d'Angibault (1845) are echoes of the socialism of Pierre Leroux. She threw herself heart and soul into the republican struggle of 1848, composed manifestoes for her friends, addressed letters to the people, and even started a newspaper. But her political ardour was short-lived; she cared little about forms of government, and, when the days of June dashed to the ground her hopes of social regeneration, she quitted once for all the field of politics and returned to her quiet country ways and her true vocation as an interpreter of nature, a spiritualizer of the commonest sights of earth and the homeliest household affections. In 1849 she writes from Berri to a political friend,—"You thought that I was drinking blood from the skulls of aristocrats. No, I am studying Virgil and learning Latin!"

To a youth of storm and stress succeeded an old age so calm and happy that it has no history. For more than a quarter of a century she continued year by year to gladden the world by some new creation, and the last of her works, the posthumous *Contes d'une Grand'mère*, is as fresh and vigorous and far more beautiful than *Indiana*. Only once was the serenity of her life troubled. The *Journal of a Traveller during the War* will be quoted by future historians not only as a record of that agonizing crisis through which the French nation passed, but also as a prophecy of its recovery, which, by the indomitable spirit it expressed, brought its own fulfilment.

In writing the life of Madame Dudevant we have glanced at some of the most important of her works. To chronicle the titles only of all her novels would require an Homeric catalogue. It is only possible to give a general estimate of her style and of her place in French literature. But first we must call attention to her latest group of novels, which we omitted in the life as deserving a separate notice. With *Jeanne* (1852) began that series of pastorals, or stories of village life, by which George Sand is best known to the English public, and by which, we believe, she will be longest remembered. No description is needed of works so well known as *La petite Fadette*, *La mare au diable*, *Les Maîtres Sonneurs*, *Le meunier d'Angibault*, *Nanon*, and *François le Champi*. With these may be classed the fairy-stories which she wrote for her grandchildren in the last years of her life, *Le géant Yéous*, *La reine Coax*, *Le nuage rose*, *Les ailes de courage*. They are too recent to be much known in England, but we may safely predict that they will be as familiar to our grandchildren as *La petite Fadette* is to us. Without attempting to analyze, we may shortly indicate the peculiar charm and originality of her idyllic novels.

1. Like Wordsworth, with the inward eye she sees into the life of things; she seizes with her pencil the visionary gleam; she shows the mystical influences which emanate from the world of sense, the witchery of the sky, the quiet soul of the river, the beauty born of murmuring sound, the grey *landes* stretching far away to the blue horizon, the deep-meadowed champaigns with orchard lawns and bowery hollows.

2. Like Wordsworth, too, she had found love in huts where poor men dwell, and like him she is "a leader in that greatest movement of modern times, care for our humbler brethren,—her part being to make us reverence them for what they are, what they have in common with us, or in greater measure than ourselves."

3. To interpret for her readers these pictures of primitive life she has invented a style of her own,—not that, like Fontenelle, she makes her shepherds talk the language of the court, but she expresses the feelings of peasants in words so simple that a peasant might have used them, and yet so pure that they would pass muster with the Académie. Like Courier she is archaic, but her archaisms are not extracted from books, but relics of classical French which still lingered on in the quiet nooks of central France.

In conclusion, a few words must be said of her style, though much of its delicate harmony must elude a foreign critic, for it is by her style that she will chiefly live. It is simple and unaffected, yet full of subtle turns and picturesque expressions. Her dialogue is sparkling, her narrative clear and flowing, her descriptions exact, and her eloquence grandiose yet never meretricious. Topin is reminded of "the language of Rousseau, with something more of ease and finesse, the grace of Bernadin St Pierre, without his over-refinement, the warmth and eloquence of our greatest orators, and that without effort or straining." Nisard pronounces George Sand the master of French prose writers. To Thackeray her diction recalled the sound of country bells falling sweetly and sadly on the ear; it stirred the nerves of Mill like a symphony of Haydn or Mozart.

One of the greatest of English novelists seems by the name she has adopted to provoke comparison with George Sand. In psychological analysis and insight into the problems of modern life, she is at least her equal; in her range of knowledge, in self-control, and in practical common sense she is greatly her superior; but in unity of design, in harmony of treatment, in that purity and simplicity of language so felicitous and yet so unstudied, in all those qualities which make the best of George Sand's novels master pieces of art, she is as much her inferior. George Eliot is a great moralist, a great teacher; George Sand, whatever we may think of her doctrine and her morality, is by universal consent a supreme artist.

She has stayed in many camps, and lent her pen to many causes, she has had many friends and many lovers, but to one cause only has she remained constant—the cause of human progress; and the only master in whose service she has never wearied is art. (F. S.)

DUDLEY, a parliamentary and municipal borough of England, in a detached portion of the county of Worcestershire surrounded by the county of Stafford. It lies in the centre of the "Black Country," about eight miles W.N.W. of Birmingham, at a junction on the Great Western railway. The town is generally well-built, its streets are well-paved, and there is a fair supply of water. The principal buildings are the parish church of St Thomas, rebuilt in 1819 at a cost of £23,000, and restored in 1862; several other churches, of which the most recent is St Luke's, erected in 1876; the town-hall, the county court, the Guest hospital (formerly the blind asylum), endowed (1868) by Joseph Guest, with a legacy of £20,000 (1861), the school of art, the new dispensary (1868), and the mechanics' institute (1861). Among the educational establishments are a free grammar-school, a subscription library, and a geological society with a small scientific museum. On a hill to the north are the extensive remains of an ancient castle, surrounded by beautiful grounds; and in the market-place stands a fountain, erected by the earl of Dudley at a cost of £3000, on the occasion of his marriage. The presence of coal, iron-ore, and limestone gives its peculiar character to the industries of the place. According to the census of 1871, 5442 men were engaged in the iron manufacture, 1040 as makers of engines or machines, and 3501 in the coal-mines; while the nail manufacture alone gave employment to 1267 males and 3019 females. Among the various articles produced are fire-irons, stoves, shovels, edge tools, chains, anchors, and especially anvils and vices. The glass-works, brass foundries, and brickworks are also of importance; and tanning, brewing, and malting are extensively carried on. The parliamentary borough has an area of 7715 acres, and returns one member to Parliament. In 1871 the population of the municipal borough, which has an area of 3680 acres, was 43,782; that of the parliamentary borough was 82,249.

Dudley castle, according to an unfounded tradition preserved by Camden, was first built about 700 by a Mercian prince called Dodo. It is mentioned in Domesday book as belonging after the conquest to William Fitz Ansculf. Being held in 1138 for the empress Maud by Ralphe Paganel, it was burnt by Stephen. In 1161 Gervase, Ralphe's son, founded a priory for Cluniac monks, about a quarter of a mile to the west of the castle, at a spot still distinguished by a few ruins. The lordship was afterwards held by the Somerys, and the Suttons; and from the latter family it was transferred by marriage to the Wards of Bixley. John Ward, sixth Baron Dudley, was in 1763 created Viscount Dudley and Ward; and in 1827 John William, the fourth viscount, was created Earl Dudley. The title died with him in 1833, but was restored in 1860 in favour of William, his second cousin. The description Sir Amyas Pawlet gives of the town in 1585 is—"one of the poorest towns I have seen in my life." On its surrender to the Parliament in 1646–7 the fortifications of the castle were demolished, but it continued habitable to 1750, when a fire broke out which reduced it to its present ruinous state. Dudley was enfranchised in 1832 by 2 Will. IV. c. 45; and it received incorporation in 1865. See Booker's *History of Dudley*, and Twamley's *History of Dudley Castle and Priory*, 1867.

DUDLEY, EARLS OF. See NORTHUMBERLAND.

DUEL, a deadly combat between two persons. The word is used in two distinct senses—(1) the judicial combat, a form of trial which prevailed in the Middle Ages, ordained by law as a proof of guilt or innocence; and (2) the modern duel, a pre-arranged combat with deadly weapons between two private persons to settle some private quarrel.

Though duelling is in England obsolete, and in other countries fast obsolescent, yet it must still command our attention as the latest survival of feudalism, and its history will always be studied as one of the most curious developments of mediæval society.

On the origin of the duel a vast amount of perverse ingenuity has been spent. Writers of the 16th and 17th centuries commonly begin their treatises with an account of the combats between David and Goliath, Hector and Achilles, the Horatii and Curiatii. By etymology it is true that *duellum* is the same word as *bellum*, and in this sense the origin of the duel must be traced to the earliest condition of society, when every man's hand was against his neighbour. But, in the specialized sense which the word now bears, the duel was a peculiar institution of comparatively recent origin, a local custom which never spread beyond the limits of civilized Europe. It is easily distinguished both from the casual affrays of savages and the set battles of the champions of contending nations. An account of the judicial duel will clearly show that it is the direct parent of the modern duel. In the year 501 Gondebald, king of the Burgundians, passed a law authorizing the wager of battle, and in the preamble he gives his reason for introducing this new form of trial. It is that his subjects may no longer take oaths upon uncertain matters, or forswear themselves upon certain. Here is one proof among many that the judicial duel was introduced to correct the abuses of compurgation by oath. Like the other ordeals which it superseded, it was a direct appeal to Heaven to vindicate truth and punish falsehood. Like them it was founded on the superstitious spirit of the age, but unlike them it addressed itself to the martial temper and personal prowess of the nobles. Other ordeals, such as the cross, the corsned, and the oath on the gospels, were in the hands of the clergy, and were manipulated by them in the interest of the church or of themselves. In the wager of battle each man felt that his cause was in his own hands, and, though might was right, yet even this was better than the jugglery of priests. Nor, as Montesquieu has pointed out, was the trial so irrational as it would seem to modern eyes. Among a warlike people cowardice is a sign of other vices, vices which are most hateful and most prejudicial to a simple community, of meanness, lying, and fraud. It shows an indifference to public opinion, a neglect of the education of the day, which consisted mainly in the use of arms and warlike exercises. In a word, the law was neither better nor worse than the received morality of the time. From this jurisdiction none was exempt; women, minors, and ecclesiastics were required to appear by proxy; and adverse witnesses, and even the judge himself, were liable to be challenged to make good their words by force of arms. Those who are curious to observe the formalities and legal rules of a judicial combat will find them described at length in the 28th book of Montesquieu's *Esprit des Lois*. On these regulations he well remarks that, as there are an infinity of wise things conducted in a very foolish manner, so there are some foolish things conducted in a very wise manner. For our present purpose it is sufficient to observe the development of the idea of personal honour from which the modern duel directly sprang. In the ancient laws of the Swedes we find that if any man shall say to another, "You are not a man equal to other men," or "You have not the heart of a man," and the other shall reply, "I am a man as good as you," they shall meet on the highway, and then follow the regulations for the combat. What is this but the modern challenge? By the law of the Lombards if one man call another *arga*, the insulted party might defy the other to mortal combat. What is *arga* but the *dummer Junger* of the German student? Beaumanoir thus describes a legal process under Louis le Débonnaire:—The appellant begins by a declaration before the judge that the appellee is guilty of a certain crime; if the appellee answers that his accuser lies, the judge then ordains the duel. Is not this the modern point of honour, by which to be given the lie is an insult which can only be wiped out by blood?

From Germany the trial by judicial combat rapidly spread to every country of Europe. In France it was first confined to criminal causes, but this restriction was removed by Louis IX., who made it legal in civil matters as well, with the one proviso that in cases of debt the amount must exceed twelve deniers. By Philippe le Bel it was again confined in civil cases to questions of disputed inheritance, and forbidden altogether during the war between England and France. In 1385 a duel was fought, the result of which was so preposterous that even the most superstitious began to lose faith in the efficacy of such a judgment of God. A certain Jacques Legris was accused by the wife of Jean Carrouge of having introduced himself by night in the guise of her husband, and thus abused her. A duel was ordained by the Parliament, which was fought in the presence of Charles VI. Legris was defeated and hanged on the spot. Not long after a criminal arrested for some other offence confessed himself to be the author of the outrage. No institution could long survive so open a confutation. Henceforward the duel in France ceases to be an appeal to Heaven, and becomes merely a satisfaction of wounded honour. The last instance of a duel authorized by the magistrates, and conducted according to the forms of law, was the famous one between Francois de Vivonne de la Châtaignerie and Guy Chabot de Jarnac. The duel was fought on the 10th of July 1547 in the court-yard of the château of St Germain-en-Laye, in the presence of the king and a large assembly of courtiers. It was memorable in two ways. It enriched the French language with a new phrase; a sly and unforeseen blow, such as that by which De Jarnac worsted La Châtaignerie has since been called a *coup de Jarnac*. And Henry, grieved at the death of his favourite, swore a solemn oath that he would never again permit a duel to be fought. This led to the first of the many royal edicts against duelling.

In England, it is now generally agreed that the wager of battle did not exist before the time of the Norman Conquest. Some previous examples have been adduced, but

on examination they will be seen to belong rather to the class of single combats between the champions of two opposing armies. One such instance is worth quoting as a curious illustration of the superstition of the time. It occurs in a rare tract printed in London, 1610, *The Duello, or Single Combat.* "Danish irruptions and the bad aspects of Mars having drencht the common mother earth with her sonnes' blood streames, under the reigne of Edmund, a Saxon monarch, *misso in compendium* (so worthy Camden expresseth it) *bello utriusque gentis fata Edmundo Anglorum et Canuto Danorum regibus commissa fuerunt, qui singulari certamine de summa imperij in hac insula* (that is, the Eight in Glostershire) *depugnarunt.*" By the laws of William the Conqueror the trial by battle was only compulsory when the opposite parties were both Normans, in other cases it was optional. As the two nations were gradually merged into one, this form of trial spread, and until the reign of Henry II. it was the only mode for determining a suit for the recovery of land. The method of procedure is admirably described by Shakespeare in the opening scene in *Richard II.*, where Henry of Bolingbroke, duke of Hereford, challenges Thomas duke of Norfolk, and in the mock-heroic battle between Horner the Armourer and his man Peter in *Henry VI.*, and by Sir W. Scott in the *Fair Maid of Perth*, where Henry Gow appears before the king as the champion of Magdalen Proudfute. The judicial duel never took root in England as it did in France. In civil suits it was superseded by the grand assize of Henry II., and in cases of felony by indictment at the prosecution of the Crown. One of the latest instances occurred in the reign of Elizabeth, 1571, when the lists were actually prepared and the justices of the common pleas appeared at Tothill Fields as umpires of the combat. Fortunately the petitioner failed to put in an appearance, and was consequently nonsuited (See Spelman, *Glossary*, *s.v.* "Campus"). As late as 1817 Lord Ellenborough, in the case of Thornton *v.* Ashford, pronounced that "the general law of the land is that there shall be a trial by battle in cases of appeal unless the party brings himself within some of the exceptions." Thornton was accused of murdering Mary Ashford, and claimed his right to challenge the appellant, the brother of the murdered girl, to wager of battle. His suit was allowed, and, the challenge being refused, the accused escaped. Next year the law was abolished (59 Geo. III., c. 46).

In sketching the history of the judicial combat we have traced the parentage of the modern duel. Strip the former of its legality, and divest it of its religious sanction, and the latter remains. We are justified, then, in dating the commencement of duelling from the abolition of the wager of battle. To pursue its history we must return to France, the country where it first arose, and the soil on which it has most flourished. The causes which made it indigenous to France are sufficiently explained by the condition of society and the national character. As Buckle has pointed out, duelling is a special development of chivalry, and chivalry is one of the phases of the protective spirit which was predominant in France up to the time of the Revolution. Add to this the keen sense of personal honour, the susceptibility, and the pugnacity which distinguish the French race. Montaigne, when touching on this subject in his essays, says, "Put three Frenchmen together on the plains of Libya, and they will not be a month in company without scratching one another's eyes out." The third chapter of d'Audiguier's *Ancien usage des duels* is headed, "Pourquoi les seuls Français se battent en duel." English literature abounds with allusions to this characteristic of the French nation. Lord Herbert of Cherbury, who was ambassador at the court of Louis XIII., says, "There is scarce a Frenchman worth looking on who has not killed his man in a duel." Ben Jonson, in his *Magnetic Lady*, makes Compass, the scholar and soldier, thus describe France, "that garden of humanity":—

> There every gentleman professing arms
> Thinks he is bound in honour to embrace
> The bearing of a challenge for another,
> Without or questioning the cause or asking
> Least colour of a reason.

Duels were not common before the 16th century. Hallam attributes their prevalence to the barbarous custom of wearing swords as a part of domestic dress, a fashion which was not introduced till the later part of the 15th century. In 1560 the states-general at Orleans supplicated Charles IX. to put a stop to duelling. Hence the famous ordinance of 1566, drawn up by the Chancellor de l'Hôpital, which served as the basis of the successive ordinances of the following kings. Under the frivolous and sanguinary reign of Henry III., "who was as eager for excitement as a woman," the rage for duels spread till it became almost an epidemic. In 1602 the combined remonstrances of the church and the magistrates extorted from the king an edict condemning to death whoever should give or accept a challenge or act as second. But public opinion was revolted by such rigour, and the statute remained a dead letter. A duel forms a fit conclusion to the reign. A hair-brained youth named L'Isle Marivaux swore that he would not survive his beloved king, and threw his cartel into the air. It was at once picked up, and Marivaux soon obtained the death he had courted. Henry IV. began his reign by an edict against duels, but he was known in private to favour them; and, when De Crequi asked leave to fight Don Philip of Savoy, he is reported to have said, "Go, and if I were not a king I would be your second." Fontenay-Mareuil says, in his *Mémoires*, that in the eight years between 1601 and 1609, 2000 men of noble birth fell in duels. In 1609 a more effective measure was taken at the instance of Sully by the establishment of a court of honour. The edict decrees that all aggrieved persons shall address themselves to the king, either directly or through the medium of the constables, marshals, &c.; that the king shall decide, whether, if an accommodation could not be effected, permission to fight should be given; that the aggressor, if pronounced in the wrong, shall in any case be suspended from any public office or employment, and be mulcted of one-third of his revenue till he has satisfied the aggrieved party; that any one giving or receiving a challenge shall forfeit all right of reparation and all his offices; that any one who kills his adversary in an unauthorized duel shall suffer death without burial, and his children shall be reduced to villanage; that seconds, if they take part in a duel, shall suffer death, if not, shall be degraded from the profession of arms. This edict has been pronounced by Henri Martin "the wisest decree of the ancient monarchy on a matter which involves so many delicate and profound questions of morals, politics, and religion touching civil rights" (*Histoire de France*, x. 466).

In the succeeding reign the mania for duels revived. De Houssaye tells us that in Paris when friends met the first question was, "Who fought yesterday? who is to fight to-day?" They fought by night and day, by moonlight and by torch-light, in the public streets and squares. A hasty word, a misconceived gesture, a question about the colour of a riband or an embroidered letter, such were the commonest pretexts for a duel. The slighter and more frivolous the dispute, the less were they inclined to submit them to the king for adjudication. Often, like gladiators or prize-fighters, they fought for the pure love of fighting. A misunderstanding is cleared up on the ground. "N'importe," cry the principals, "puisque nous sommes ici, battons-nous." Seconds, as Montaigne tells us, are no longer witnesses, but must take part themselves unless they would be thought wanting in affection or courage; and he goes on to complain that men are no longer contented with a single second, "c'était anciennement des duels, ce sont à cette heure rencontres et batailles." There is no more striking instance of Richelieu's firmness and power as a statesman than his conduct in the matter of duelling. In his *Testament Politique* he has assigned his reasons for disapproving it as a statesman and ecclesiastic. But this disapproval was turned to active detestation by a private cause. His elder brother, the head of the house, had fallen in a duel stabbed to the heart by an enemy of the cardinal. Already four edicts had been published under Louis XIII. with little or no effect, when in 1626 there was published a new edict condemning to death any one who had killed his adversary in a duel, or had been found guilty of sending a challenge a second time. Banishment and partial confiscation of goods were awarded for lesser offences. But this edict differed from preceding ones not so much in its severity as in the fact that it was the first which was actually enforced. The cardinal began by imposing the penalties of banishment and fines, but, these proving ineffectual to stay the evil, he determined to make a terrible example. To quote his own words to the king, "Il s'agit de couper la gorge aux duels ou aux édits de votre Majesté." The count de Boutteville, a renommist who had already been engaged in twenty-one affairs of honour, determined out of pure bravado to fight a twenty-second time. The duel took place at mid-day on the Place Royal. De Boutteville was arrested with his second, the count de Chapelles; they were tried by Parliament, condemned, and, in spite of all the influence of the powerful house of Montmorenci, of which De Boutteville was a branch, they were both beheaded at Grève, June 21, 1627. For a short time the ardour of duellists was cooled. But the lesson soon lost its effect. Only five years later we read in the *Mercure de France* that two gentlemen who had killed one another in a duel were, by the cardinal's orders, hanged on a gallows, stripped, and with their heads downwards, in the sight of all the people. This was a move in the right direction, since, for fashionable vices, ridicule and ignominy is a more drastic remedy than death. It was on this principle that Caraccioli, prince of Melfi, when viceroy of Piedmont, finding that his officers were being decimated by duelling, proclaimed that all duels should be fought on the parapet of the Ponte Vecchio, and if one of the combatants chanced to fall into the river he should on no account be pulled out.

Under the long reign of Louis XIV. many celebrated duels took place, of which the most remarkable were that between the duke of Guise and Count Coligny, the last fought on the Place Royal, and that between the dukes of Beaufort and Nemours, each attended by four friends. Of the ten combatants, Nemours and two others were killed on the spot, and none escaped without some wound. No less than eleven edicts against duelling were issued under le Grand Monarque. That of 1643 established a supreme court of honour composed of the marshals of France; but the most famous was that of 1679, which confirmed the enactments of his predecessors, Henry IV. and Louis XII. At the same time a solemn agreement was entered into by the principal nobility that they would never engage in a duel on any pretence whatever. A medal was struck to commemorate the occasion; and the firmness of the king, in refusing pardon to all offenders, contributed more to restrain this scourge of society than all the efforts of his predecessors.

The subsequent history of duelling in France may be more shortly treated. The two great Frenchmen whose writings preluded the French Revolution both set their faces against it. Voltaire had indeed, as a young man, in obedience to the dictates of society, once sought satisfaction from a nobleman for a brutal insult, and had reflected on his temerity in the solitude of the Bastille.[1] Henceforward he inveighed against the practice, not only for its absurdity, but also for its aristocratic exclusiveness. Rousseau had said of duelling, "It is not an institution of honour, but a horrible and barbarous custom, which a courageous man despises and a good man abhors." Then came the Revolution, which levelled at a blow the huge structure of feudalism, and with it the duel, its instrument and apanage. *Pauca tamen suberunt priscæ vestigia fraudis.* With each reaction against the revolutionary spirit and return to feudal ideas the duel reappears. Under the Directory it again became fashionable among the upper classes. Napoleon was a sworn foe to it. "Bon duelliste mauvais soldat" is one of his best known sayings; and, when the king of Sweden sent him a challenge, he replied that he would order a fencing-master to attend him as plenipotentiary. After the battle of Waterloo duels such as Lever loves to depict were frequent between disbanded French officers and those of the allies in occupation. The restoration of the Bourbons brought with it a fresh crop of duels. Since then they have been chiefly confined to military circles, and a small section of Parisian journalists. Yet a list of duels fought within the last fifty years in France would occupy no inconsiderable space, and would include some of the most famous names in literature and politics, Emile de Girardin, Armand Carrel, Lamartine, Alexandre Dumas, Ledru Rollin, Edmond About, Sainte-Beuve, and M. Thiers. Even at the present hour men like Paul de Cassagnac exercise a sinister power, and an editor of the *Pays* must be an adept with swords and pistols no less than a skilled writer.

As a complete history of duelling would far exceed the limits of this article, we have preferred to trace in some detail its rise and fall in the country where it has most prevailed. We are thus compelled to pass by other nations, and conclude with a brief epitome of its annals at home. Duelling did not begin in England till some hundred years after it had arisen in France. There is no instance of a private duel fought in this country before the 16th century, and they are rare before the reign of James I. A very fair notion of the comparative popularity of duelling, and of the feeling with which it was regarded at various periods, might be gathered by examining the part it plays in the novels and lighter literature of the times. The earliest duels we remember in fiction are that in the *Monastery* between Sir Piercie Shafton and Halbert Glendinning, and that in *Kenilworth* between Tressilian and Varney. (That in *Anne of Geierstein* either is an anachronism or must reckon as a wager by battle.) Under James I. we have the encounter between Nigel and Lord Dalgarno. The greater evil of war, as we observed in French history, expels the lesser, and the literature of the Commonwealth is in this respect a blank. With the Restoration there came a reaction against Puritan morality, and a return to the gallantry and loose manners of French society, which is best represented by the theatre of the day. The drama of

[1] Voltaire met the Chevalier Rohan-Chabot at the house of the Marquis of Sully. The Chevalier, offended by Voltaire's free speech, insolently asked the Marquis, "Who is that young man?" "One," replied Voltaire, "who, if he does not parade a great name, honours that he bears." The Chevalier said nothing at the time, but, seizing his opportunity, inveigled Voltaire into his coach, and had him beaten by six of his footmen. Voltaire set to work to learn fencing, and then sought the Chevalier in the theatre, and publicly challenged him. A *bon-mot* at the Chevalier's expense was the only satisfaction that the philosopher could obtain. "Monsieur, si quelque affaire d'intérêt ne vous a point fait oublier l'outrage dont j'ai à me plaindre, j'espère que vous m'en rendrez raison." The Chevalier was said to employ his capital in petty usury.

the Restoration abounds in duels. Passing on to the reign of Queen Anne, we find the subject frequently discussed in the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*, and Addison points in his happiest way the moral to a contemporary duel between Mr Thornhill and Sir Cholmeley Dering. "I come not," says Spinomont to King Pharamond, "I come not to implore your pardon, I come to relate my sorrow, a sorrow too great for human life to support. Know that this morning I have killed in a duel the man whom of all men living I love best." No reader of *Esmond* can forget Thackeray's description of the doubly fatal duel between the duke of Hamilton and Lord Mohun, which is historical, or the no less life-like though fictitious duel between Lord Mohun and Lord Castlewood. Throughout the reigns of the Georges they are frequent. Richardson expresses his opinion on the subject in six voluminous letters to the *Literary Repositor*. Sheridan, like Farquhar in a previous generation, not only dramatized a duel, but fought two himself. Byron thus commemorates the bloodless duel between Tom Moore and Lord Jeffrey:—

> Can none remember that eventful day,
> That ever glorious almost fatal fray,
> When Little's leadless pistols met the eye,
> And Bow Street myrmidons stood laughing by?

As we approach our own times they become rarer in fiction. Thackeray, indeed, who represents an older generation, and the worse side of aristocratical society, abounds in duels. His royal highness the late lamented commander-in-chief had the greatest respect for Major Macmurdo, as a man who had conducted scores of affairs for his acquaintance with the greatest prudence and skill; and Rawdon Crawley's duelling pistols, "the same which I shot Captain Marker," have become a household word. Dickens, on the other hand, who depicts contemporary English life, and mostly in the middle classes, in all his numerous works has only three; and George Eliot never once refers to a duel. Tennyson, using a poet's privilege, has laid the scene of a duel in the year of the Crimean war, but he echoes the spirit of the times when he stigmatizes "the Christless code that must have life for a blow."

To pass from fiction to fact, a list of the celebrated public men who in the last century have fought duels will suffice to show the magnitude of the evil:—Fox, Pitt, William Pulteney and Lord Hervey, Canning and Lord Castlereagh, the duke of York, the duke of Richmond, Wilkes, Sir Francis Burdett, Grattan, Daniel O'Connell. For particulars we must refer the reader to the respective names.

The year 1808 is memorable in the annals of duelling in England. Major Campbell was sentenced to death and executed for killing Captain Boyd in a duel. In this case it is true that there was a suspicion of foul play; but in the case of Lieutenant Blundell, who was killed in a duel in 1813, though all had been conducted with perfect fairness, the surviving principal and the seconds were all convicted of murder and sentenced to death, and, although the royal pardon was obtained, they were all cashiered. The next important date is the year 1843, when public attention was painfully called to the subject by a duel in which Colonel Fawcett was shot by his brother-in-law Lieutenant Monro. The survivor, whose career was thereby blasted, had, it was well known, gone out most reluctantly, in obedience to the then prevailing military code. A full account of the steps taken by the late Prince Consort, and of the correspondence which passed between him and the duke of Wellington, will be found in the *Life of the Prince* by Theodore Martin. The duke, unfortunately, was not an unprejudiced counsellor. Not only had he been out himself, but, in writing to Lord Londonderry on the occasion of the duel between the marquis and Ensign Battier in 1824, he had gone so far as to state that he considered the probability of the Hussars having to fight a duel or two a matter of no consequence. But though the proposal of the prince to establish courts of honour met with no favour, yet it led to an important amendment of the articles of war (April 1844). The 98th of the articles now in force ordains that "every person who shall fight or promote a duel, or take any steps thereto, or who shall not do his best to prevent a duel, shall, if an officer, be cashiered or suffer such other penalty as a general court-martial may award." By the same articles, to accept or to receive apologies for wrong or insult given or received is declared suitable to the character of honourable men. The effect has been that duels, which had already been banished from civil society, have been no less discredited in the English army. In the German army, on the contrary, the institution survives in full force, and is recognized by law. A full account of the courts of honour to regulate disputes and duels among German officers will be found in *The Armed Strength of the German Empire*.

Any formal discussion of the morality of duelling is, in England at least, happily superfluous. No fashionable vice has been so unanimously condemned both by moralists and divines, and in tracing its history we are reminded of the words of Tacitus, "in civitate nostra et vetabitur semper et retinebitur." Some, however, of the problems moral and social which it suggests may be shortly noticed. That duelling flourished so long in England the law is perhaps as much to blame as society. It was doubtless from the fact that duels were at first a form of legal procedure that English law has refused to take cognizance of private duels. A duel in the eye of the law differs nothing from an ordinary murder. Our greatest legal authorities, from the time of Elizabeth downwards, such as Coke, Bacon, and Hale, have all distinctly affirmed this interpretation of the law. But here as elsewhere the severity of the penalty defeated its own object. The public conscience revolted against a Draconian code which made no distinction between wilful murder and a deadly combat, wherein each party consented to his own death or submitted to the risk of it. No jury could be found to convict when conviction involved in the same penalty a Fox or a Pitt and a Turpin or a Brownrigg. Such, however, was the conservatism of English publicists that Bentham was the first to point out clearly this defect of the law, and propose a remedy. In his *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, published in 1789, Bentham discusses the subject with his usual boldness and logical precision. In his exposition of the absurdity of duelling considered as a branch of penal justice, and its inefficiency as a punishment, he only restates in a clearer form the arguments of Paley. So far there is nothing novel in his treatment of the subject. But he soon parts company with the Christian moralist and proceeds to show that duelling does, however rudely and imperfectly, correct and repress a real social evil. "It entirely effaces a blot which an insult imprints upon the honour. Vulgar moralists, by condemning public opinion upon this point, only confirm the fact." He then points out the true remedy for the evil. It is to extend the same legal protection to offences against honour as to offences against the person. The legal satisfactions which he suggests are some of them extremely grotesque. Thus for an insult to a woman, the man is to be dressed in a woman's clothes, and the retort to be inflicted by the hand of a woman. But the principle indicated is a sound one, that in offences against honour the punishment must be analogous to the injury. Doubtless, if Bentham were now alive, he would allow that the necessity for such a scheme of legislation had in a great measure passed away. That duels have since become extinct is no doubt principally owing to social changes, but it may

be in part ascribed to improvements in legal remedies in the sense which Bentham indicated. A notable instance is Lord Campbell's Act of 1843, by which, in the case of a newspaper libel, a public apology coupled with a pecuniary payment is allowed to bar a plea. In the Indian Code there are special enactments concerning duelling, which is punishable not as murder but as homicide.

Suggestions have from time to time been made for the establishment of courts of honour, but the need of such tribunals is doubtful, while the objections to them are obvious. The present tendency of political philosophy is to contract rather than extend the province of law, and any interference with social life is justly resented. Real offences against reputation are sufficiently punished, and the rule of the lawyers, that mere scurrility or opprobrious words, which neither of themselves import nor are attended with any hurtful effects, are not punishable, seems on the whole a wise one. What in a higher rank is looked upon as a gross insult may in a lower rank be regarded as a mere pleasantry or a harmless joke. Among the lower orders offences against honour can hardly be said to exist; the learned professions have each its own tribunal to which its members are amenable; and the highest ranks of society, however imperfect their standard of morality may be, are perfectly competent to enforce that standard by means of social penalties without resorting either to trial by law or trial by battle.

Bibliography.—Castillo, *Tractato de duello*, Turin, 1525; J. P. Pigna, *Il duello*, 1554; Muzio Girolamo, *Traité du duel*, Venice, 1553; Boyssat, *Recherches sur les duels*, Lyons, 1610; J. Savaron, *Traité contre les duels*, Paris, 1610; F. Bacon, *Charge concerning duels, &c.*, 1614; D'Audiguier, *Le vray et ancien usage des duels*, Paris, 1617; *His Majesties Edict and severe Censure against private combats*, London, 1618; Cockburn, *History of Duels*, London, 1720; Colombey, *Histoire anecdotique du Duel*, Paris; Millingen, *History of Duelling*, London, 1841; Sabine, *Notes on Duels*, Boston, 1859; Steinmetz, *Romance of Duelling*, London, 1868. See also Larousse, *Dictionnaire du xixe siècle*, article "Duel;" Mackay, *History of Popular Delusions, Duels, and Ordeals*; and for a valuable list of authorities, Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, vol. ii. p. 137, note 71. (F. S.)

DUFOUR, Wilhelm Heinrich (1787–1875), a Swiss general, director of the topographical survey of Switzerland, was born at Constance, of Genevese parents temporarily in exile, on the 15th September 1787. During his early studies at Geneva he showed no special capacity, and he took a low place in the entrance examination to the École Polytechnique at Paris, to which he went in 1807. By two years' close study he so greatly improved his position that he was ranked among the first in the exit examination. Immediately on leaving the school he received a commission in the engineers, and was sent to serve in Corfu, which was blockaded by the English. During the Hundred Days he attained the rank of captain, and was employed in raising fortifications at Grenoble for its defence against the Austrians. After the peace that followed Waterloo he retired from the French army on half-pay, and resumed his status as a Swiss citizen. Refusing the offer of a command at Briançon on condition that he would again adopt the French nationality, he devoted himself to the military service of his native land. From 1819 to 1830 he was chief instructor in the military school of Thoune, which had been founded mainly through his instrumentality. Among other distinguished foreign pupils he had the honour of instructing Prince Louis Napoleon, afterwards emperor of the French. In 1827 he was raised to the rank of colonel, and commanded the Federal army in a series of field manœuvres. In 1831 he became chief of the staff, and soon afterwards he was appointed quartermaster-general. The most important work of his life was commenced in 1833, when the Diet commissioned him to superintend the execution of a trigonometrical survey of Switzerland. He had already proved his fitness for the task by making a cadastral survey of the canton of Geneva, and publishing a map of the canton in four sheets on the scale of $\frac{1}{25000}$. The larger work occupied thirty-two years, and was accomplished with complete success. The map in 25 sheets on the scale of $\frac{1}{100000}$ was published at intervals between 1842 and 1865, and is an admirable specimen of cartography. In recognition of the ability with which Dufour had carried out his task, the Federal Council in 1868 ordered the highest peak of Monte Rosa to be named Dufour Spitze. In 1847 Dufour received the command of the Federal Army, which was employed in reducing the revolted Catholic cantons to submission. The quickness and thoroughness with which he performed the painful task, and the wise moderation with which he treated his vanquished fellow-countrymen, were acknowledged by a gift of 60,000 francs from the Diet and various honours from different cities and cantons of the confederation. In politics he belonged to the moderate conservative party, and he consequently lost a good deal of his popularity in 1848. In 1864 he presided over the International Conference which framed the so-called Geneva Convention as to the treatment of the wounded in time of war, &c. He died on the 14th July 1875. Dufour was the author of a *Mémoire sur l'artillerie des anciens et sur celle du moyen-âge* (1840), *De la fortification permanente* (1850), *Manuel de tactique pour les officiers de toutes armes* (1842), and various other works in military science.

DUFRÉNOY, Pierre Armand, geologist and mineralogist, was born at Sevran, in the department of Seine-et-Oise, in France, in 1792, and died March 20, 1857. After leaving the Imperial Lyceum in 1811, he studied till 1813 at the Polytechnic School, and then, at the age of twenty-one, entered the corps des mines. In conjunction with M. Élie de Beaumont he in 1841 published a great geological map of France, the result of investigations carried on during thirteen years (1823–1836). Five years (1836–41) were spent in writing the text to accompany the map. The two authors had already together published *Voyage métallurgique en Angleterre* (1827, 2d ed. 1837–39), *Mémoires pour servir à une description géologique de la France* (1830–38), and a *Mémoire* on Cantal and Mont-Dore (1833). Other literary productions of Dufrénoy are an account of the iron-mines of the eastern Pyrenees (1834), a treatise on mineralogy (1844, 2d ed. 1856–60), and numerous papers contributed to the *Annales des Mines* and other scientific publications, one of the most interesting of which is entitled *Des terrains volcaniques des environs de Naples*. Dufrénoy was a member of the Academy of Sciences, a commander of the Legion of Honour, an inspector-general of mines, and professor of geology at *L'École des Ponts et Chaussées*, and of mineralogy at the Imperial School of Mines, of which latter institution he was the director.

DUFRESNY, Charles Rivière (1648–1728), a French dramatist, better remembered by the comedy of his own life than by any of the numerous plays which he contributed to the Théâtre Italien and the Théâtre Français. The fact that his grandfather was an illegitimate son of Henry IV. procured him the liberal patronage of Louis XIV., who not only gave him the post of *valet de chambre*, but affixed his name now to one lucrative privilege and now to another. The *protégé*, however, appeared as eager to squander as the king was to bestow; and the pathetic confession of exhausted generosity—"I cannot enrich Dufresny"—was probably taken by the careless spendthrift as a signal compliment; though to one of his friends who consoled him with the remark that poverty is no sin, he replied, "*It is worse.*" On Louis's death he was almost as necessitous as if Louis had never lived; but he obtained 200,000 francs from the duke of Orleans in answer to an ingenious request

that his highness for his own glory would leave Dufresny in his excessive indigence as a sole example of the condition of the whole kingdom before the golden days of his regency. As if to furnish a piquant commentary on the proverb that poverty makes us acquainted with strange bed-fellows, he married his washerwoman in discharge of her bill—a whimsicality which supplied Le Sage with an episode in the *Diable Boiteux*, and was made the subject of a comedy by J. M. Deschamps—*Charles Rivière Dufresny, ou le mariage impromptu*. Clever, versatile, and superficial, he obtained in his own day a considerable reputation not only as an author and a wit, but also as a landscape gardener and architectural dèsigner : to his great patron he furnished plans for the park at Versailles, and was appointed in return overseer of the royal grounds. He died at Paris in 1728 in a house—*la maison de Pline*—which he had built with the regent's bounty. His plays, destitute for the most part of all higher qualities, but abounding in sprightly wit and pithy sayings, are no longer acted; though a few of the many in the six volumes of his *Théâtre* (Paris, 1731) are still read. *L'esprit de contradiction* (first acted in 1700), *Le double veuvage* (1702), *La coquette du village*, and *Le mariage fait et rompu* are reprinted in the second volume of Didot's *Chefs d'œuvre des auteurs comiques*; and his contributions to the Théâtre Italien, produced in collaboration with Regnard or Biancocelli, may be found in Gherardi's collection. A volume of *Poésies diverses*, two volumes of *Nouvelles historiques*, Leyde, 1692, and *Les amusements sérieux et comiques d'un Siamois*, 1807, a work to which Montesquieu was indebted for the idea of his *Lettres Persanes*, complete the list of Dufresny's writings. Two volumes of *Œuvres Choisies* were edited by Auger in 1801.

DUGDALE, Sir William (1605–1686), an eminent English antiquary, the only son of John Dugdale, who belonged to an old Lancashire family, but had sold his property in that county and bought the estate of Shustoke, near Coleshill, in Warwickshire, was born on the 12th September 1605. He received the early part of his education from Thomas Sibley, a curate near Shustoke, and attended from his tenth to his fifteenth year the Free School at Coventry, whence returning to his father, he read with him for some time law and history. In compliance with his father's wish, who was old and infirm, and desired to see him married before he died, he was married at the early age of seventeen to the daughter of a gentleman in the county of Stafford. He lived in his wife's father's house until the death of his own father in 1624, and soon thereafter went to reside at Fillongley, near Shustoke, an estate formerly purchased for him by his father. In 1625 he purchased the manor of Blyth, in the parish of Shustoke, and, preferring it as a place of residence, removed thither in 1626. His inclination to the study of antiquities manifested itself at an early age, and received its first encouragement from Samuel Roper, a barrister of Lincoln's Inn. After his settlement at Blyth Hall he made the acquaintance of some gentlemen interested in antiquities, who enabled him to obtain a sight of the old "deeds and evidences" of the county families of Warwickshire, and "divers antient writings of consequence," with the view of his writing a history of that county. In 1635 he accompanied Sir Simon Archer to London, and was by him introduced to Sir Henry Spelman, which led to his acquaintance with Thomas, earl of Arundell, then earl marshal of England, by whom he was, in 1638, created a pursuivant of arms extraordinary by the name of Blanche Lyon, and in 1639 rouge-croix pursuivant in ordinary. About this time he agreed to write his work on *Monastery Foundations*, and, having a lodging in the Herald's Office, he now spent much of his time in London in order to augment his collections out of the records of the Tower and other places in the city. In 1641 Sir Christopher Hatton, a member of the House of Commons, dreading the near approach of the revolutionary storm which soon thereafter broke over England, and the ruin that might then ensue, got him to make exact drafts of all the monuments in Westminster Abbey and the principal churches in England, including Peterborough, Ely, Norwich, Lincoln, Newark, Beverley, Southwell, Kingston-upon-Hull, York, Selby, Chester, Lichfield, Tamworth, and Warwick. He received and obeyed, in June 1642, the summons of Charles I. to attend him at York, whither, on the outbreak of the revolution, the king had betaken himself for the sake of greater security. Learning the spread of the revolution in Warwickshire, Charles deputed him to summon to surrender the castle of Banbury, in Oxford, and the castle of Warwick, which were being rapidly filled with ammunition and rebels. Banbury obeyed, but Warwick, being better prepared, contemned the summons and its inmates were proclaimed traitors. He also summoned the city of Coventry; and, accompanying Sir Richard Willys as guide, he was present at the battle of Cudworth Field, the result of which he communicated to the king. He remained at Oxford with the king till the surrender of the garrison in 1646, and witnessed the battle of Edgehill, of the field of which he made afterwards an exact survey, noting how the armies were drawn up, and where and in what direction the various movements took place, and marking the graves of the slain. In November 1642 he was admitted M.A. of the university, and in 1644 the king created him Chester-Herauld. While at Oxford he made a journey to Worcester, where—with the purpose of increasing his collections for his history of Warwickshire—he perused the registers of the bishop and of the dean and chapter; and during his Oxford leisure he applied himself also to the search for antiquities in the libraries and in the private houses. When Oxford surrendered he continued his antiquarian researches in London along with Richard Dodsworth for their joint work on the monasteries, which was published successively in single volumes in 1655, 1664, and 1673. At the Restoration he obtained the office of Norroy king-at-arms, and in 1677 was created garter principal king-at-arms, and was knighted. He died at Blyth Hall, 10th February 1686.

Besides the works on Warwickshire, published in 1656, and *Monasticon Anglicanum*, republished in 6 vols. in 1817–30, and again in 8 volumes in 1846, Sir William Dugdale is the author of *History of St Paul's Cathedral* (1658), the *Baronage of England* (3 vols. 1675–6), and other works of less importance. His life, written by himself up to 1678, with his diary and correspondence, and an index to his manuscript collections, was edited by William Hamper, and published in 1827.

DUGONG (*Halicore*), a genus of herbivorous Cetacea, forming, along which the Sea-Cows (*Manatus*), and the now extinct *Rhytina*, the sub-order Sirenia. In this genus the head is small, and is abruptly truncated in front, the snout being remarkably obtuse and furnished with bristles. The intermaxillary bones are enormously developed, and from these proceed two large incisor teeth or tusks, which are well developed in the male, but which in the female are arrested in their growth, and remain concealed beneath the surface. There are never more than five molar teeth on each side of either jaw, or twenty in all, and these are flat on the grinding surface. The flippers are unprovided with nails, and the tail is broad, and differs from that of the manatee in being crescent-shaped instead of rounded. The bones are very hard and firm, and take a polish equal to that of ivory. The dugongs frequent the shallow waters of the tropical seas, extending from the east coast of Africa north of the mouth of the Zambesi river, along the shores of the Indian, Malayan, and Australian seas, where they may be seen basking on the surface of the water, or browsing on submarine pastures of *Algæ* and *Fuci*, for which the

thick obtuse lips and truncated snout preeminently fit them. They are gregarious, feeding in large numbers in localities where they are not often disturbed. The female produces a single young one at a birth, and is remarkable for the great affection it shows for its offspring, so that when the young dugong is caught there is no difficulty in capturing the mother with it. There are two species—the Indian Dugong (*Halicore indicus*) and the Australian Dugong (*Halicore australis*). The former is very abundant along the shores of the Indian Ocean, and is captured in large numbers by the Malayans, who esteem its flesh as a great delicacy; while the lean portions, especially of young specimens, are regarded by Europeans even as excellent eating. It is generally taken by spearing, the main object of the hunter being to raise the tail out of the water, when the animal becomes perfectly powerless. It seldom attains a length of more than 8 or 10 feet. The Australian Dugong is a larger species, attaining sometimes a length of 15 feet. It occurs along the Australian coast from Moreton Bay to Cape York, and is highly valued by the natives, who hunt for it with spears, and gorge themselves with its flesh, when they are fortunate enough to secure a carcase. In recent years the oil obtained from the blubber of this species has been largely used in Australia as a substitute for cod-liver oil. It does not contain iodine, but is said to possess all the therapeutic qualities of cod-liver oil without its nauseous taste. A full grown dugong yields from 10 to 12 gallons of oil, and this, according to Bennet, "forms in cold weather a thick mass, and requires to be melted before a fire previously to being used." According to the same authority, the flesh of the Australian dugong is easy of digestion, the muscular fibre when fresh resembling beef, and when salted having the flavour of excellent bacon. In the earliest Australian dugong fishery, natives were employed to harpoon these cetaceans; they soon, however, became too wary to allow themselves to be approached near enough for this purpose, and the harpoon was abandoned for the net. The latter is spread at night, and in its meshes dugongs are caught in considerable numbers. The skin is nearly half an inch thick, and can be made into gelatine or glue.

DUGUAY-TROUIN, René (1673–1736), a famous French admiral, was the son of a sea captain, and was born at St Malo on the 10th June 1673. He was originally intended for the church, and studied with that view at Rennes and Caen; but on the breaking out of the war with England and Holland in 1689 he obtained leave to enter the marine. Accordingly he embarked in the capacity of a volunteer on board a small vessel of 18 guns, equipped by his family, and during the first three months his courage was tried by a violent tempest, an imminent shipwreck, the boarding of an English ship, and the threatened destruction of his own vessel by fire. The following year, as a volunteer in a vessel of 28 guns, he carried off the honours in a bloody combat with an English fleet of five merchant vessels. The courage he then showed was so remarkable that in 1691, at the age of eighteen, he obtained the command of a frigate of 14 guns, when, having been thrown by a tempest on the coast of Ireland, he burned two English ships in the river Limerick. In 1694 his vessel of 40 guns was captured by the English, and, being taken prisoner, he was confined in the castle of Plymouth, where, however, he made love to the daughter of the jailer, and by her aid managed to escape. He then obtained command of a vessel of 48 guns, and made a capture of English vessels on the Irish coast. In 1696 he made a brilliant capture of Dutch vessels, and the king hearing an account of the affair raised him in 1697 to the rank of captain of a frigate. In 1704–5 he desolated the coasts of England. In 1706 he was raised to the rank of captain of a vessel of the line. In 1707 he was made chevalier of the order of St Louis, and captured the greater part of an English convoy of troops and munitions bound for Portugal. His most glorious action was the capture in 1711 of Rio Janeiro, on which he imposed a heavy contribution. In 1715 he was made chief of a squadron, and in 1728 commander of the order of St Louis and lieutenant-general. In 1731 he commanded a squadron for the protection of French commerce in the Levant. He died 27th September 1736.

DU GUESCLIN, Bertrand (*c.* 1314–1380), constable of France, the most famous French warrior of his age, was born of an ancient but undistinguished family, at the castle of La Motte-Broon, near Rennes, about 1314. The date is doubtful, the authorities varying between 1311 and 1324. The name is spelt in various ways in contemporary records, *e.g.*, Claquin, Klesquin, Guescquin, Glayaquin, &c. The familiar form is found on his monument at St Denis, and in some legal documents of the time. In his boyhood Bertrand was a dull learner, spending his time in open air sports and exercises, and could never read or write. He was remarkable for ugliness, and was an object of aversion to his parents. He first made himself a name as a soldier at the tournament held at Rennes in 1338 to celebrate the marriage of Charles of Blois with Jeanne de Penthièvre, at which he unseated the most famous competitors. But this playing at fighting was not enough for his ambition; and in the war which followed between Charles of Blois and John de Montfort, for the possession of the duchy of Brittany, he served his apprenticeship as a soldier. As he was not a great baron with a body of vassals at his command, he put himself at the head of a band of adventurers, and fought on the side of Charles and of France. He distinguished himself by a brilliant action at the siege of Vannes in 1342; and after that he disappears from history for some years. In 1351, having shortly before been made a knight, he was sent into England with the lords of Brittany to treat for the ransom of Charles of Blois, who had been defeated and captured by the English in 1347. When Rennes was besieged by the duke of Lancaster, in 1356, Du Guesclin forced his way with a handful of men into the town, and successfully defended it till June 1357, when the siege was raised in pursuance of the truce of Bordeaux. For this service he was rewarded with the lordship of Roche d'Airien. At the expiration of the truce he distinguished himself by the defence of Dinan, and here he engaged in single combat with Sir Thomas Canterbury. Shortly afterwards he married; and about the same time he passed into the service of France, and greatly distinguished himself at the siege of Melun (1359). In April 1364, in conjunction with Boucicaut, he recovered Mantes and Meulan from the king of Navarre; and in May he defeated the Navarrese under Captal de Buch at Cocherel, and took their leader prisoner. The king now created him marshal of Normandy and count of Longueville. At the battle of Auray, in September of the same year, Charles of Blois was defeated and killed, and Du Guesclin taken prisoner, by Sir John Chandos. The grand companies beginning, after the close of the war, to play the part of brigands in France, it was necessary to get rid of them. Du Guesclin was ransomed for 100,000 crowns, and was charged to lead them out of France. He marched with them into Spain, visiting Avignon on the way, and extorting from the Pope a large sum of money and his absolution. Du Guesclin now supported Henry of Trastamare against Peter the Cruel, set the former upon the throne of Castile (1366), and was made constable of Castile and count of Trastamare. In the following year he was defeated and captured by the Black Prince, ally of Peter the Cruel, at Najara, but was soon released for a heavy ransom. Once more he fought for Henry, reinstated him on the throne