

and may be proved by external evidence. But the deism of the 17th century is a phase of thought that has no living reality now, and the whole aspect of the religious problem has been completely changed. To a generation that has been moulded by the philosophy of Kant and Hegel, and by the historical criticism of Strauss and the later German theology, the argument of the *Analogy* cannot but appear to lie quite outside the field of controversy. To Butler the Christian religion, and by that he meant the orthodox Church of England system, was a moral scheme revealed by a special act of the divine providence, the truth of which was to be judged by the ordinary canons of evidence. The whole stood or fell on historical grounds. A speculative construction of religion was a thing abhorrent to him, a thing of which he seems to have thought the human mind naturally incapable. The religious consciousness does not receive from him the slightest consideration, whereas it is with its nature and functions that the scientific theology of the present time is almost entirely occupied. The *Analogy*, it would appear, has and can have but little influence on the present state of theology; it was not a book for all time, but was limited to the controversies and questions of the period at which it appeared.

Throughout the whole of the *Analogy*, it is manifest that the interest which lay closest to Butler's heart was the ethical. His whole cast of thinking was practical. The moral nature of man, his conduct in life, is that on account of which alone an inquiry into religion is of importance. The systematic account of this moral nature is to be found in the famous *Sermons preached at the Chapel of the Rolls*, especially in the first three. In these sermons Butler has made substantial contributions to ethical science, and it may be said with confidence, that in their own department nothing superior in value appeared during the long interval between Aristotle and Kant. To both of these great thinkers he has certain analogies. He resembles the first in his method of investigating the end which human nature is intended to realize; he reminds of the other by the consistency with which he upholds the absolute supremacy of moral law.

In his ethics, as in his theology, Butler had constantly in view a certain class of adversaries, consisting partly of the philosophic few, partly of the fashionably-educated many, who all participated in one common mode of thinking. The key-note of this tendency had been struck by Hobbes, in whose philosophy man was regarded as a mere sensitive machine, moved solely by pleasures and pains. Human nature had come to be looked upon as essentially selfish; disinterested actions were sneered at as impossibilities by the many, and were explained away into modifications of selfishness by the scientific moralists. Cudworth and Clarke, it is true, had tried to place ethics on a nobler footing, but their speculations had been of the abstract kind, which was always distasteful to Butler. They were not practical enough, were not sufficiently "applicable to the several particular relations and circumstances of life." He desired to base ethical law not on abstract theory, but on the actual facts of human nature.

The fundamental view of things from which he starts in his inquiry may be called the teleological. "Every work, both of nature and art, is a system; and as every particular thing both natural and artificial is for some use or purpose out of or beyond itself, one may add to what has been already brought into the idea of a system its conduciveness to this one or more ends." Ultimately this view of nature, as the sphere of the realization of final causes, rests on a theological basis; but Butler does not introduce prominently into his ethics the specifically theological groundwork, and may be thought willing to ground his principle on experience. The ethical question then is, as with Aristotle,

what is the τέλος of man? He is placed in the world with many courses of action open to him. What is that line of activity which is correspondent to, or is the realization of, his true nature? The answer to this question is to be obtained by an analysis of the facts of human nature, whence, Butler thinks, "it will as fully appear that this our nature, *i.e.*, constitution, is adapted to virtue, as from the idea of a watch it appears that its nature, *i.e.*, constitution or system, is adapted to measure time." Such analysis had been already attempted by Hobbes, and the result he came to was that man naturally is adapted only for a life of selfishness,—his end is the procuring of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. A closer examination, however, shows that this at least is false. The truth of the counter propositions, that man is φύσις πολιτικός, naturally social, and that the full development of his being is impossible apart from society, becomes manifest on the slightest examination of the facts. For while self-love plays a most important part in the human economy, there is no less evidently a natural principle of benevolence, prompting actions which have for their end, the good of others. Moreover, among the particular passions, appetites, and desires there are some whose tendency is as clearly towards the general good as that of others is towards our own satisfaction. Finally, that principle in man which reflects upon actions and the springs of actions, which approves some and disapproves others, unmistakably sets the stamp of its approbation upon conduct that tends towards the general good. It is clear, therefore, that we were made for society; man is ζῷον πολιτικόν, and from this point of view the sum of practical morals might be given in Butler's own words,—“that mankind is a community, that we all stand in a relation to each other, that there is a public end and interest of society, which each particular is obliged to promote.” But deeper questions remain.

The threefold division into passions and affections, self-love and benevolence, and conscience, is Butler's celebrated analysis of human nature. In the handling of the several parts he shows remarkable psychological power, and succeeds in obviating many of the difficulties drawn from the principles of the selfish theory of ethics. He is especially concerned to show that self-love and benevolence are in no sense opposed to one another. This he does by examining the function of self-love and the relation it bears to the passions. The special desires or affections are the expressions of wants in our nature which are to be satisfied by the possession of definite things. The objects of the desires are therefore the things naturally adapted to satisfy them, and not the pleasure which is the accompaniment of satisfaction. The passions tend towards their objects as ultimate ends, and are consequently unselfish or disinterested. On the other hand, self-love aims at procuring happiness for the individual; and happiness means the general satisfaction of desires. Self-love is therefore distinct from the particular desires, but is completely dependent on them. Its end is the attainment of pleasure, and it desires external things only as means towards this. In itself it has no actual content; it only directs the particular passions towards their ends, and frequently, by fixing its attention too much upon its own goal, personal happiness, is in danger of defeating its own endeavours. Self-love is therefore distinct from and in no way opposed to the particular affections which are themselves disinterested. Just as little opposition is there between self-love and disinterested benevolence. An affection which finds its gratification in some external object and rests in it as a final end, is in no sense opposed to self-love. This is one of the most important parts of Butler's ethical psychology.

Up to this point he has merely analyzed the various parts of human nature, and has pointed out the course of action corresponding to each. But in a system or organism the parts do not exist for themselves but for the whole. The idea of human nature is not completely expressed by saying that it consists of reason and the several passions. "Whoever thinks it worth while to consider this matter thoroughly should begin by stating to himself exactly the idea of a system, economy, or constitution of any particular nature; and he will, I suppose, find that it is one or a whole, made up of several parts, but yet that the several parts, even considered as a whole, do not complete the idea, unless in the notion of a whole you include the relations and respects which these parts have to each other." This fruitful conception of man's ethical nature as an organic unity Butler owes directly to Shaftesbury and indirectly to Aristotle; it is the strength and clearness with which he has grasped it that gives peculiar value to his system.

The special relation among the parts of our nature to which Butler alludes is the subordination of the particular passions to the universal principle of reflection or conscience. This relation is the peculiarity, the *cross*, of man; and when it is said that virtue consists in following nature, we mean that it consists in pursuing the course of conduct dictated by this superior faculty. Man's function is not fulfilled by obeying the passions, or even cool self-love, but by obeying conscience. That conscience has a natural supremacy, that it is superior in kind, is evident from the part it plays in the moral constitution. We judge a man to have acted wrongly, *i.e.*, unnaturally, when he allows the gratification of a passion to injure his happiness, *i.e.*, when he acts in accordance with passion and against self-love. It would be impossible to pass this judgment if self-love were not regarded as superior in kind to the passions, and this superiority results from the fact that it is the peculiar province of self-love to take a view of the several passions and decide as to their relative importance. But there is in man a faculty which takes into consideration all the springs of action, including self-love, and passes judgment upon them, approving some and condemning others. From its very nature this faculty is supreme in authority, if not in power; it reflects upon all the other active powers, and pronounces absolutely upon their moral quality. Superintendency and authority are constituent parts of its very idea. We are under obligation to obey the law revealed in the judgments of this faculty, for it is the law of our nature. And to this a religious sanction may be added, for "consciousness of a rule or guide of action, in creatures capable of considering it as given them by their Maker, not only raises immediately a sense of duty, but also a sense of security in following it, and a sense of danger in deviating from it." Virtue then consists in following the true law of our nature, that is, conscience. Butler, however, is by no means very explicit in his analysis of the functions to be ascribed to conscience. He calls it the Principle of Reflexion, the Reflex Principle of Approbation, and assigns to it as its province the motives or propensities to action. It takes a view of these, approves or disapproves, impels to or restrains from action. But at times he uses language that almost compels one to attribute to him the popular view of conscience as passing its judgments with unerring certainty on individual acts. Indeed his theory is weakest exactly at the point where the real difficulty begins. We get from him no satisfactory answer to the inquiry, What course of action is approved by conscience? Everyone, he seems to think, knows what virtue is, and a philosophy of ethics is complete if it can be shown that such a course of action harmonizes with human nature. When pressed still further, he points to justice, veracity, and the common good as comprehensive ethical

ends. His whole view of the moral government led him to look upon human nature and virtue as connected by a sort of pre-established harmony. His ethical principle has in it no possibility of development into a system of actual duties; it has no content. Even on the formal side it is a little difficult to see what part conscience plays. It seems merely to set the stamp of its approbation on certain courses of action to which we are led by the various passions and affections; it has in itself no originating power. How or why it approves of some and not of others is left unexplained. Butler's moral theory, like those of his English contemporaries and successors, is defective from not perceiving that the notion of duty can only have real significance when connected with the will or practical reason, and that only in reason which wills itself have we a principle capable of development into an ethical system.

It has frequently been made the ground of objection to Butler's philosophy of man's moral nature that he did not carry his analysis far enough, and that he accepted as ultimate facts what are really compounded of simpler elements. His distinction between self-love and the passions has in particular been rejected on the plea that the end of appetite or desire is not the object suited to satisfy it, but pleasure, or at least the removal of uneasiness. This last, however, is fairly included under Butler's expression, "gratification of the passions." The removal of uneasiness no doubt results in pleasure, but it is not the pleasure that removes the uneasiness. What is really sought is the object that will satisfy us, that will fill up the want in our existence, and with which we, so to speak, identify ourselves. With regard to the general objection, even were it granted that self-love and benevolence are developments from the passions, the relations between them would none the less hold good. Self-love is not superior to the passions, because it has been originally created their superior, but because under the sphere of its inspection and decision the particular desires are included; it stands above them because they form the objects upon which it works. Further, growth or development, deeply considered, does not invalidate authority or superiority in kind. The ethical consciousness, like all other parts of our nature, grows; it is only by degrees and slowly that man comes to the full recognition of the reason that lies in him and forms his true personality. He is moral at first only *δύναμις*, and the varying conditions of experience are requisite in order to afford the means of development from this mere potentiality. The customary observances and legal precepts, in which the common ethical consciousness of humanity has given expression to itself, are being continually tested by comparison with the formal requirements of the inner law of duty, and change gradually as they are found at various epochs to be imperfect realizations of reason. The ultimate goal of all such progress is that state of ethical observance in which rights and duties come to be recognized as the outcome of human personality, and the realization of true freedom.

Bartlett, *Memoirs of Butler*, 1839. The best edition of Butler's works is that in 2 vols., Oxford. Editions of the *Analogy* are very numerous; that by Fitzgerald, 1849, contains a valuable Life and Notes. Whewell has published an edition of the *Three Sermons*, with Introduction. The analyses of the *Analogy* by Duke (1847) and Wilkinson (1847), Chalmers's *Prelections* (posthumous works, ix.), Napier's *Lectures*, (1864), and Swainson's *Handbook* may be consulted with advantage. For the history of the religious works contemporary with the *Analogy*, see Lechler, *Ges. d. Engl. Deismus*; Pattison, in *Essays and Reviews*; Hunt's *Religious Thought in England*, vols. ii. and iii.; A. S. Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought*. For Butler's ethics see Mackintosh, Whewell, and Jouffroy. It is quite surprising that German historians of ethics should ignore Butler. Feuerbach, Fichte, Wuttke, and Trendelenburg totally omit mention of his name; Vorländer, in his *Ges. d. Phil. Moral. Rechts- und Staatslehre d. Engländer u. Franzosen*, devotes three pages to Butler and fifteen to Bolingbroke. (R. AD.)

BUTLER, SAMUEL (1612-1680), whose name appears to have been spelt Boteler in official documents to the end of his life, was born at Strensham on the Avon in Worcestershire. He was baptized on the 8th of February 1612. His father, who was of the same name and was then churchwarden, is variously represented as a substantial farmer (owning a small freehold, and leasing from Sir William Russel a considerable farm valued at £300 a year), and as "a man of but slender fortune," who was barely able to educate his son at a free school. The author of *Hudibras* was apparently educated at the college (or cathedral) school, Worcester, and the house in which he was born was pulled down (being considered incapable of repair) about 1873. Hardly any other particulars of his youth are recorded, and his later education (if he received any) is equally uncertain. He has been loosely asserted (as is the case with many other distinguished persons of his century) to have studied at both Cambridge and Oxford, but the balance of testimony seems to be against his having belonged to either university. The time between the completion of his education (circa 1630) and the Restoration, a period of fully thirty years, appears to have been spent by him in three different households, with Mr Jefferies of Earl's Croome in Worcestershire, with the countess of Kent at Wrest in Bedfordshire, and with Sir Samuel Luke at Woodend or Cople Hoo in the same county. He served Mr Jefferies in the capacity of justice's clerk, and is supposed to have thus laid the foundation of his remarkable knowledge of law and law terms. He also employed himself at Earl's Croome in general study, and particularly in painting, which he is said to have thought of adopting as a profession. It is probable, however, that art has not lost by his change of mind, for, according to one of his editors, in 1774 his pictures "served to stop windows and save the tax; indeed they were not fit for much else." At Wrest, where he is said to have been gentleman to the countess, he pursued his studies in painting, drawing, and music; probably, also, in other directions, for Wrest contained a good library. Here he met and worked for Selden. But his third sojourn, that at Cople Hoo, was not only apparently the longest, but also much the most important in its effects on his career and works.

We are nowhere informed, nor is it at all clear, in what capacity Butler served Sir Samuel Luke, or how one who was not only in temper and sympathies, but also from early associations, a decided royalist, came to reside in the house of a noted Puritan and Parliament man. In the family of this "valiant Mamaluke," who, whether he was or was not the original of *Hudibras*, was certainly a rigid Presbyterian, "a colonel in the army of the Parliament, scoutmaster-general for Bedfordshire and governor of Newport Pagnell," Butler must have had the most abundant opportunities of studying from the life those who were to be the victims of his great future satire. But we know not how long he held his situation (whatever it was) under the knight of Cople, and we hear nothing positive of him till the Restoration, immediately after which he was appointed secretary to Lord Carbery (then President of Wales) and steward of Ludlow Castle. Contradictory documents exist respecting his tenure of the latter office, one speaking of him as "late steward" in January 1662, the other (a protection against arrest) addressed to him as steward in September 1667. About this time he married a Mrs Herbert, according to Aubrey a widow with a good jointure, on whose means he lived comfortably. Aubrey knew him well and could hardly be wrong on such a point, especially as his testimony as to Butler's living in comparative comfort is confirmed by another authority to be afterwards mentioned. It should, however, be observed that other accounts state that Mrs Herbert's fortune was lost through

bad securities. Late in 1662 the first part of *Hudibras* was published. On the 26th of December Pepys bought it, and though neither then nor afterwards could he see the wit of it, he repeatedly testifies to its extraordinary popularity. This popularity is most clearly proved by the issue of a pirated edition within a month, and by the appearance of a spurious second part within the year. This latter compliment (which it will be remembered was also paid to Butler's spiritual ancestor Cervantes) determined the poet to bring out the second part, which was licensed on November 7, 1663, and which if possible exceeded the first in popularity. From this time till 1678, the date of the publication of the third part, we hear nothing certain and hardly anything at all of Butler. He appears at some period to have visited France. He is said to have received a gift of £300 from Charles II., and to have been secretary to Buckingham when the latter was Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. Most of his biographers, in their eagerness to prove the ill-treatment which Butler is supposed to have received, disbelieve both these stories, perhaps without sufficient reason. It must be allowed that it is scarcely a valid argument that Butler, if he had been secretary to Buckingham, would not have spoken so severely of that nobleman in his *Characters (Remains, 1754)*, when it is remembered that he satirized Sir Samuel Luke, to whom he held nearly the same relation, with certainly equal virulence. Two years after the publication of the third part he died (September 25, 1680), and was buried by his friend Mr William Longueville (a bencher of the Middle Temple) in the churchyard of St Paul's, Covent Garden. He was, we are told, "of a leonine-coloured hair, sanguine, choleric, middle-sized, strong." Portraits exist at Oxford and elsewhere which represent him as somewhat hard-featured. Two personal anecdotes, and perhaps two only, are recorded of him. One is the well-known story which tells how Wycherly laboured hard to secure for the neglected poet the patronage of Buckingham, how an interview was at last arranged, from which the duke was, alas! called off by the passage of "a brace of ladies," and how the opportunity was lost. The other bears suspicious marks of having been made up as setting for a witticism of Lord Dorset's. Dorset, it seems, was anxious to know the author of *Hudibras*, and prevailed on a common friend to bring him to a tavern. At the first bottle Butler was quiet and reserved, at the second full of wit and spirits, at the third dull and stupid,—upon which Dorset's comment was that Butler was "like a nine-pin, little at both ends, but great in the middle." Of these stories it may be said, as of most such, that they may be true and cannot be proved to be false.

Of the neglect of Butler by the Court something must be said. It must be remembered that the complaints on the subject supposed to have been uttered by the poet all occur in the spurious posthumous works, that men of letters have been at all times but too prone to complain of lack of patronage (a fact which makes it probable that Dryden, Otway, Oldham, &c., in alluding to Butler, spoke as the proverb of that day went, "one word for him and two for themselves"), that the actual service rendered by Butler was rendered when the day was already won, and that the pathetic stories of the poet starving and dying in want are contradicted by the best authority—Mr C. Longueville (son of the poet's friend)—who asserted that Butler, though often disappointed, was never reduced to anything like want or beggary, and did not die in any person's debt. But the most significant story on the subject is Aubrey's, that "he might have had preferments at first, but would not accept any but very good, and so got none." Three monuments have been at different times and places erected to the poet's memory,—the first in 1721 by

Alderman Barber in Westminster Abbey. This was the occasion of some rather misplaced wit from Pope and others. In 1786 a tablet was placed in St Paul's, Covent Garden, by some inhabitants of that parish. This was destroyed in 1845. Some thirty or forty years ago another was set up at Strensham by a Mr Taylor of that place. Perhaps the happiest epitaph on him is one by Dennis, which (borrowing, indeed, its most striking expression from Cowley) sets forth that Butler "was a whole species of poets in one."

Butler's published works during his life consisted of the three parts of *Hudibras* (the second and third were republished together in 1674, with notes by the author); of an *Ode on Duval* (the famous highwayman); and of two pamphlets attributed to Prynne. In 1715 three volumes, entitled *Posthumous Works of Mr S. Butler*, were published with great success. Their contents, however, are all spurious except one or two short pieces. The poet's papers remained in the hands of his friend Mr Longueville, and were not published till 1759, when Mr Thyer, librarian at Manchester, edited two volumes of verse and prose under the title of *Genuine Remains*. The most remarkable of the prose writings are characters of the kind popular in the 17th century, and partaking largely of the faults usual in such pieces. To this some additional fragments were added in 1822; a fragment of a tragedy on Nero is also spoken of. In 1726 Hogarth executed some illustrations to *Hudibras*, which are among his earliest but not, perhaps, happiest productions. In 1744 Dr Zachary Grey published an edition of *Hudibras*, which has been repeatedly reprinted, and has formed (with that of Nash in 1793) the basis of all subsequent editions. It contains an enormous mass of notes, displaying little critical or literary power, but abounding in curious information. A worthy edition is still to seek; but that of the late Mr R. Bell is convenient, and supplies much information, which is generally accurate. Mr Bohn's (of *Hudibras* only) is also useful. Butler's lesser works would of themselves fairly sustain, though perhaps they would hardly create, a great reputation. Abundance of happy thought, of ingenious expression, and of vigorous verse, may be found in the *Miscellaneous Thoughts*, the *Ode on Duval*, and the *Satires* on the Royal Society (*The Elephant in the Moon*) and on *Critics*. But the splendour of *Hudibras* has somewhat paled their fire.

Hudibras itself, though probably quoted as often as ever, has perhaps dropped into the class of books which are more quoted than talked of, and more talked of than read. In reading it, it is of the utmost importance to comprehend clearly and to bear constantly in mind the purpose of the author in composing it. This purpose is evidently not artistic but polemic, to show in the most unmistakable characters the vileness and folly of the anti-royalist party. Anything like a regular plot—the absence of which has often been deplored or excused—would have been for this end not merely a superfluity but a mistake, as likely to divert the attention and perhaps even enlist some sympathy for the heroes. Anything like regular character-drawing would have been equally unnecessary and dangerous—for to represent anything but monsters, some alleviating strokes must have been introduced. The problem, therefore, was to produce characters just sufficiently unlike lay-figures to excite and maintain a moderate interest, and to set them in motion by dint of a few incidents not absolutely unconnected,—meanwhile to subject the principles and manners of which these characters were the incarnation to ceaseless satire and railery. The triumphant solution of the problem is undeniable, when it has once been enunciated and understood. Upon a canvas thus prepared and outlined, Butler has embroidered a collection of flowers of wit, which

only the utmost fertility or imagination could devise, and the utmost patience of industry elaborate. In the union of these two qualities he is certainly without a parallel, and their combination has produced a work which is unique. The poem is of considerable length, extending to more than ten thousand verses, yet Hazlitt hardly exaggerates when he says that "half the lines are got by heart;" indeed a diligent student of later English literature has read great part of *Hudibras* though he may never have opened its pages. The tableaux or situations, though few and simple in construction, are ludicrous enough. The knight and squire setting forth on their journey; the routing of the bear-baiters; the disastrous renewal of the contest; *Hudibras* and Ralph in the stocks; the lady's release and conditional acceptance of the unlucky knight; the latter's deliberations on the means of eluding his vow; the Skimmington; the visit to Sidrophel, the astrologer; the attempt to cajole the lady, with its woeful consequences; the consultation with the lawyer, and the immortal pair of letters to which this gives rise complete the argument of the whole poem. But the story is as nothing; throughout we have little really kept before us but the sordid vices of the sectaries, their hypocrisy, their churlish ungraciousness, their greed of money and authority, their fast and loose morality, their inordinate pride. The extraordinary felicity of the means taken to place all these things in the most ridiculous light has never been questioned. The doggerel metre, never heavy or coarse, but framed so as to be the very voice of mocking laughter, the astounding similes and disparates, the rhymes which seem to chuckle and to sneer of themselves, the wonderful learning—with which the abuse of learning is rebuked, the subtlety with which subtle casuistry is set at nought can never be missed. Keys like those of L'Estrange are therefore of little use. It signifies nothing whether *Hudibras* was Sir Samuel Luke of Bedfordshire or Sir Henry Rosewell of Devonshire, still less whether Ralph's name in the flesh was Robinson or Pendle, least of all that Orsin was perhaps Mr Gosling, or Trulla possibly Miss Spencer. Butler was probably as little indebted to mere copying for his characters as for his ideas and style. These latter are in the highest degree original. The first notion of the book, and only the first notion, Butler undoubtedly received from *Don Quixote*. His obligations to the *Satyre Menippée* have been noticed by Voltaire, and though English writers have sometimes ignored or questioned them, are not to be doubted by any student of the two books. The art (perhaps the most terrible of all the weapons of satire) of making characters without any great violation of probability represent themselves in the most atrocious and despicable light was never perhaps possessed in perfection except by Pithou and his colleagues and by Butler. Against these great merits some defects must certainly be set. As a whole, the poem is no doubt tedious, if only on account of the very blaze of wit, which at length almost wearies us by its ceaseless demands on our attention. It should, however, be remembered that it was originally issued in parts, and therefore (it may be supposed) intended to be read in parts, for there can be little doubt that the second part was written before the first was published. A more real defect, but one which Butler shares with all his contemporaries from Jonson downwards, is the tendency to delineate humours instead of characters, and to draw from the outside rather than from within. This also may be partially palliated by some remarks made above.

Attempts have been made without much success to trace the manner and versification of *Hudibras*, especially in Cleveland and in the *Musarum Deliciae* (lately reprinted) of Sir John Mennis (Pepys's Minnes) and Dr Smith. But if it had few ancestors it had an abundant offspring. A

list of seventeen direct imitations of *Hudibras* in the course of a century was given in the *Retrospective Review*, and may be found in Mitford's *Butler*. Portions of it have been at different times translated into Latin with no great success. Complete translations of considerable excellence have been made into French by John Townley (London, 1757, 3 vols.), and into German by D. W. Soltan (Riga, 1787); specimens of both may be found in Bell's edition. Voltaire tried his hand at a compressed version, but not happily. (C. SA.)

BUTLER, WILLIAM ARCHER (1814-1848), a brilliant writer on theology and the history of philosophy, was born at Annerville, near Clonmel, probably in 1814. His father was a Protestant, his mother a Roman Catholic, and he was brought up in the Romish faith. At the age of nine he was sent to Clonmel school, where he distinguished himself not so much by rigid attention to his class work as by general brilliancy and power. Even when a boy he was strongly drawn towards the imaginative and poetical, and some of his early verses show an astonishing precocity. After leaving Clonmel school he entered Trinity College, Dublin. Two years before he had joined the Protestant church. His career at college was remarkably brilliant. The studies to which he specially devoted himself were the literary and metaphysical; and he was particularly noted for the extreme beauty of his style, both in speaking and in written exercises. In 1834 he gained the ethical moderatorship, newly instituted by Provost Lloyd, and continued in residence at college, pursuing his favourite studies. Many papers were about this time contributed by him to the *Dublin University Magazine*; it is to be regretted that these have not been collected. In 1837 he made up his mind to enter the church, and in the same year he was elected to the professorship of moral philosophy, specially founded for him through the exertions of Provost Lloyd. About the same time he was presented to the prebend of Clonahorka, in Donegal, and resided there when not called by his professorial duties to Dublin. In 1842 he was promoted to the rectory of Raymoghly. His lectures and his sermons were equally admired for their strength of thought and richly imaginative style. In 1845 appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal* his *Letters on Development*, written under a great press of business, but in every way worthy of the author, and the best reply made to the famous essay of Newman which had called them forth. Butler's life was but short. He caught cold when returning one day from public service; the cold terminated in fever, which proved fatal in a few days. He died on the 5th July 1848. His *Sermons*, published in two vols. by Woodward and Jeremie, have been universally recognized as among the most important recent contributions to theology. They are remarkable not only for rare brilliancy of style, but for subtlety and force of thought. The diction is at times too ornate and rhetorical, but it is not to be forgotten that the sermons were hurriedly written, were never revised, and were all the work of a young man. Their uncommon excellence deepens the regret at the early death of the author. The *Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy*, edited in a masterly manner by W. Hepworth Thompson (2 vols. 1856; 2d ed., 1 vol. 1875), have taken their place as the best among the few British works on the history of philosophy. The introductory lectures, and those on the early Greek thinkers, are not of the highest value, and though they evidence wide reading, do not show the complete mastery over the material that is found in Schwegler or Zeller. The lectures on Plato, however, are of great value, and furnish a most admirable and enthusiastically conceived exposition of the Platonic system. Butler was evidently attracted by the lofty spirit of Platonism, and sets forth its main features with the warmest admiration. In details he is not altogether to be

trusted, but any defects in his scholarship are amply supplied in the valuable notes of his editor.

See *Memoir of W. A. Butler*, prefixed by Rev. J. Woodward to first series of *Sermons*.

BUTO, an Egyptian goddess, called in the language *Uat* or *Uatin*, the eponymous goddess of the town Buto in Northern Egypt, supposed to be modern Kum el Aman and Kum el gir, on the western banks of the Damietta branch of the Nile. The goddess herself personified Lower Egypt, and as such wore the *teser* or red crown, whether in her human form, or typified as a vulture, or uræus, in which respect she resembled Nat or Neith. She presided over fire, and resided in it or the solar eye, and was identified with the goddesses Bast and Siset or Mericptah, of which she may have been another type. Buto was also considered to represent the Greek Latona, and the uræus Mahur, and this again connected her with Lower Egypt or the Delta. She was considered to be the regent and mistress of the lands Pe and Tep, districts of her nome, of the land of *Hanebu* or the Greeks, and of *Taneter*, the divine land or Arabia, also of *Anhu* the capital of *Xrut*, another of the nomes of Lower Egypt. The ideas of the Greeks that she personified darkness, and that the *mygale* or shrew-mouse was sacred to her, are incorrect; for, as already stated, *Uat* presided over the element of fire, and the shrew-mouse appears from the inscriptions on the base of figures of this little animal to have been dedicated to Horus, like the Apollo Smintheus of the Greeks. The name was also given to the capital of a nome ruled over by the deities Har or Horus and Uat or Buto. The Greeks supposed that Buto was the capital of Chemmitis or Phthenotes close to the Boutike Lake, the present Burullus, near the old Sebennyitic branch of the Nile. It contained several temples, and in that of Buto oracles were delivered, and the temple was 10 *orgyiai* or fathoms high. The most remarkable object, however, in it was the monolith shrine 40 cubits or about 60 feet square, with a roof of stone, 4 cubits or about 6 feet thick, and 5000 tons weight. It was brought from Elephantina. It appears from an inscription found at Cairo that, during the Persian occupation of Egypt, Khabash, then the ruler of Egypt, had given the nomos Phthenotes to the state of Buto, but that this arrangement was not recognized by Xerxes. Subsequently the older arrangement was restored by Ptolemy Lagus about 313 B.C.

Herodotus, ii. 155; Reinisch, *Denkmäler in Miramis*, s. 201; Wilkinson, *Mann. and Cust.*, iii. 330, 331, iv. 271-3, v. 40; Brugsch, *Geographie*, i. s. 58; Jablonski, *Panth. Egypt.*, iii. 84-116; *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, 1871, p. 1 and foll.

BUTRINTO, a fortified town of European Turkey on the coast of Albania, in the sandjak of Delvino, directly opposite the island of Corfu, and situated at the mouth of a stream which connects the Lake of Vatzindro with the bay. It has a small harbour, and is the seat of a Greek bishop. In the neighbourhood are the ruins of the ancient *Buthrotum*, consisting of a Roman wall, about a mile in circumference, and some remains of both later and Hellenic work. *Buthrotum* was a Roman colony in the time of Strabo, but makes little figure in ancient history. The modern city belonged to the Venetians till 1797, when it was seized by the French, who in 1799 had to yield to the Russians and Turks. Population, 1500.

BUTTER, is the fatty portion of the milk of mammalian animals. The milk of all mammals contains such fatty constituents, and butter from the milk of goats, sheep, and other animals has been and may be used; but that yielded by cow's milk is the most savoury, and it alone really constitutes the butter of commerce. The milk of the various breeds of cattle varies widely in the proportion of fatty matter it contains: its richness in this respect being

greatly influenced by season, nature of food, state of the animals' health, and other considerations. While the proportion of cream to milk in the case of most breeds ranges from one-twentieth to one-tenth, in the case of the celebrated Alderney cattle it amounts to as much as from three to four-tenths. Dr Parkes (*Practical Hygiene*) gives the following as the average composition of unskimmed milk having a sp. gr. of 1.030:—

Casein	4.0
Fat	3.7
Lactin (Sugar of Milk)	5.0
Salts	0.6
Total Solids	13.3
Water	86.7

On a low average each pint of milk ought to yield a full half-ounce of butter. The fat or butter is disseminated through freshly-drawn milk in minute, clear globules, each of which is enclosed in a thin membranous sac or bag; and being specifically lighter than the mass of the fluid, the globules gradually rise to the surface, bringing mixed with them a proportion of milky matter, and form cream. Usually the cream is skimmed off the surface of the milk for making butter, but by some the churning is performed on the milk itself without waiting for the separation of the cream. The operation of churning causes the rupture of the oil sacs, and by the coalescence of the fat so liberated butter is formed. Details regarding churning and the preparation of butter generally will be found under DAIRY.

Fresh or unsalted butter of good quality should present a rich straw-yellow colour. At ordinary temperatures it has a firm uniform consistency, while it is soft enough to cut and spread easily under the knife without breaking or crumbling. It should possess a faint sweet odour, and a bland, soft, delicate flavour, melting in the mouth without any indication of grittiness. Pure butter is a complex chemical compound, consisting in large part of fats or glycerides of the non-volatile acids, palmitic acid, and butyric acid, with occasionally stearic acid. With these there occur small proportions of glycerides of the volatile acids, butyric, capronic, caprylic, and caprinic acid, to which the butter owes its distinguishing flavour and characteristics, as it has the non-volatile acids in common with other fats, though in different proportions. Butter when unadulterated and prepared with ordinary care should contain at least 85 per cent. of pure fat, the remainder consisting of casein, water, and salt. The casein is derived from milk, which is never perfectly washed out, but in butter of good quality this ought not to amount to more than from 3 to 5 per cent. Water may be present to the extent of from 5 to 10 per cent. without the butter being subject to a charge of adulteration; and a small proportion of salt is commonly worked into the butter in its preparation, but in what is sold as fresh or sweet this should only be from $\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 per cent. of the whole weight.

When butter is exposed to the air for some time, especially in warm weather, or in hot, confined situations, it quickly becomes rancid, acquiring thereby a distinct disagreeable odour and a biting taste, owing to the development of a volatile fatty acid under the influence of a species of fermentation, which is doubtless caused by the nitrogenous substance, casein, it contains. The more completely, therefore, all milky and curdy matter is washed out of butter the less will be the tendency to set up and develop fermentation. The preservation or curing of butter depends for its efficacy on the employment of some agency by which fermentative action may be prevented; but there are also several ways by which its development may be retarded and the material kept sweet for a considerable period. Rancidity may be corrected to some extent by melting the butter and pouring it into ice-cold water. As a

means also of retarding rancidity, butter is in some parts of France and the East melted up and heated till the water it may contain is evaporated, when the casein which rises as a scum to the surface is carefully skimmed off; but butter cannot be so melted without injuriously affecting its delicate flavour. By keeping fresh butter in a very cool place covered with pure water renewed daily, it will remain sweet for a considerable time. A still better method, recommended by M. Payen (*Substances Alimentaires*) is to use water acidulated with either tartaric acid or vinegar. It is also said that sugar in the form of a syrup poured over the butter is an excellent medium for retarding rancid fermentation. Butter, however, which is to be kept for a considerable length of time is "cured," or preserved by incorporating with it some substance or substances which act upon the nitrogenous material it contains, and thus prevent fermentation; and for this purpose common salt is the agent chiefly relied on. The salt used should be pure, dry, and finely powdered. About 5 per cent. of salt is sufficient for the purpose of curing; and when the quantity exceeds 8 per cent. it ought to be regarded as an adulteration. Butter very lightly salted for keeping only a short time is said to be powdered. A mixture much used for curing butter in Continental dairies is thus prepared:—One part each of sugar and nitre are mixed up with two parts of common salt and reduced to a very fine powder. This mixture is thoroughly kneaded into the butter in the proportion of about 1 oz. to every lb. After standing over for a fortnight butter so prepared will be ready for use and have a soft, agreeable taste, which it will retain a long time. In the preservation of all butter, the exclusion of air, as much as possible, is of the utmost consequence. It is, therefore, packed for sale in oaken kegs or glazed earthenware jars, filled quite full, and covered with a clean linen cloth on which salt is sprinkled. When in use the kegs should also be closely covered over, and the surface of the butter kept under brine.

Butter of good quality is a most digestible form of fat, while its flavour is so delicate and little pronounced that it is always acceptable to the palate. It is used most extensively by all classes, not only in the direct form with bread at nearly every meal, but also as entering very largely into the preparation of pastry, puddings, sauces, fancy cakes, and biscuits. Taking into account the daily consumption of this article, it is evident that the amount used in a year by a population such as that of Great Britain must be very great, an inference borne out by the fact that in 1875 the imports were 1,619,808 cwts., valued at £9,050,025, and, though no means exist of accurately estimating the home produce, it may safely be regarded as equal to the whole imports. The countries whence butter is imported into Great Britain are chiefly Germany, Holland, Denmark, and especially France. A large proportion of the French butter comes from the department of Calvados—Isigny being the centre of the best butter-making district. The value of the total produce of France in 1867 was estimated at 250 millions of francs.

Butter is a substance which affords great scope for adulteration, and its composition makes accurate detection of certain foreign matters a matter of considerable labour and difficulty. Other animal fats, such as lard, beef and mutton dripping, and tallow, with certain vegetable fats, are the chief adulterants. Such adulterations may be suspected by their characteristic smell, and detected by their different melting points, by microscopical examination, and by their ethereal solutions. Messrs Angell and Hehner have proposed a convenient method of estimating the fusing points of fat by placing a given weight of definite size on the fat, and observing the temperature at which it sinks into the substance. They find that the sinking-point for genuine butter