyan observes that the free and wild life of the political exiles in Pampas would have become a symbol and an inspiration for the youth of an enslaved Europe yearning for religious and political emancipation.

(d) Germany.

In Germany, as everywhere else, reaction would have triumphed if Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo. With the vast armies necessary to make France respect the Rhine frontier, the monarchs would have cheated the German people

of all hopes of union and liberty. By the process of "mediatization', the larger princes would have benefited at the expense of the smaller. The peasants of Prussia would not have been thrust back into serfdom, though they would have continued to derive the benefits of the reformed Civil Service and other reforms of the Napolenic regime prior to Waterloo. But all traces of the Code Napoleon would have been abolished; and the University and National movements would have been suppressed by Austria; Prussia would have obtained her share of Poland; the cries of the Poles and the Greeks for freedom would have gone unheeded. Only the Germans on the left bank of the Rhine would have been well governed: they would have been the quietest, the most contented and the most loyal subjects of Napoleon.

(e) France,

But the French would have been less easy to satisfy. The people would have claimed a greater measure of liberty and it would have been impossible to enforce that claim, except by violent means, if only Napoleon retained half of his old health and vigour. But his energies would have declined and he would have scornfully delegated, to democratically inclined ministers, powers which he would have found impossible to wield. Nevertheless, the censorship world have been rigid and an attempt at suppression of free thought in literature would have been made. But the censorship would have became feeble with the advancing

infirmity and illness of the ageing Napoleon. "Under these conditions of irritating but ineffectual repression", the spirit of free thought and liberty would have flourished as in the eighteenth century. "The Romantic movement undermined the Imperial idea with the intellectuals; "the breath of the Pampas" was felt in the quartier Latin. It was in vain that the police broke the busts of Byron and forbade plays in which the unities were violated".

Though the freedom movement would have acquired strength due to Napoleon's senility, it would not have been directed against Napoleon himself who would have let live the Liberals. The Revolution which would have gathered momentum would have been "rather a preparation for Napoleon's death than a very deliberate disloyalty to the man who had saved France from the *ancien regime*". The peasants and soldiers would have regarded the political and social condition of France as almost perfect. The soldiers would still have been the favourites of the Government. The peasants would surely have felt gratitude to Napoleon since they were indebted to him for the lands they tilled in peace and security. Besides, the religion of the vast majority would have been respected though the church would have been deprived of secular powers; the power of the State would not have disintegrated family life; and education would have been run by the State on scientific and military lines.

The only cause of complaint against Napoleonic rule after Waterloo would have been administrative and not

social, religious or administrative. The declining energies of autocratic Napoleon would have made the Imperial Service, accustomed to wait on his initiative, inefficient.

(f) Italy.

Napoleon's victory at Waterloo would have made Italian unity and freedom impossible. Austria would have managed to retain the Venetian province ; Sicily would have remained to the House of Bourbon and, due to the waning of British influence, the old methods of Sicilian despotism would have returned; and none would have dared to propose to the victorious Napoleon the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope.

The victory of Napoleon at Waterloo would also have meant the continuance of the **Code Napoleon**, and of the unifying influence of the French Imperial system. Government and education would have continued to enjoy freedom from clerical influence. The French dominance would have been hated and opposed both by the clerical forces of reaction and the liberal forces—the former represented by Prince Charles Albert of Savoy and the latter, by Mazzini. But these two kinds of forces would have been the deadliest enemies,—with the clerical forces plotting for the restoration of the **ancien regime** of Austria, the Pope and the Native Princes, and the liberal forces dreaming of an Italian Republic. Napoleon would have crushed both the movements and punished both the Savoyard prince and Mazzini with death : he would have been, as in his youth, the enemy alike of the **ancien regime** and of democratic liberty.

ESSAY.

A Critical appreciation of "If Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo", noting the underlying purpose of Trevelyan's Speculations.

It was as a result of the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo that liberty and liberalism triumphed everywhere. In England the Reform Bill and the Catholic Emancipation Bill were passed. England helped the Spanish American colonies in their revolt and recognized their independence. In Spain itself the liberal movements triumphed. In France, revolution broke out in 1830. Italy was ultimately united and free; and the German states became a unified state. But it should be remembered that the downfall of Napoleon was immediately followed by the triumph of despotism. The Holly Alliance dominated Europe; liberty was trampled down.

Trevelyan's imaginary picture of Europe is not, therefore, entirely the reverse of the reality. The idea behind Trevelyan's speculations seems to be that but for Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo, reaction and despotism would have taken deeper roots and that the British victory at Waterloo, if it did not ensure the success of liberalism, at least made it possible.

In general, Napoleon's victory at Waterloo would have necessitated the maintenance of armies and fleets of the

European nations on a war footing. These armies would have sustained despotism; and the threat of French invasion would have even made it popular. Consequently liberty and free-thought would have suffered much. In England, the Catholic Emancipation Bill and the Reform Bill would not have been passed. Grey would not have become Prime Minister. Repression would indeed have been so severe that Byron and Shelley would have become political martyrs—the former by being executed and the latter through incarceration. The gates of the ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge would have been barred against radicals and dissenters who would have founded the Manchester University. In short the conflict between the forces of reaction and liberalism would have been very sharp and constitutional progress would have been impossible. Consequently, liberals like Lord John Russel would have become radicals.

A reactionary government in England would have attempted at suppressing the Spanish South American colonies. In Spain liberal movements would have been ruthlessly suppressed. In Germany the national hopes of unity and liberty would have been defeated. In France, the revolution would have been deferred till the death of Napoleon. In Italy not only the clerical forces but also the forces of liberty would have been ruthlessly suppressed by Napoleon in alliance with Austria. Poland would have been partitioned among Austria, Russia and Prussia. And Greece would not have won independence from the Turk.

The speculations of Trevelyan are in the main probable and reveal a good sweep of historical imagination and a deep understanding of the currents and under-currents of English and European politics. The political incarceration of Shelley, the transplanation of Murat to the Pampas of Argentina, and above all the martyrdom of Byron in England are indeed fine strokes of historical imagination.

But the real piece of historical fiction in the essay is the picture we get of Napoleon. The evolution of the Napoleon of Peace has been superbly conceived. The reaction of Napoleon to the long shout for "Peace" that runs down the lines of his soldiers and the end of Napoleon with the Marseillaise on his lips constitute a masterpiece of characterisation. Such minute details as those as of the torrent of words Napoleon pours forth at Wellington with clenched fists and walking to and fro and of Napoleon muttering distractedly about Italy and Josephine on the eve of his death give verisimilitude to Trevelyan's picture of Napoleon, which is informed with deep and intimate knowledge of Napoleon's character and temper.

CLIO, A MUSE.

Introduction.

In this essay Trevelyan deals with the scope and function of history. Incidentally the question whether history is a science or an art is discussed in order to determine the character of history. Trevelyan maintains that history has no properly scientific value and that its purpose is educative. The three fold function of history is scientific, imaginative and literary. Trevelyan puts forth a passionate plea that history should not be divorced from literature under the pretext that history is a science. In order to substantiate his thesis that history too requires art, he gives us a "history of history."

The student can with profit compare Trevelyan's views on the relations between History and Literature towards the close of **History and Fiction.**

SUMMARY.

1. Is history a science or an art? Or the scientific and literary views of history.

During the last fifty years there have been great changes in the realm of history. Of these two have to be particularly noted. The first is that history has a far higher standing in higher education than before. Indeed, in universities history is fast driving the classics out of the field. But, as against this gratifying change, should be set the loss, by history, of its old popular influence. Far less people to-day read books of history than before. History has ceased to be part of the English national literature. This regrettable change was brought about by a few friends of history who proclaimed it a science. Among those who held this scientific view of history, Professor Seeley was the foremost. Historians like Carlyle and Macaulay, who have enjoyed vast audiences, have been dismissed contemptuously as mere literary historians, who are not reliable. History is thus to-day a "science" for specialists and no more "literature" for the common reader.

We are thus led to the question whether History is a science or an art. Trevelyan holds that the very application, to history, of the analogy of physical science is wrong. For, in the first place, accumulation of knowledge in history cannot have any utilitarian value as in science: no amount of historical knowledge can lead to the invention of the steam-engine. Secondly, there can be, in history, no deduction of

universal laws of cause and effect, as in science. For no historical event can be considered in isolation : it is inseparable from its circumstances which can never repeat themselves. It is forty years since the " literary historians " have been banished. And what " law " have the " scientific historians " discovered ? None. " Medea has successfully put the old man into the pot, but I fail to see the fine youth she has promised us".

History is something more than the mere accumulation of facts. And it is only the collection of facts and the shifting of evidence that are in some sense scientific. History is only in part a matter of ' fact '. After the facts have been collected, the historian has to interpret those facts. There can be nothing scientific in this interpretation of facts. For instance the facts of the French Revolution are comparatively well known. But it is impossible to deal scientifically with the psychology of the twety-five million and odd people who were involved in the French Revolution. It is only with the aid of sympathy and imagination that the historion can interpret his facts. The human mind cannot be dissected and analysed as the body. The interpretation of facts—the most important part of history—cannot be in the nature of a scientific deduction. It can only be " an imaginative guess at the most likely generalizations ".

Scientific deduction of causal laws is impossible when dealing with human affairs. Even if that were possible no one would be interested in it. It is in the deeds of our ancestors that we are interested rather than in the causes and effects

of those deeds. We are also eager to know what feelings and thoughts inspired our ancestors to act as they did. The first duty of the historion is, therefore, to tell the story. Of course, it is also his business to generalize and to guess as to cause and effect. But, as Travelyan puts it, the historian should do it modestly and not call it "science". History is, after all, in its unchangeable essence, "a tale". and the art of the narrative is the principal craft of the historian. "Round the story, as flesh and blood round the bone, should be gathered many different things—character-drawing, study of social and intellectual movements, speculations as to probable causes and effects, and whatever else the historian can bring to illuminate the past. *But the art of history always remains the art of narrative. That is the bed-rock*". The historian should tell the story in such a way as to make the past live again as vividly as the present. "Every true history must, by its human and vital presentation of events, force us to remember that the past was once real as the present and uncertain as the future". It is also the function of history to enable us to feel and experience the thoughts and feelings of your ancestors. "To recovery some of our ancestors' real thoughts and feelings is the hardest, subtlest and most educative function that the historian can perform". In short, the historian must possess—besides industry and knowledge—the art of making our ancestors live again in modern narrative. In interpreting the facts before him, the historian should display "the largest grasp of intellect, the warmest human sympathy, the highest imaginative powers".

If such be the character and function of history, it can never be a "science." The true value of history is not scientific but educative. The so-called "scientific" historians educate none but themselves. The true historian educates the public; he enables the common reader to imagine what his ancestors were like, trains his political judgement, widens the range of his sympathy and rouses his conscience. This great function cannot be discharged by the historian unless he has himself emotion and imagination which are banned by the "scientific" historians.

Carlyle had emotion and imagination, toleration and sympathy. That is why his presentation of the French Revolution is vivid with the colours of reality. His portraits of the leaders of the revolution are living ones. Carlyle did not employ cold analysis and conventional summings up. Scientific historians with more knowledge of facts understood Man less. Again, Carlyle found out that Cromwell was not a hypocrite, not by means of any deductive process but by means of imagination and sympathy. The scientific historians consider humour incompatible with "the dignity of history." But there are situations which can be treated usefully and truthfully only by seeing the fun of them. Carlyle has made good use of humour as illustrated by his description of the Anacharsis Clootz' Deputation of the Human Species to the French Assembly. But it should be remembered that Carlyle had his defects as a historian. He neglected, sometimes, the accumulation of facts and the proper shifting of evidence. The modern historian has to imitate only his imagi-

native and narrative qualities. Only at his very best Carlyle combined the requisities of the ideal historian — industry, knowledge, insight, sympathy and imagination ; his account of the eve of 10th August, in the Chapter called " The steeples at Midnight ", is an instance in point.

Besides Carlyle, Professor Pollard and Maitland have also made the past live by their imaginative treatment. Maitland has laid bare to us the legal side of the English mediaeval mind. Professor Pollard has made the Tudor times live again in his vivid narrative.

To sum up, it is wrong to talk of history as a science since knowledge of the past has no utilitarian value like science and since it cannot lend itself to scientific deduction of universal, causal laws. The function of history is to make the past live again in narrative. And that is impossible without imagination, insight, sympathy and a synthetic outlook. The value of history is not scientific but educational.

2. The educative value of history.

History can educate the minds of men by making them reflect upon the past. It can impress on us the great truth that the past was once as real as the present. It can also enable us to understand the real thoughts and feelings of our ancestors. " To recover some of our ancestors' real thoughts and feelings is the hardest, sublest and most educative function that the historian can perform." According to Trevelyan, there are various ways in which history can educate the mind.

The first educative effect of history is to remove prejudice. It trains the mind to take a larger and a more sympathetic view of political problems and to view our own age in its proper perspective. History may not change the political views of the reader. But it destroys the spirit of prejudice and improves his political temper and his way of thinking about politics. It enables the reader to understand, if not accept, ideals and policies which he would automatically reject if they came from his political opponent. This aspect of history — viz., curing a man of political prejudice — can well be called the political function of history. **Lecky's** Irish history and **Gardiner's History of the Civil War** enable us to understand the Unionists and the Home Rulers, the Royalists and the Roundheads, respectively.

The second educative function of history is the "presentation of ideals and heroes from other ages." Thus history not only removes prejudice but also breeds enthusiasm. It enables the average man to soar above the ordinary, everyday ideas which govern his life. The study of ancient history may create in his mind the desire to emulate the Spartan or the Roman. History also provides us with innumerable models for imitation in the great men of the past.

The third educative function of history is to enable the reader to fully understand and enjoy literature. To completely enjoy any great poet or writer, knowledge of the history of his age is essential. "For much of literature is allusion, either definite or implied". Some passages in Browning's

poetry—the last half-dozen stanzas of *Old pictures in Florence* or the fifth stanza of *Lovers' Quarrel*—cannot be understood unless we know something of the Europeon history of that day. And political authors are enjoyed " in exact proportion to the amount we know of the history of their times ".

Another educative function of history is to enrich the value, and to give a keener edge to the pleasure, of travel at home or abroad. To the physical beauty of the place we may visit, historical knowledge adds the wistful charm of old memories and associations. For instance, the garden front of St. Johns College, Oxford, is beautiful to every one. But it reminds the student of history vividly of the days—in the course of the Civil war—when Royalty, accompanied by the courtiers, trod the quadrangles in sorrow and disappointment since the tide of war had turned against them. History also intensifies the joy of battlefield hunting, which does not consist in merely identifying the positions taken up by the contending armies and in recalling the tactics employed. It is only if we know the moral issues involved in the war and the character of the men who fought that we can perfectly enjoy this hobby. History provides us with this knowledge. It is in this connection that Trevelyan discusses the importance of the Battle of Blenheim which saved Europe from the despotism of Louis XIII who had conquered Spain, Italy, Belgium and half Germany. It is a pity that Southey, in his poem *After Blenheim*, makes old Kaspar condemn that momentous battle as a useless waste of blood and treasure. In fact, Blenheim is as good a battle field as Waterloo. But

for the battle of Blenheim, the cause of freedom would have gone under and there would have been no French Revolution.

"Who would have listened to Voltaire and Rousseau, or even to Montesquieu, if Blenheim had gone the other way, and the Grand Monarch had been gathered in glory to the grave?"

Thus the study of history removes political prejudice, inspires us with high ideals, stimulates us to emulate the great men of the past, enables us to enjoy literature completely, and enriches the pleasures of travel and battlefield hunting.

3. The need for form in history.

History is both a science and an art. The element of science in history comes, not in the tracing of cause and effect, but in collecting and sifting evidence regarding facts. When the facts have been accumulated and the evidence sifted, the historian selects and classifies them and interprets them. This is the imaginative or speculative aspect of his work. Then follows the third and last aspect of his work—viz., the literary function. He has to clothe his exposition in an attractive form. The narrative has got to be powerful. The art of composition—arrangement, planning and style—is thus an integral and important part of the historian's function. History is art added to scholarship. It is not only the accumulation and interpretation of facts but it also involves the art of presentation and a good, limpid style. Very few historians have been able to do full justice to the scientific

and artistic aspects of history. Gibbon is one of those giants who have attained perfection in both. Every historian may not be able to equal Gibbon. But he should try and pay as much attention to form as to matter, as much to art as to science. Trevelyan advisedly calls this expository aspect of the historian's task " literature ", since literature itself stands to lose if it were to be divorced from scholarship and serious thoughts. And history will be useless unless it educates the minds of the readers by combining a pleasing and attractive form and sustained, magnificent narrative with accuracy of fact and exactness of argument.

4. The history of history.

The scientific view of history was imported from Germany. In Trevelyan's opinion the German methods will only drill British historians into so many " Potsdam Guards of learning ". They are certain to prove a strait-waistcoat to English faculties. The French have managed to combine with their native excellence in composition, the rigid German standard of research. English historians have to look to the free, popular literary traditions of history in their own land.

Clarendon was the father of English history. His *History of the Great Rebellion* was the first great historical work in England. In it he wrote of events in which he had himself played a part. This book was meant for the education and delight of all who could read. And it was a part of the national literature of the age. Though Clarendon was a royal partisan, the book was a source of knowledge and

inspiration for five generations of Whigs and Tories alike. The dignity of the author's mind and "the grave majestic eloquence of his style" made the book a great treasure-house. It not only gave a detailed account of the events but also taught men the art of politics and instilled into their minds a pride in their national institutions. For two hundred years, the tradition established by the *History of the Great Rebellion* lasted.

It was in the middle of the eighteenth century that historians began collecting evidence and writing of events outside their personal experience. The Clarendonian epoch of contemporary history and political memoirs was over. The age of antiquarian study had begun. Hume and Robertson belonged to this new movement of antiquarian study. And **Gibbon** was its culmination. His perfect genius united accuracy with art. But his chief defect as a historian was utter lack of emotion and imagination. In this respect, he was a typical child of his age—the age of reason and classicism.

Sir Walter Scott marks the transition from the classic to the romantic conception of history. He brought to bear upon his reconstruction of the past his Shakespearean sympathy and imagination. This novelist did more to history than any professional histroian. He made mankind realise that history was not a mere accumulation of facts, to be coldly analysed and to be generalized upon. His novels taught historians that history should re-create the past in all its vividness and complexity. "The great antiquarian and

novelist showed historians that history must be living, many —coloured, and romantic if it is to be a true mirror of the past."

Macaulay was not slow to learn the lesson taught by Scott. He belonged to the Victorian Age, which was a golden age for all sorts of literature due to the spread of education. Of the historians of this period Carlyle and Macaulay stand foremost. Carlyle possessed imagination and insight though he sometimes neglected the accumulation of facts and the siftling of evidence. It is to this period that the following historians belonged: Motley, Froude, Lecky, Green, Leslie Stephen, and others.

In this connection, Trevelyan gives us a rather detailed estimate of Macaulay as a historian. His *History of England* was "an education in patriotism, humanity and statesmanship." "The book made men proud of their country, it made them understand her institutions, how they had come into existence and how liberty and order had been won by the wear and tear of contending factions," In presentation and arrangement—in the artistic transition from subject to subject, from paragraph to paragraph—there is none to equal Macaulay's *History of England.* Macaulay has been accused of whig partisanship. But his whiggism meant nothing more than his belief in religious toleration and parliamentary government. His views were indeed those of a moderate free-trade unionist of the present day. Far from being partial to the whigs, Macaulay frequently falls foul of them.

For instance, modern historians are agreed that Macaulay's onslaught on the founder of the whig party—Lord Shaftesbury —is unfair. Thus Macaulay's judgment went wrong, not on account of his "whiggism", but due to his simple hearted hatred of knavery and wickedness, wherever they were to be found. Besides, love of antithesis and colourful contrast and vivid portrayal often led him to exaggerations. In his desire to contrast the selfishness with the greatness of Marlborough, Macaulay painted in rather too thick colours the former. But before he could touch upon the greatness of his subject, Macaulay died. "If Macaulay had lived another five years, Marlborough would now enjoy the full meed of admiration and gratitude still denied to him by his countrymen's little knowledge of what he did". Macaulay's errors as an historian originated, neither from political prejudice nor from lack of learning, but from too much reliance on his marvellous memory, the limitation of his intellectual outlook and his bad habit of attributing motives.

By the time of Macaulay's death, the foundations of the English historical tradition, begun by Clarendon, seemed to have been fairly laid. History has become popular and a part of the national literature, "The foundations of a broad, national culture based upon knowledge of our history and pride in England's past, seemed to have been securely laid". The next generation of historians had but to continue and improve upon that tradition. But they destroyed the foundations and, by proclaiming history to be a science and the concern of a few experts, at one stroke deprived history of popular

support. These scientific historians declared that Macaulay and Carlyle were merely "literary historians", who were "unsound" and who had been "exposed". Consequently, the public, already feeling the temptation of light and frivolous literature, ceased to read history. It should be borne in mind that subsequent discoveries can only disprove facts and *not* opinions. So there is no meaning in condemning the literary historians on the ground that their *views* have been exploded. The new scientific school of historians swears by dispassionateness. But in the name of dispassionateness, zeal, the sense of art and ethical passion should not be banned. It is not enough for a historian to be merely fair and accurate. He should also go into the heart of his subject and infect us with enthusiasm for it. Creighton's account of Luther though fair and accurate, fails to give us an idea of the greatness of Luther whereas Carlyle's portrait of Luther is vivid. Again, Lord Acton was a great historian on account of the zeal with which he held his opinions. He was not dispassionate in the narrow sense of the word; indeed, "his lectures were dramatic performances, with surprises, limelights and curtains."

Due to the pseudo-scientific view of history, it has ceased to interest the public, to influence and form the ideas of the new age. In the place of history, people now read cheap journalism purveying gossip and scandal. Fortunately, glib condemnation of literary historians is no longer the fashion. The spread of education has produced a great number of people who know how to read but not what to read, and

who are thirsting for knowledge in an attractive form. In order to make the best use of this new audience, history is taught at schools and universities, the Workers. Educational Association has been formed, and short outline books are being prepared. Trevelyan hopes that those who write the main historical books will write it as literature, beautiful and attractive in form, and fit for the general public. The historian should expend as much attention and skill on the art of narrative as on research.

Note:—Questions on this essay may be framed around the sub-headings in the summary.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF HISTORY.

Introduction.

This Inaugural Lecture delivered at Cambridge in 1927 by Trevelyan covers much the same ground as *Clio, A Muse,* written twentythree years earlier. Of the latter Trevelyan says : " When that essay came out in a magazine...it was a youthful rebel. For all its crudity I think I will send it out again to parade the streets a little longer with its flag of revolt, but in company with a kind and elderly policeman, my Inaugural Lecture of 1927 ".

Clio, A Muse is a passionate protest againt the petrification of history by dubbing it a science. When he wrote it, Trevelyan did not have the authority and weight which he had when he delivered the Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor. Hence *Clio, A Muse* is called a youthful rebel whereas the Inaugural Lecture is termed " a kind and elderly policeman." And the views of Trevelyan on the fundamentals have not changed.

SUMMARY.

Prof. Seeley. When Trevelyan came to the Cambridge University as a freshman in 1893, he had the privilege of being taught by Sir John Seeley, who had succeeded Charles Kingsley as professor in 1869. He was a great publicist as well as historian; he propagated his own political doctrine, supporting it with arguments and illustrations drawn from history. "Such political interests may be the inspiration or the poison of historical work, according to circumstances. Often they are both inspiration and poison at once." Fortunately in Seeley's case, they proved only an inspiration. His lectures on *The Expansion of England* expanded the scope of history and aroused the men of his day to a consciousness of their imperial responsibilities. But Seeley set a dreary limitation to history by defining it as "past politics." This mistaken definition of history leads Trevelyan to a discussion of the scope of history.

The Scope of history.

History is the truth about the past. If rightly read or taught, it is a noble education to the human mind not only in politics but in all kinds of human relationship, ideals and aspirations. It cultivates an intelligent patriotism free from jingoism and makes of men better party men. "History does not make men Guelphs or Ghibellines. But if rightly studied it makes them better Guelphs or better Ghibellines,"

The value of history is, therefore, educative. It lies in the training of the student's mind by the dispassionate study of the past. It follows that " History cannot rightly be used as propaganda even in the best of causes." History is the open Bible. The historian should not presume to interpret it infallibly. Even if historians were to set up a claim of infallibility, the divisions and differences of opinion among them would soon destroy that claim. The so-called " verdict of history " is a myth. There can be no finality about the human affairs belonging to the past. The "verdict of history" changes from age to age and country to country on one and the same question, such as the English Reformation or the Industrial Reformation. This is inevitable since there is no infallible guide to just historical judgments. " Learning is indeed a necessary condition to the discovery of historical truth, but it is no infallible guide to just historical judgments." The most learned historians hold divergent views: there can be no unanimity among them. The student of history has to read as many books as possible, reflect upon them and form an opinion for himself. And the truth about the past emerges slowly and partially because there are many historians, correcting and supplementing one another. There being no such thing as a final " verdict of history ", the many-sided and complex truth about the past is being slowly unravelled by various processes and various types of historians. It is not only the cold, detached and dispassionate historian who helps us to discover the past but also the historian endowed with passion and sympathy. Carlyle and Gardiner belong to the

latter category: with their intellectual passion and sympathy, they have discovered for us the truth about the English Puritan era and about the character of Cromwell. The past was full of passion and passion is therefore one element in historic truth. Sympathy is a necessary part of understanding."

History stirs our imagination when we remember that far more is lost in oblivion than what we have discovered about the past. The past can never be reconstructed in all its richness and variety. As Travelyan puts it: "On the shore where Time casts up its stray wreckage we gather corks and broken planks, whence much indeed may be argued and more guessed; but what the great ship was that has gone down into the deep, that we shall never see". And the usual text-books, with their cut-and-dried divisions of eras and movements, rob history of its imaginative appeal and diminish the vastness, richness and variety of the past. History of the highest order is nourished by original documents, old letters and diaries—such as Pepys' diary and Hickey's memoir — and by great histories by remarkable writers like Maitland.

History must, therefore be many-sided, because human life is itself complex and various. Prof. Seeley was wrong in treating of history as "past politics". Past politics were but the outward form and expression of past religion, economics, religion, jurisprudence and social life. Politics cannot be studied in isolation. A purely political history is bound to

suffer from a sense of unreality and dryness. A purely political narrative of the struggle of the king and parliament in England, a purely ecclesiastical life of Backet, Calvin, or Laud, read like the chronicles of Cloud-Cuckoo-Land. For purposes of convenience we divide the historical material at our disposal into various departments—political, economic, and ecclesiastical. But to reconstruct the past in all its richness, we have to reassemble the parts. No one branch of history can be studied in isolation. For instance social history is the connecting link between economic and political history. Social history pertains to everyday things in the past—the manners and customs, the dress and the mode of life. Sir Walter Scott was the first to lay emphasis on this important aspect of history. His historical novels gave to history the realism and variety of actual life to the records of the past. It was he who first taught us to think of our ancestors as real human beings with passions and absurdities like our own." Inspired by the writings of Scott, Macaulay took a keen interest in the everyday life of his ancestors. In the third chapter of his *History*, he powerfully drew the attention of historians to the social life of the past.

It is the purpose of history to lay bare the truth about the past. It must be as many-sided since human life is itself many-sided. It is concerned with every activity of man. To discharge his function properly, the historian must have not only knowledge and industry but also insight, sympathy and imagination. The appeal of history is, in the last

analysis, poetic. History is imagination pursuing the fact of the past and fastening upon it. It impresses us with the reality of the past.

The contribution of Cambridge to the development of history under lord Action and Prof. Bury.

During the last years of Seeley's professorship Cambridge was taking a great step forward in the development of economic and legal history. Due to the efforts of Cunningham economic history was being made a university subject, and "the genius of Maitland was beginning to shine in upon old legal papers and muniment-rooms on which the dust of six centuries had been allowed to collect." But History had not come into her own yet in the university. The classics, mathematics and science dominated the university studies and the students of history were very small in number.

Just at that time when the transference of a great number students from the classics to history could have been prophesied, Lord Acton was sent to the university as Professor in 1895. The subsequent splendid development of Cambridge history was not due to Acton alone. The History School benefited by the services of many men. Nevertheless the coming of Acton at that juncture proved of first rate importance. He came to the university with the reputation of a great scholar. He had won laurels in many an old European controversy The news of his appointment as Professor created a stir in the university. Though reserved by nature, Acton was ever

ready to show personal kindness and give individual advice and encouragement to every genuine student of history. With the great Acton as their head, the history students learned to hold their heads high. Summing up the debt of the Cambridge History School to Acton's leadership, Trevelyan observes: "The Cambridge History School was destined in any case to become a big school, but it was largely owing to his arrival at that critical moment that it became a great school."

In 1902 Acton was succeeded by Professor Bury. Bury was unrivalled for the vastness and accuracy of his knowledge of the history of many races and lands. He wrote far more than Acton. Width of outlook and a keen sense of the drama of history were Acton's unique merits: "In Acton there was a width of outlook on the drama of history, a deep insight into the effect of principles upon action and of ideas upon events, a sense of great issues and their significance, a passionate feeling about right and wrong which often flared up from under his dignified and reserved manner of speech." These two men endowed with such diverse gifts and temperaments had one peculiarity in common—viz., the value they attached to freedom of opinion.

Bury held the professorship for quarter of a century and "the Cambridge History School grew up, from the vigorous sapling that Acton tended, into the tree with many stong branches". The *Cambridge Histories* initiated by Lord Acton continue to be issued

and these volumes cover a wide field. In Anglo-Saxon history Cambridge leads. The Diplomatic and Colonial Documents transferred to Cambridge from the Public Record Office in London constitute valuable material for research workers. Cambridge men have made great contributions to the revival of naval history. Economic history and legal history continue to be nourished. Cambridge has now the brilliant School of Political Economy founded by Alfred Marshal.

The Cambridge History School now occupies a position of national importance. History attracts a far larger number of students than any other branch of the humanites, Indeed, in the friendly rivalry between the humanities and the sciences history holds the balance even between the two. But for history scientific study would have far outstripped the humanities. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the classics combined great literature with great history. To-day the classics no longer hold the place which they once held, in university studies. Therefore the responsibilities of historians and teachers of history are greater than ever before.

A few thoughts on the teaching and writing of history.

The use of history is not material but educative. It educates the mind, stimulates thought or intensifies intellectual emotion. History can make people wiser and give them intellectual pleasure of a very high order. There is always the danger that historians may spend too much time and

energy on gathering facts and not enough on bringing out the interest latent in the facts.

In universities the young student must be made to feel that history is at once a stimulation and a satisfaction of intellectual curiosity; that it is a process of thought, not a mere learning by rote". And the books prescribed should be of high intellectual or literary merit. The success of a history school should be tested by the number of students who in after-life read history for pleasure. Lastly, the student of history, like the student of literature, should be steeped in the tradition of English history. English historians have a splendid heritage. The historians of the past cannot be neglected, since old modes of historical thought may act as a corrective to the present day ones. "The doctrine of the permanent value of great historians was finely enforced by Bury when he re-edited Gibbon, to help keep him in use for modern students." Besides the books written by the great historians, contemporary memoirs such as those of Clarendon and magnificient political controversies such as those conducted by Milton or Burke constitute the heritage of the English historian. "Can a man be said to have had a liberal education if he has never read some at least of the nobler passages in Clarendon?"

As regards the writing of history, the importance of research needs no proof or emphasis. In Cambridge the ablest of young men are given every facility and encouragement to engage in original work immediately after they get

their degree. Experiments in research should be done while one is young. Hence Trevelyan's remark: "Authors should sow their wild oats young. Some wild oats, indeed, like Bryce's University Prize Essay, *The Holy Roman Empire*, bring forth a hundredfold of excellent grain." In Cambridge the older men help the younger students. Lord Acton gave help and encouragement to so many. It is to foster such personal relations between the more experienced men and the younger ones that the Cambridge University Historical Society exists. Outside the university, the young historian gets the willing help of the officials of the British Museum, the Record Office, or the Bodleian Library. Above all, the young historian must depend upon his own mother-wit and initiative.

To-day the universities stand in closer relation to the writing of history than ever before. The reading public for the historian is not confined to a leisured, well-educated and not over-learned aristocracy. It now consists of clever persons of all classes, among whom are schoolmasters and university trained men. They demand that historical works should not merely be learned but also attractive in form. Some historians have written two books on the same subject, one for the learned and another for the general public. "But perhaps the highest ideal of history will always remain the volume that satisfies both the learned and the general reader." The historian has, therefore, to spend as much labour on form as on research. In the words of Trevelyan; "Let the science and research of the historian find the fact, and let his imagination and art make clear its significance."

POOR MUGGLETON AND THE CLASSICS.

Introduction.

In this essay, Trevelyan criticises, in a playful manner, through the medium of a mouthpiece he has invented, the methods of teaching the classics in the schools. Trevelyan is strongly for the preservation of the classical tradition. His only grievance seems to be that the study of the Greek tragedies is insisted upon in schools in too early a stage; and that the task of translating English into Greek verse is futile torture. Muggleton is presented as a failure in classical studies in the schools. But there is no doubt that his admiration for classical works and the relics of the past glory of Greece is genuine. This is an indirect attack on the methods of classical training in schools.

SUMMARY.

Defective mode of classical training.

During the eight years of his secondary education, Muggleton was drilled and trained in Greek and Latin. Now Muggleton can read Latin fairly fluently. But he cannot understand the Greek writers and he needs the help of Bohn's translations. This is due to the fact that, at school, he was asked to study the Greek tragedy when he had not learnt to appreciate even the literature of his own country. It was no wonder, therefore, if the Greek tragedies did not produce on him the cathartic effect mentioned by the critics. To him Hecuba, the tragic character created by Euripides, seemed a silly old fool. Muggleton was also asked, in school, to translate English into Greek verse. He did the work by finding out from the dictionary the Greek equivalents for the English words and so arranged them as to answer the requirements of metre. This mechanical way of doing the task did him no good and he learnt nothing about Greek prosody. The defect with the classical training given in schools is that it is antediluvian. The method followed now is the one originally introduced by Erasmus in the fifteenth century for the purpose of training scholars to edit Greek and Roman authors. (This reminds one of the present system of education in India introduced by Macaulay to produce clerks for the East India Company).

Muggleton finds some consolation in the recent reform according to which boys are asked to begin their study of Greek tragedy only when they reach their eleventh or twelfth year.

Muggleton's genuine love of Greek culture and civilization.

Though a failure in the classics according to antiquated scholastic standards, Muggleton has a genuine love for Greek literature and the ruins of Greece. Whenever possible he is in the habit of sneaking off to Greece to see and to be thrilled by the monuments and ruins of Greece. In the summer of 1913 he went to Greece under the pretext of visiting the Balkans. He chose the hot season since there would be no crowd of tourists then.

Muggleton's account of this trip to Greece conclusively proves his love of and devotion to the classics. Standing on the balcony of his hotel in Salonika, Muggleton enjoyed the view of Olympus across the Aegean sea. The sight reminded him of what he had read about Xerxes in Herodotus. His mind travelled further back into the past when the Greek race should have first been thrilled by the sight of this mountain. Later, on his way to Athens, Muggleton was haunted by memories of the famous Battle of Thermopylae in which Leonidas and his small band Spartans covered themselves with imperishable glory. On reaching Athens, Muggleton scaled the Acropolis and spent a full hour all alone in the Parthenon, admiring and contemplating its architecture

and the specimens of Greek sculpture still to be seen in it. After the Parthenon, Muggleton visited the Erechtheum. And throughout his stay Muggleton was rapturously identifying the places he had read about in school in the Greek classics—the Pnyx, the Parthenon, the theatre of Dionysius and the Areopagus. He was delighted with the harmony of the whole scene. And he wondered how this cradle of European civilization had been neglected for over 1200 years by humanity.

THE NEWS OF RAMILIES.

Introduction.

This fantasy is a splendid specimen of historical fiction. Trevelyan himself has postulated in *History and Fiction* that the historical novelist should be equipped with sound antiquarian knowledge and imagination. The function of historical fiction is to make the past live. *The News of Ramilies* admirably fulfils this function and Trevelyan has displayed, in this fragment of historical fiction, a thorough knowledge of the past and a powerful imagination. It attempts to give a glimpse of University life early in the eighteenth century when party feeling ran so high that they were felt even within the cloisters of the university. The historical setting for the fantasy consists of Marlborough's victory at Ramilies in 1706 in the course of the War of the Spanish Succession ; and of such real personages as the Queen, the Duke of Marlborough, Sir Isaac Newton and Richard Bentley. Tom Slippers, his friend Smithers, Lord Jacobus Towrow and the Earl of Kingsdown Charteris are fictitious characters. Smithers is the conscientious Tory while Tom Slippers is a poor parson's son trained to live an austere life and to hate the Whigs. The snobbishness, cowardice, weakness for wine and high spirits of Tom Slippers are purely individual characteristics. The Lord and the Earl are typical Tory and Whig respectively. Besides

vividly picturing the rivalry among colleges and the fanaticism of the political parties, Trevelyan has also made use of words and constructions peculiar to the 18th century in order to achieve verisimilitude. Above all, the designation of Tom Slippers as the future curate to the Vicar of Bray is most happy. Simon Aleyn, the Vicar of Bray, is celebrated in English literature for his genius for adopting his religious principles to the disposition of the ruling monarch. He managed to retain his position through the reigns of Henry the VIII, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth. His motto was "Whatsoever King shall reign, I'll be the Vicar of Bray, Sir!" At the very outset we are led to expect that Tom Slippers will compromise with his Tory convictions.

SUMMARY.

On the morning of the 27th of May, 1706, Tom Slippers was surprised to find the Master himself conducting the service at the College Chapel. He later learnt that news of Marlborough's victory at Ramilies had been brought at midnight by an outrider of Lord Godolphin, the Lord Treasurer. Due to the insistence of his friend, Smithers, Slippers for once made an exception to his habit of drinking water at breakfast. In honour of the victory of Marlborough, the two students drank ale.

Tom Slippers and Smithers went out for a walk after breakfast and they happened to meet the Whig Earl of Kingsdown Charteris. Slippers thought of avoiding the earl since his lordship was in the habit of punning upon his curious name and of asking him (Slippers) whether the cobbler did not pinch his feet. But on this occasion his lordship politely took off his hat and asked him whether he was not for the honest party (viz., the whigs) and "Goddam—the-French-King" Flattered by the unusual politeness of his lordship, Tom Slippers replied, "Yes, my lord." And his lordship thereupon invited Slippers to the drinking party to be held that night to celebrate the English victory at Ramilies. When his lordship was gone, Smithers rebuked Slippers and asked him whether he had become a Whig and a Methodist. Slippers warmly defended himself by saying that he was for

Church and State as a Tory but that he was for "Goddam-the-French-King" too since he detested the French monarch. He added. A plague on your parties, that an honest fellow cannot go about his business, no, nor so much as get his curacy, without this party give it to him and that party try to take it from him.

That night Tom Slippers shut himself up in his room and bolted the door. He was afraid that the Whig students would bodily remove him and compel him to join their festivities. But when he heard them knocking and kicking against the door, Slippers opened the door, fearing, as he says, that the door and his print of King Charles would be damaged by the uproarious Whig crowd! Perhaps the real fact was that cowardice prompted him to open the door.

When Tom Slippers went down to the quadrangle he found all the students, excepting the stricter sort of Tories, assembled there. Whenever the faces of these Tories were seen there was hissing and hooting. The Earl of Kingsdown Charteris too was there. He went to the length of suggesting that the Tory Lord Jacabus Towrow be put under the pump. At about nine o'clock the tables were set in the quadrangle and wine flowed. Every one who passed that way was compelled to drink Whig toasts. Tom Slippers, who was liberal to himself in the matter of drinking wine, got very merry and marched with the rest of the crowd, giving three cheers for the Duke of Marlborough or Lord Godolphin under the windows of the Tories. Occasionally the Tory inmates

poured hot water on the crowd. The roisterers then stopped under Sir Isaac Newton's rooms and gave him three cheers; but the great philosopher. though he was a Whig, did not come out. After that the crowd stopped before the Master's Lodge and gave him three cheers. Tom Slippers did not join the shout since he had been given to understand, by his tutor, that the Master was but a poor scholar. Master Bentley did not take any action against the crowd for disturbing the peace of the College when he learnt that it was a Whig crowd.

The crowd now marched round singing the song made for the army of "The British Grenadiers." Then they sang a ribald song about the Pope, the Devil and the Jacobites. Though Tom Slippers was a Tory, he could not help remembering the song since it was a merry one. When he returned to his garret, Smithers bitterly asked him whether he was a Whig and a Dissenter to have joined the revelry. Tom Slippers retorted that Smithers was a Papist.

The after-effect of these revelries was that Tom Slippers was late for the Chapel the following morning.

THE MIDDLE MARCHES.

Introduction.

Till the accession of James I in 1603, the history of the relations between Scotland and England is one of bitter and bloody war between the two countries. Again and again England tried in vain to subjugate the hardy and freedom -loving Scots. And marauding bands of Scottish robbers periodically crossed the Border, drove away the cattle and laid waste the land. Therefore, the history of the Border Country constitutes a colourful chapter in British history. Life on the Scottish side of the Border has been celebrated by Sir Walter Scott in his poems and novels. Trevelyan has chosen the to treat of the English side of the Border. The English Border was divided for administrative and military purposes into the East, Middle and West Marches. The Middle Marches is the theme of Trevelyan's essay. It is the aim of the author to depict life in the Middle Marches in the time of the Border warfare—especially during the sixteenth century. Trevelyan tries to get at the reason why our cultured and commercialised age finds an irresistible fascination in the life led by the wild, thieving, cut-throat population of the Border country. These savage people were lovers of poetry; nay, they were poets in their own way. They have given us the immortal Ballads and it is these Ballads that have cast a spell over their bloody feuds and predatory excursions. With them life was but a game with Death, which they played according to certain rules of chivalry. Hence it is that there is nothing of the sordid even about the most brutal murders committed by them.

SUMMARY.

1. Northumberland: the land of the far horizons.

It is the horizon rather than the dome of the sky that is usually rich with the glories and beautiful shapes of massed clouds, crimson with the splendour of the rising or setting sun. These glories of cloudland are denied to the climber on the hillside, who, however, commands distant prospects. The walker on the fen country can see the clouds on the far horizon but he cannot command far views. It is only in Northumberland, as one walks all day on the long ridges, that both heaven and earth are seen. It is the land of the far horizons. There we have far views of moor and valley and we can watch the clouds drifting along the horizon. The ground between us and the horizon consists partly of heather but mainly it is moorland which the ballad-writers called the "bent." The vast distances, the unadorned and austere moorland, the solitude and the solemn stillness broken only by the purling streams, and the ever-present horizon rich with cloud shapes cast a melancholy but meditative spell on us. The great silence and the grand distance give us an undefinable satisfaction. Peace and beauty reign supreme. But the bones of a sheep here and there grimly remind us of the eternal law of Death. Indeed, in the days of Border warfare, skeletons, not only of sheep, but also of men, were found in the moorland.

By far the best view can be had from a ridge two miles south-east of Elsdon. Winter's Gibbet is quite an important landmark. On this wooden gibbet, erected as late as 1791, the corpse of a tramp named Winter was hanged. In the days of the heroic Border thieves, there was a stone cross in the place of the wodden gibbet. It was then called Sting Cross. The view from Winter's Gibbet covers the whole of the Middle Marches.

2. The Middle Marches.

The English Border was divided for administrative and military purposes in to the East, Middle and West Marches. The Middle Marches comprised Redesdale, North Tynedale, and upper Wansdeck and Coquetdale.

3. Social life in the Middle Marches towards the close of the Border Warfare.

"Two long reports of Royal Commissioners one in 1542 and another in 1550, give a minute and fascinating account of the society of these districts towards the close of the long centuries of Border warfare, early in the period celebrated by *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*".

The most formidable and frequent raids in the Middle Marches were made, not by the Scots, but by the English robbers of North Tynedale and Redesdale. The reason was that the inhabitants of these two valleys, cut off from the rest of Northumberland by the high Moorland rampart

crowned by the sting Cross, bore the brunt of the Border warfare. The soil was barren. Hence a considerable portion of the population of these two valleyes lived by raiding the neighbouring valley of Coquetdale, which was more fertile and less exposed to Border warfare. The raiders were in close league with those of Scottish Liddesdale. Of the two valleys, North Tynedale was more entirely given to thieving and less addicated to agriculture than Redesdale. Tynedale "wore a martial and barbarous appearance". The ways and passages were in many places blocked with huge trees. There were many narrow and dangerous paths to trap and puzzle the stranger. And the houses were built in positions of natural security; the walls were of strong oak; and the roofs were covered with turf and earth.

The men of these districts knew no other loyalty than the loyalty towards their clan "They united for raids into foreign territory; but they stained their native valley with the blood of intestine feuds. The most famous of these is celebrated in *The Ballad of Percy Reed*....."

Coquetdale was comparatively more sheltered from Border warfare than North Tynedale and Redesdale. Besides, the soil was fertile. The inhabitants of this valley, were law-abiding people. The northern part of this valley, known as Kidland Lee, was the most beautiful part of the English Border and it contained good pasture for sheep. But no one dared to live there for fear of the Scots and the men of Redesdale. Only in summer time did the men of

Coquetdale take their sheep to Kidland Lee. Even this could not be done in times of war with the Scots or when the men of Redesdale were in an evil humour. It was in Coquetdale that the keeper of Redesdale had his headquarters; for he dared not live in the turbulent valley entrusted to his charge. Harbottle Castle was his headquarters. Similarly, the keeper of North Tynedale had his headquarters at a safe distance—viz. Chipchase Castle in the upper Wansbeck valley. Since the State could not efficiently police the two "thieving valleys", an elaborate system of watch and ward was devised. In Henry VIII 's time two horsemen were stationed at passages and fords. But the raiders easily avoided these watchmen. It was only when they returned with large droves of cattle as their booty, that they met with difficulties. The watchmen were expected to rouse the population and give chase to the raiders. "The first social and political duty of the English and Scottish Borders was to "to follow the fray" —that is, to mount at a moment's notice and ride in pursuit of plunderers." But people did not always follow the fray out of personal affection for their neighbours. Often they expected monetary rewards as we learn from "riding" ballads like *Jamie Telfer*.

Why is it that our cultured and commercialised society is keen on collecting the relics of these cut-throats? Saying that Scott has celebrated them in his poems and novels is no answer; for the question arises as to why he did so. Lawlessness and cruelty, murder and robbery, can be had among any barbarous people. The peculiarity of the Border life

which Scott celebrated was its Ballads. "It was not one ballad maker alone, but the whole cut-throat population who felt this magnanimous sorrow, and the consoling charm of the highest poetry". In other words, these lawless and savage people of the world loved poetry and song. Many of the popular ballards, celeberating real incidents, have reached us because they were handed down from generation to generation by oral tradition. They were sung by shepherds and farm - girls to each other at the milking.

"The Border Ballards, for good and for evil express this society and its quality of mind as well and truly as the daily press and the music - hall stage express that of the majority of town - dwellers of to - day". A tense poetic strain and a deep melancholy characterise these Border Ballards. The best Border Ballards are the most tragic. This is appropriate since conditions of life in the Border were most precarious: violent death dogged the footsteps of man due to the Border warfare, the internecine feuds and above all the violent and unrestraimed passions of these wild and savage people. Unlike the lover in the South English ballards, the lover in the Border Ballard has no chance of "living happily ever afterwards" as illustrated in the *Original Lochinvar*. And it is significant that most of these ballards make no mention of the unhappy lovers meeting in heaven. Seeking no consolation from a belief in an after-life, the borderers had no political or social idea on this earth. They just lived spontaneously, swayed by

elemental passions conscious of an inexorable Fate, and pitying the lot of the unhappy victims of their own cruelty. That is why even, their most wicked and horrible stories are not sordid but tragic; we are awed, but not repulsed, when the lover of Helen of Kirkonnel hacks to pieces his rival whose shot has erringly killed Helen and bewails:

I hacked him into pieces sma',
For her sake that died for me.

I wish I were where Helen lies!
Night and day on me she cries,
And I am weary of the skies,
For her sake that died for me."

The people of the Border country were undoubtedly savage people. But they were great-souled people. They lived spontaneously. "Their life was a game with Death, in which each in turn was sure soon to pay forfeit; it was played according to certain rules of family honour, varied and crossed by lovers' passions. All classes of a sparse population joined in this game with Death, and relished it as the poetry and breath of life." It is this attitude of the Border people to life as if it were a game, played according to certain rules of honour and chivalry and subject to chance, that invests their life with a grandeur and a glamour not to be had in our civilized life with its ideals and vested interests and safety-

valves of a future life and a heaven. How can we withold our admiration from Douglas who crossed the Border, burnt Northumberland and Durham and waited for Harry Percy whom he had challenged? Military considerations would have urged him to go away. But chivalry and love of the game compelled him to wait for his enemy at the risk of his life. Such utter disregard of life is not only great but poetic and romantic and it gives the clue to the fascination Border Life had for Scott and still has for us.

The conclude with the words of Trevelyan: "Like the Homeric Greeks, they were cruel, coarse savages, slaying each other as the beasts of the forst; and yet they were also poets who could express in the grand style the inexorable fate of the individual man and woman, and infinite pity for all the cruel things which they none the less perpetually inflicted upon one another". "The sense of human life, its passions, its love, its almost invariable tragedy, seem the abiding thoughts of this savage but great-souled people."

4. Later history of the Middle Marches.

The Ballads have long since ceased to represent Border life. They were long ago superseded by Burns and the Bible. In the eighteenth century we find that a majority of the Border people are Dissenters. Their religion is the result of neither reasoning nor fervour. It is merely handed on

from father to son. They are now a fine, law-abiding people. They are yet free from any taint of vulgarity. It is now difficult to say how far the inhabitants of Redesdale are descendants of the Englishmen of the sixteenth century and how far of Scottish immigrants.

Question.

Give an account of life in the Middle Marches in the great Border days and point out the reason why it fascinates us.

Answer.

Reproduce section 3.

ANNOTATIONS.

N. B.— Remember that every annotation should be an essay in miniature, a piece of writing, intelligible in itself.

It is unnecessary to state at the outset of every annotation the author's name and the title of the selection from which the passage in question has been taken. The contest can be fixed without such a statement. Lastly, as far as possible, comment and elucidation of allusion should not stand apart but should be an integral part of the answer.

A careful study of the summaries will enable the student to locate most of the important passages suitable for annotation. Many of such passages have been incorporated in the body of the summaries. By no means exhaustive, the following annotations are intended to serve as models.

WALKING.

1. **Nursery lore tells us that "Charles I walked and talked: half-an-hour after his head was cut off" Mr. Sidgwick evidently thinks that it was a case not merely of *post hoc* but *propter hoc*, an example of summary *but just punishment*,** **(Page 4.)**

Unlike Mr. Sidgwick, who congletely bans company and talk during walks, Trevelyan maintains that genial talk is essential during week-end walks. There is the miracle story, told in nurseries, that Charles I walked and talked half-an-hour after his head was cut-off. Trevelyan humorously remarks Mr. Sidgwick would have considered the execution of Charles I an instance of just and speedy punishment for walking and talking at the same time which seems nothing less than a crime in Mr. Sidgwick's opinion.

The reference to the fallacy in logic—*post hoc ergo propter hoc* (after this, therefore, on account of this) should not be taken seriously for Charles I walked and talked *after* his execution and thus the punishment seems to have preceded the crime. Trevelyan's attempt at humour is laboured.

2. **Pan would not have appeared to Pheidippides on the road** **(Page 10.)**

While discussing the comparative merits of road-walking and cross-country walking, Trevelyen makes this remark.

The road may be invaluable for pace and swing. The road-walker can cover considerable distance. But to him are denied the secret beauties of nature—" the moving accidents by flood and field They are vouchsafed only to the cross-country walker. Trevelyan cannot, therefore, believe in the story that Pan, the God of Nature appeared to Pheidippides, the Athenian courier when he was racing to Sparta to obtain help against the invading Persian hordes. According to the story, Pan promised to help the Athenians. In this context Pan stands for the secret beauties of nature and Pheidippides, the road-walker. Pheidippides, it is said, covered 150 Miles in two days.

3. In that scene Shakespeare put his unerring finger fine on the want of his age—Tea for walkers at evening (Page 15.)

In Shakespeare's As you Like It ", Rosalind, Celia and Touchstone, the Clown go to the forest of Arden to meet the exiled Duke. Corin the shepherd meets them at dusk when they are weary and depressed. Corin could not supply them with refreshments. Trevelyan surmises that if only Corin had given them a pot of tea they would have walked on refreshed and cheered. According to Trevelyan perfection of walking is not possible without tea. There was no tea in the times of Shakespeare and so perfection of walking was impossible. Shakespeare, says Trevelyan humourously, has thus aptly pointed the want of tea.

JOHN WOOLMAN, THE QUAKER.

1. **The story of the piece of ribbon thrills us...the French Revolution.** **(Page 43).**

or

2. **Stevenson, for instance, would have loved...a bourgeois' easy-chair** **(Page 43).**

Comparing Woolman with St. Augustine and Rousseau, Trevelyan points out that Rousseau was not a "good" man like St. Augustine. The man who fermented the French Revolution has revealed in his *Confessions* weaknesses, which tempt us to feel morally superior to him. When he was a young man in the employ Madam de Vercellis, he stole a ribbon in the confusion that followed her death and put the blame on a servant-maid. There was an ironic appropriateness in the advocate of the Social Contract theory leaving his illegitimate children at the door of the foundling asylum. Indeed, a historical fictionist like Stevenson, would have loved to trace the history of these illegitimate children who might have become respectable middle class citizens or ended their lives disreputably by suicide.

But we cannot forget that Rousseau repented his faults bitterly. It was the incident of the ribbons that induced him to write the *Confessions*. And in his old age, Rousseau tried his best, though in vain, to trace his children, whom he had abandoned due to his poverty.

The great strengh of Rousseau's character seems to have been born of his weaknesses.

Quartier Latin: that part of Paris where the University of Paris and other educational institutions were situated.

Old Serpent of Eternity: i.e., Rousseau.

The Morgue: where unclaimed dead bodies were exposed.

Burgeois' easy-chair: i.e., a respectable and comfortable life.

3. They say John Brown in the ghost.....those poor fellows.

In the Civil War between the Northern and South Americas over the question of slavery, the soldiers of the North marched into the South, singing

"John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave,
But his soul goes marching on!"

John Brown fought against slavery in a violent and militant manner. His attempt to capture the armoury of the Kansas State failed and he was captured and hanged in 1859. He thus died a martyr to the cause of the abolition of slavery. It was, therefore, appropriate that the soldiers of North imagined that the ghost of John Brown led them.

But, before John Brown, John Woolman had served the cause of abolition of slavery in a perfectly non-violent manner, using nothing but persuasion and appeals to the conscience of the slave-owner. Hence his ghost, imagines Trevelyan, ought to have performed ambulance work in the course of the Civil War. And while doing so, Woolman's Ghost would have found itself in the company of Walt Whitman, who did hospital work during the Civil War.

JOHN BUNYAN.

1. In these first sentences, by the magic words..... fate of a man's soul **(Page 49)**

The opening passage in *Pilgrim's Progress* instantly places the reader in the heart of action. Homer, Milton, Dante, Shakespeare—none of these has an opening to his credit, which better performs the author's initial task. The first sentences in *Pilgrim's Progress* vividly impress us with the spiritual nature of the book. The author says that he laid himself down in a Den and slept. As he slept, he dreamt and beheld a Man clothed a with rags with a Book in his hand and a great Burden on his back, crying lamentably "what shall I do?" The man in the dream stands for the whole of humanity, the Burden, for his sins and the Book, for the Bible. Thus, at the very outset, it is clear that the theme of the book is nothing less than the redemption and salvation of his soul. By the magic of these simple words, Bunyan has created an allegoric and yet an intensely human atmosphere.

2. "I can remember my fears and doubts and sad months with comfort. They are as the head of Goliath in my hand." **(Page 50).**

Wordsworth defined poetry as "emotion recollected in tranquility." A judged by this definition, the *Pilgrim's Progress* is a great poem. Bunyan recorded in this book his religious experiences after their violence had subsided and

after he had reached a spiritual haven from which he could look back calmly and detachedly on his past sufferings, tribulations, doubts and agonies. As Bunyan himself says, those sufferings and agonies were like the head of Goliath in his hand. The reference here is to the Biblical story of how David killed Goliath, the Philistine and went to King Saul with the head of Goliath in his hand. The severed head of Goliath in David's hand could no more do any one any harm. Similarly the spiritual agonies which Bunyan had earlier experienced could not do him any harm when he sat down to record them in the *Pilgrim's Progress.*

3. Autolycus might accost the Pilgrims...in the way-side tavern. (Page 55).

In *Pilgrim's Progress*, Bunyan enshrined for all time the rural England of his days with all its beauty and merriment and the language, as it was spoken, in all its Anglo-Saxon purity and raciness. The picture that we get in this great book is of rural England as Shakespeare knew it, for the rural England of the days of Bunyan was just the same as the rural England of Shakespeare. In **Pilgrim's Progress** Bunyan's own Puritanism is super-added to the picture of rural England. We will not at all, therefore, be surprised if such characters of Shakespeare as Autolycus, the clever rogue in *Winter's Tale* or Falstaff, the greatest comic character greet the characters in **Pilgrim's Progress.** Bardolph was one of the satellites of Falstaff. Falstaff's great weakness was for wine and hence the remark of Trevelyan, "Falstaff might send Bardolph to bid them join him in the way-side tavern.

POETRY AND REBELLION.

1. Then, too, Shakespeare did not take part in the gunpowder plot.....defending Rochelle.

(Page 67.)

Confronted with a choice between the Romantic Age and the Elizabethan Age, Trevelyan would rather prefer the former. It is true that the Elizabethan Age can boast of Shakespeare, the greatest of English writers. But, as against one colossus—Shakespeare—the Romantic Age can boast of six giants—Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Byron, Shelley and Sir Walter Scott. And whereas Shakespeare seems to have kept himself aloof from the stirring events of his own day, the Romantic poets played a vital role in the great events of their age. Byron and Shelley defied the Holy Alliance; Wordsworth and Coleridge undermined the supremacy of of Alexander Pope in the realm of poetry, and were shadowed by the spies of Pitt; and Southey intended to found a communistic colony on the banks of the Susquehannah river. But Shakespeare seems to have been, in actual life, a conventional and respectable citizen, aloof from the great events of his day like the Gunpowder Plot of 1605, the adventures of the Sea Dogs and the battles between the English and the French over the Protestant stronghold La Rochelle in France. He did not even write satires on James I or his Secretary of State, Lord Cecil.

2. Society is duly warned against a scoundrel like Charles Lamb! He is the sort of person who breaks up family life!

In *Poetry and Rebellion*, Trevelyan points out how the poets who fought for freedom were up against tremendous odds. Europe was under the iron heels of the unholy alliance of Austria, Prussia and Russia. In England the Tories, not content with suppressing freedom of thought and speech, claimed a monopoly of morals and persecuted free thought in the name of immorality. In this infamous work, they were aided by Tory papers like the *Anti-Jacolin* founded by Canning. This paper took upon itself the task of slandering the personal character of the lovers of freedom. In order to condemn Southey and Lamb, the paper alleged that their friend Coleridge had deserted his wife and children and society was warned against the friends of such a wrecker of family life. There could nothing more absurd and blatantly false than accusing Charles Lamb of wrecking family life. For Lamb was the gentlest of persons and in order to take care of his sister, who had fits of mental derangement, he remained single. Such was the nature of the campaign of slander carried on in the alleged interests of morality against the lovers of freedom by a profligate aristocracy and a corrupt clergy. It was this brazen-faced hypocrisy in political and religious life that Byron denounced.

6. He had in that short while done more for the happiness and perfection of mankind than all the Pantisocratic Societies that ever talked (Page 86).

It is Trevelyan's contention, in *Poetry and Rebellion*, that Brandes has overestimated the importance of rebellion in poetry. Brandes seems to think that freedom is the end of life and the chief theme of poetry. But Trevelyan maintains that, as in life so in poetry, freedom is only the means and condition. The greatest poetry is not so much the poetry of rebellion as that poetry which treats of the feelings, ideals and aspirations of man. Wordsworth and Coleridge are great poets not merely because they rebelled against convention but chiefly because they did creative work. The former wrote *Tintern Abbey* and the latter, *Ancient Mariner*. Wordsworth, by his creative poetry, helped mankind more to attain perfection and happiness than people like Southey who never carried out their fantastic schemes and plans like the founding of a communistic society on the banks of the Susquehannah river.

It is this exaggerated importance which Brandes attaches to rebellion that is responsible for his overestimate of Lord Byron who had no positive and constructive philosophy of life though there was none to rival him as the poet of rebellion.

HISTORY AND FICTION.

---

1. To him the pageant of history was more like a Walpurgis night than a Parthenon procession.

(Page 89)

In *History and Fiction*, Trevelyan shows how Scott did more for history than any professional historian. He found history composed of two elements—antiquarianism and superficial analysis or sententious generalizations. This classical method of treating history had reached its perfection under the masterly hand of Gibbon who had traced the history of the Roman Empire through fourteen calamitous centuries in a cold and frigid manner without any living human interest. Hence his History can be aptly compared to the sculptured figures in the Parthenon at Athens—perfect in form but lacking in life and emotion. It was Sir Walter Scott who brought to bear upon antiquarian study his Shakespearean wealth of imagination and breadth of sympathy and painted the past in all its vividness, variety and richness. Hence it may be aptly remarked that History was to Scott a Walpurgis night when, according to the Germans, the witches hold their annual feast in all pomp and splendour. This feast is believed to be held on the eve of May Day.

that there is no difference in degree of reality between the past and the present. "We are all food for history. No one century, not even the twentieth, is more real than any other". This idea was called by the Elizabethan poets "mortality." In the first scene of the last act, Hamlet is struck with the idea that he and those whom he knows will one day be as dead as Alexander, the great conqueror, or Yorick, the jester in his father's court, the sight of whose skull has given rise to these reflections. But history presents the other cheerful side of the proposition: viz., Alexander and Yorick were once as live and real persons as ourselves.

This idea that the appeal of History is fundementally poetic is elaborated by Trevelyan in the concluding pages of *History and Fiction.*

ENGLISHMEN AND ITALIANS.

1. Indeed when Puritanism waned, and Whiggism took its place.....a modern civilized state.
(Page 107)

The debt England owed Italy was not only literary but also political. It was from Rome that England got her conceptions of *Lex*, *Rex*, and *Imperator*. Even the Puritan Republicans looked as much to Livy, Plutarch and Tacitus as to the Old Testament. Later, when Puritanism was crushed and whiggism became the champion of radical political doctrines, the examples of radicalism in the Bible—like Ehud and Jael—were more and more replaced by Roman models of republicanism—Cato and Brutus, contemporaries of Julius Caesar. Trevelyan adds that the Roman models were more refined than the examples from the Bible. For Ehud freed the Israelites from the Moabites by killing the Moabite King treacherously. Similarly, Jael—a woman—killed Sisera, the enemy of the Israelites when Sisera was her guest.

2. "Napoleon's dominion was like a July day in Egypt—all cear, brilliant, and blazing; but all silent, not a voice heard, the stillness of the grave."
(Page 111).

This remark made by the Italian poet, Ugo Foscolo, to John Cam Hobhouse is quoted by Trevelyan in *Englishmen and Italians*. It figuratively expresses the merits as well as

the limitations of the services rendered by Napoleon to Italy. Napoleon freed Italy from the triple tyranny of Austria, of the Catholic Church, and of petty despots; instead of mediaeval laws, he gave the *Code Napoleon*; he freed education from clerical obscurantism and re-fashioned it on scientific and military lines; and threw open careers to professional and middle class men. In short, Italy, was for the first time, after two centuries of death-trance, united as a nation. Ugo Foscolo praised Napoleon, rightly, as the liberator of Italy. But the poet was also conscious of the defect of the Napoleonic regime in Italy. Napoleon, though he had freed Italy from foreign rule and from the tyranny of priests and despots had also suppressed effectively the liberties of the people.

IF NAPOLEON HAD WON THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO.

---

1. "The Franks are tired of war, and we two cannot ride out alone. Besides, we are growing old. One grows old and dies. The Pyramids they grow old, but they do not die." (Page 126.)

Trevelyan's imaginary portrait of what Napoleon would have been like if he had won the Battle of Waterloo is remarkable for its insight into Napoleon's character. If he had won the Battle, he would have become a vehement advocate of peace. For this astounding change in the psychology of this great conqueror, Trevelyan assigns two reasons—opposition from his own countrymen to war and his own infirmity due to old age. Trevelyan represents a deputation of French citizens waiting on Napoleon to urge cessation of war. Confident of the support of his army for the continuation of war, Napoleon goes to review the army. He is pained and surprised to hear the long shout of "Peace" that runs down the lines of soldiers. On his way back to the ante-chamber, he addresses to his Mameluke attendant the words contained in the passage. These words make it clear that not only opposition of his countrymen but his own growing infirmity convert him to a policy of peace. But Napoleon was a man of soaring ambition. In a wistful and melancholy vein he contemplates upon the mutability of

man. He regrets that man cannot be, like the Pyramids, immortal. After a moment of silence, Napoleon asks the Mameluke: "Do you think one will be remembered after forty centuries?" It is difficult to say whether this question signifies his anxiety for fame or his philosophoic resignation to oblivion which is the lot of mortals.

2. **"We must preserve the balance between Monarchy and Republicanism in the New World as in the Old."** **(Page 130).**

The victory of Napoleon at Waterloo would have meant the strengthening of the forces of reaction in England. After the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo, the Spanish American Colonies revolted against their Mother Country and England. Due to the anarchical conditions prevailing in South America, British trading interests suffered severely. In 1823, the Foreign Secretary, Canning (who was a "progressive Tory") appointed Consuls to the Spanish colonies to watch over British interest. This was an implied recognition of the independence of those colonies. Justifying this policy, Canning said in Parliament: "I called the New World into existence, to redress the balance of the old." In 1825 England openly recognized the independence of the Spanish American Colonies.

Trevelyan cleverly twists the famous utterance of Canning into "We must preserve the balance between Monarchy and Republicanism in the New World as in the Old" and puts these words into the mouth of the notoriously reactionary Castlereah. The idea is that, if Napoleon had

won the Battle of Waterloo, the reactionaries would have come to power in England and helped Spain, however inadequately, to subdue the rebellious South American Colonies. The words put in the mouth of Castlereah are in keeping with his character: he was responsible for the notorious "Six Acts", which stifled freedom of thought and association and for the Peterloo massacre.

3. Hence it is that the note of the Pampas is as prevalent as the note of Byron in the literature and art of that epoch. (Page 130).

If Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo, the forces of reaction would have become triumphant throughout Europe and the wild treeless plains of Argentina (called Pampas) in the Spanish South America would have become the haven of revolutionary exiles, principally English and Italian. The Pampas would have become, for the whole of Europe under the heels of tyrants, the symbol of freedom, spiritual and political. Consequently the art and literature of the post—Waterloo epoch would have been influenced as much by the ideal of the wild life of Pampas as by Lord Byron, the Grand Rebel against tyranny.

4. The Romantic movement undermined the Imperial idea with the intellectuals ... unities were violated. (Page 131.)

According to Trevelyan, had Napoleon won the Battle of Waterloo, the French people would have been restless and

discontented and would have claimed a greater measure of liberty. Revolutionary tendencies would have struck a strident note in the politics and literature of France. In literature the death knell of convention and slavery to form would have been rung and the passion for spiritual and political freedom, signified by the Pampas, would have prevailed among the student population. Lord Byron would have been worshipped as a martyr to the cause of freedom. And plays violating the unities of time, place and action would have been written in defiance of the official ban. The police authorities would have in vain broken the busts of Lord Byron to discourage worship of him. Indeed repression in France would have been ineffectual though irritating.

CLIO, A MUSE.

1. **Medea has successfully put the old man into the pot, but I fail to see the fine youth whom she promised us.** **(Page 144)**

Those who have proclaimed history a "science" and have damned "literary historians have, according to Trevelyan, committed a grave mistake. The analogy of physical science has been wrongly applied to history. History can perform neither of the two functions of physical science: viz., direct utility and deduction of laws of cause and effect. It is clear that no one can by a knowledge of history, however profound invent the Steam-Engine. Secondly, history cannot deduce causal Laws of Universal application for the simple reason that no historical event can be studied apart from the circumstances and that these circumstances will never recur. The "scientific historians have not discovered a single law of universal application during the forty years. When they proclaimed that history was a science and banned the "literary historians" we were led to expect great things, but nothing—no law—has been discovered.

The reference in the passage is to the legend that Medea, the enachantress, put her father-in-law in to a cauldron and boiled him with some herbs and that he became young again. But the scientific historians by confining themselves to the task of tracing the casual connection in historical facts have produced no law of universal application.

2. Is not Man's history and Men's history a perpetual evangel ? (Page 148)

Refuting the view that history is a "science", Trevelyan points out that there is nothing scientific about the functions of the historian. No doubt the collection of facts and the sifting of evidence are in some sense scientific. But the most important part of the business of the historian is the interpretation of facts which can never be in the nature of a scientific deduction of cause and effect, but can only be an imaginative guess at the most likely generalizations. Even if cause and effect were possible to be discovered, none would be interested in them. The deeds of our ancestors and their thoughts and feelings are what interest us and these have to be treated by the historian with intellect and imagination. The value of history, in short, is not scientific but educative. History develops our political judgment, enlarges our sympathy, provides us with ideals and models for imitation and enables us to view ourselves and our age in the proper perspective. History is the pursuit of the truth about the past—a truth that makes us nobler. Hence it was that Carlyle, in his *Sartar Resartus*, compares history to the gospel.

3. Who would have listened to Voltaire, or even to Montesquieu, if Blenheim had gone the other way, and the Grand Monarch had been gathered in glory to the grave ? (Page 159.)

Battlefield hunting is one of the joys that history can afford. Historical knowledge not only helps us to identify the

positions of the armies and to solve military problems but also to appreciate justly the issues over which the battle was fought and to know and feel the motives and emotions that animated the soldiers as they hacked at each other. For instance the student of history, when he is on the battlefield of Blenheim, remembers Southey's poem *After Blenheim.* In this poem old Kaspar says that he cannot understand why the English and the French killed each other. It is unfortunate that Southey should have singled out the Battle of Blenheim as an example of useless waste of blood and treasure; for it was as important for human freedom as the Battle of Waterloo. Marlborough's victory over the French at Blenheim on the 13th of August 1704 put an end to the despotism of Louis XIV who had already conquered Spain, Italy, Belgium and half of Germany. If Louis had won the Battle of Blenheim repression would have been rampant and the cause of freedom would have gone to the wall. The philosophers and apostles of freedom could never have spread their revolutionary doctrines which fermented the French Revolution. Voltaire, Rousseau and Montesquieu were the most important of such philosophers.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF HISTORY.

---

1. There is another class of historical judge, who sees safety in the compromising policy of Solomon, and divides the baby in half. **(Page 180)**

In his inaugural address as Regius Professor, Trevelyan contends that history cannot be rightly used as propaganda even in the best of causes. History cannot, therefore, be of direct use to the solution of present-day problems. The value of history consists in the training of the student's mind by the disclosure of the truth about the past as fully as possible and by dispassionate study. But "dispassionate study" should not be taken to mean exclusion of emotion and imagination. Scholarship and learning are necessary for arriving at just historical judgments. "The past was full of passion, and passion is therefore one element in historic truth." There have been instances of learned historians, devoid of imagination and passion, arriving at judgments as absurd as the judgment of Solomon that the baby claimed by two women should be divided between them. Learning and abstract reasoning are thus no infallible guides to just historical judgments.

Trevelyan's analogy is not happy since king Solomon's judgment helped him to find out the true mother of the baby she had not the heart to allow the baby to be killed.

2. **On the shore where Time casts up its stray wreckage.....we shall never see.** **(Page 181.)**

In his inaugural lecture as Regius Professor, Trevelyan maintains that history is the open Bible and that historians cannot claim to be infallible interpretors. History should aim at presenting the truth about the past in all its variety and many-sidedness. There can be, therefore, no finality about the "verdicts" of history, which change from country to country and from age to age. Those who talk about final or complete verdicts of history forget the immensity and complexity of the ground to be covered by history. It is impossible to know all about the French Revolution, for instance, and to study with scientific accuracy the psychology and life-histories of the millions of men and women involved in this great event. History can at best make only the most likely generalizations from the known facts. Compared to what we do not know about the past, what we know is very little. Even as we cannot picture for ourselves the wrecked ship that has gone down to the bottom of the sea from the odds and ends of broken planks that are washed ashore, so also from the few facts we know about the past, it is impossible to reconstruct a complete and definite picture of the past. The comparisons of the past to the wrecked ship, of eternity to the ocean, and of the known facts of history to the stray wreckage are both apt and beautiful.

3. Authors should sow their wild oats young. Some wild oats, indeed, like Bryce's University Prize Essay, *The Holy Roman Empire*, bring forth a hundred-fold of excellent grain. (Page 192)

Towards the close of *The Present Position of History*, Trevelyan concedes the imporatnce ef research and points out how ample facilities for research have been provided for in the Cambridge University. The ablest of the young scholars are enabled to travel and devote their time to original work in history; for youth is full of enthusiasm and energy and it is the time for all kinds of ventures and enterprises which older men might view as foolish. It is true that these experiments may prove foolish. But some of them may also prove of first-rate importance. Bryce's College Prize Essay on the Holy Roman Empire, published in 1864, is an instance in point. Viscount James Bryce later became Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford. He was also British Ambassador at washington.

POOR MUGGLETON AND THE CLASSICS

What was Hecuba to me or I to Hecuba? (Page 59)

In *Poor Muggleton and the Classics* we have Trevelyan's criticism of the old fashioned method of imparting classical education in public schools. In his letter, Muggleton complains that he was asked to read Euripides' *Hecuba* in his tenth age. Being too young to appreciate even the dramas of his own country, Muggleton failed to grasp the significance of this great Greek Tragedy. In the play, Hecuba, wife of King Priam of Troy, was taken captive by Ulysses. During the voyage, the ship in which she was taken prisoner came to a standstill. A human sacrifice being needed to propitiate the gods, Hecuba's daughter was sacrificed. The sorrows of Hecuba form the theme of Euripides' play. On a mature mind, capable of appreciating tragedy, this play is bound to have a cathartic (purifying) effect. But to young Muggleton, the great tragic character, Hecuba, was nothing but a poor old lady, muttering and moaning.

THE NEWS OF RAMILIES.

"A plague on your parties, that an honest fellow cannot go about his business, no, nor so much as get his curacy, without this party give it to him and that party try to take it from him."

(Page 137)

In these words Tom Slippers, the future curate to the Vicar of Bray, defends himself against the rebuke of his friend Smithers for having accepted the invitation the Earl of Kingsdown Charteris to a drinking party in honour of Marlborough's victory at Ramilies. The Earl is a Whig and the conscientious and stricter sort of Tories did not like the continuation of the War. But Tom Slippers does not want to be over-strict in the matter of party principles, since he wants to impress his friend with a show of friendship with the Earl. Besides, these words show that the country persons of the 18th Century were in the habit of adjusting their religious beliefs to the whims of the ruling monarch. Of such persons, the Vicar of Bray (Simon Alleyn) was the most notorious. *A plague on your parties"* redolent of Shakespeare. Mercutio, when he is mortally wounded by Tybalt, utters these words, in *Romeo and Juliet.* **Plague** Curse.

THE MIDDLE MARCHES.

---

1. **In happier days to come these steep, slippery banks of Alwyn and Usway were hunted by Diana and the Osbaldistone pack; and these passages of the hills were threaded by Andrew Fairservice and his friends the smugglers, and his enemies the Jacobites.** **(Page 30.)**

Kidland Lee, watered by the Rivers Alwyn and Usway, is part of Coquetsdale. It is the most beautiful part of the English Border, studded with green rounded hills, consisting of long, straight ridges, gradually and slightly raised above the valleys. Though Coquetsdale was, in the 16th century, a comparatively peaceful region in the Middle Marches, the King's peace did not extend to Kidland Lee. For fear of the murderous raids of the Scots and of the men of Redesdale, the people of Coquetsdale did not settle down in Kidland Lee. Only in summer time did they take out their flocks to the valleys of Kidland Lee. Even this was impossible in time of war with Scotland or when the men of Redesdale were in an evil humour.

But later, in the times of George I, i.e., the 18th century, ("In happier days to come"), Kidland Lee became the hunting ground for Diana and the hounds of Osbalistone. They hunted on the slippery banks of the Rivers Alwyn and

Usway. And it was through the hills that Andrew Fairservice and his friends and enemies alike passed. All the persons mentioned here are characters in Scott's *Rob Roy*. *Diana Vernon* is the heroine. She is beautiful and witty. She marries *Frank Osbaldistone*, heir to and nephew of *Sir Hildebrand Osbaldistone*, whose pack of hounds is mentioned in the passage. *Andrew Fairservice* is Sir H. Osbaldistone's humorous Scotch gardener; he is in league with smugglers and he hats Jacobites. Diana is herself an ardent Jacobite, ie., supporter of the House of Stuart.

2. It was chivalry and love of the game, and no military considerations, that made Douglas wait for Percy... (Page 40).

Towards the close of *The Middle Marches*, Trevelyan cites the Battle of Otterburn (1388), as a specimen of the spirit of chivalry and utter disregard for life which invest the Border Life with glamour. James, the second earl of Douglas, crossed the Border, burnt Northumberland and Durham and challenged Harry Percy (or Hotspur) to fight him before he re-crossed the Border. Douglas waited for Hotspur. This waiting was not out of strategic considerations. Indeed, by waiting, Douglas was risking his life. It was the spirit of chivalry and the love of warfare according to the rules of the game that made him wait for Hotspur. And Hotspur too attacked Douglas's Camp at night, though his (Hotspur's) men were tired. The result was that Hotspur was overthrown and

taken prisoner. But Douglas was killed. Truly, the Battle of Otterburn was a battle of heroes. It is typical of the attitude of the heroic Border people to life as if it were a game with Death, to be played according to certain rules of honour and chivalry—a game which they relished as the very breath of their lives.

Douglas The same person who is mentioned in the famous ballad, The *Chevy Chase.*

Printed at the Chandravilas Pinjrapole Press, Trichinopoly.

Chandravilas Pinjrapole Press,

241, Big Bazaar, Trichy.