

Poland, in spite of the partition of 1772, by which it lost 6600 square miles, still possessed a territory of upwards of 223,000 square miles, and a population of about 14,000,000. Russia held 1,593,300 square miles, and Turkey about 245,000; and their respective populations amounted to 25,000,000 and 15,000,000.¹

In 1789 the great French Revolution had fairly commenced, and for the next quarter of a century the history of Europe is little more than a history of France and her friends, and France and her foes. Never since the invasions of the Germanic nations had there been such a complete overturning of all existing political arrangements as was effected by the daring despotism of Napoleon. In 1812 the French empire included, not only France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg, but also the whole country to the left of the Rhine, the mainland of Sardinia, part of Modena, Tuscany, and Rome, Geneva, Neuchâtel, and Valais—a total area of no less than 339,000 square miles, with an aggregate population of 42,366,000. The 35 states of the confederation of the Rhine, including the kingdoms of Westphalia, Saxony, Bavaria, Würtemberg, the grand duchies of Frankfort, Berg, Baden, Hesse, and Würzburg, were under the protection of Napoleon; a similar position was held by the kingdoms of Italy and Naples, by Illyria and the grand duchy of Warsaw; and French influence was paramount in Switzerland, Prussia, Austria, and Denmark. England and Russia were the only truly independent states of real political importance; Spain and Portugal were fighting for their existence; and Sweden on the one hand, and Turkey on the other, were practically outside of Europe.

At the great monarchical congress of Vienna, an attempt was made to restore nearly everything that the Revolution had undone. Austria recovered East Galicia from Russia, and Tyrol and Salzburg from Bavaria; and in compensation for Belgium, &c., she obtained the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom of Italy, as well as Dalmatia and Parma. A kingdom of the Netherlands was constructed out of Belgium, Holland, and the German duchy of Luxembourg. The kingdom of Sardinia was restored to Victor Emmanuel and strengthened by the addition of Genoa; and Modena and Tuscany were assigned the one to Duke Francis IV. and the other to Ferdinand the brother of the Austrian emperor. Naples and Sicily, as the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, were given back to the former king Ferdinand; Spain and Portugal to Ferdinand VII. and the house of Braganza respectively. Russia incorporated Finland, Bessarabia, part of Moldavia, &c.; the kingdom of Poland was governed under Russian suzerainty by a vice-king, with a free constitution; Cracow was declared a free state under the protection of Austria, Russia, and Prussia. Switzerland was allowed to retain its federative system, and its neutrality was guaranteed. Prussia not only got what she had lost by the peace of Tilsit, but received a part of Poland, including Dantzic and Posen, the half of the kingdom of Saxony, and a flourishing territory on the middle and lower Rhine; Bavaria obtained the Palatinate of the Rhine; and Hanover, augmented by East Frisia, was made a kingdom. The restoration of a German empire being rendered impracticable by the particularist tendencies of several of the larger states, a German confederation, or *Deutsches Bund*, was substituted, under the presidency of Francis of Austria and his successors. The diet of this confederation had its seat at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, and consisted of the representatives of no fewer than 38 sovereign states, which, besides the German dominion of Austria, included the five kingdoms of Prussia, Bavaria, Hanover, Saxony, and Würtemberg, the electoral principality of Hesse-Cassel, seven grand-duchies, nine duchies, ten prin-

cipalities, the landgraviate of Hesse-Homburg, and the four free cities, Frankfort, Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck. England obtained possession of Malta in the Mediterranean and of Heligoland off the Danish coast; and the Ionian islands were placed under an English protectorate.

And now a new glacial period of absolutism threatened to invade Europe. Alexander of Russia, Frederick William of Prussia, and Francis of Austria united in a Holy Alliance, which, based, perhaps honestly enough, on the noblest humanitarian professions, proved practically an association for the strict preservation of the royal prerogative against the encroachments of the people. The promise of constitutional government made by many of the sovereigns to their subjects was forgotten or ignored, and even when a constitution was granted it was not unfrequently another form of despotic machinery. The Bourbons bourbonized in France and Spain, and the policy of Metternich was dominant in Austria and Italy. The pope did his best to restore the supremacy of the clergy by concordats with the several states of Catholic Europe; the Jesuits were re-established, and soon recovered a large part of their influence; and even the Knights of St John were called back to a futile existence.

But the principles of the Revolution were not dead; they only slumbered, and before long they gave signs of awaking. Neither the political distribution of the European territory established by the Congress of Vienna, nor the political doctrines which mainly conditioned the distribution, were destined to endure. The July revolution in France (1830), which drove out Charles X. and introduced the constitutional government of Louis Philippe, was a signal of change. In the same year the independence of Greece was permanently secured, after the treaty of Adrianople had closed the Russo-Turkish war; and the separation of Belgium from Holland was recognized by the five great powers in the London conference. A great struggle for national existence burst out in Poland—only, however, to end in its complete incorporation with Russia. By 1848 constitutionalism had made no small progress; Russia, Austria, and Prussia were, indeed, as absolutist as ever, but, besides England, France, and Switzerland, Spain and Portugal, Holland and Belgium, Norway and Sweden, Denmark, Greece, and the greater number of the minor German states had all attained a certain amount of political freedom. In Germany, Duke Charles Augustus of Saxe-Weimar had given his subjects a constitution as early as 1816; Nassau, Bavaria, and Baden followed the example in 1818; and after violent disturbances the people of Würtemberg secured the same privileges. If the July revolution of 1830 had been potent, much more potent was the more radical revolution of February 1848. The storm swept over the Continent, and when it had ceased the political aspect of Europe had changed. By the dreadful "Days of March," the king of Prussia, Frederick William IV., was forced to become a "constitutional king," and a national assembly was soon after instituted. In Austria, Metternich had to flee for his life, and Ferdinand was constrained to submit to the demands of the Liberals. In Italy, Rome expelled the pope and declared itself a republic; Sicily expelled the Bourbons and chose the duke of Genoa as their king; and the northern states rose against Austrian domination. A reaction, however, soon again set in. France passed from a republican to a strongly monarchical government; the Prussian king cancelled his constitution and issued another in its stead; Austria was successful in putting down the Hungarian and Bohemian patriots and inflicting a terrible revenge; and Italy saw the defeat of the army of Charles Albert, and had to submit again to Austrian despotism in Lombardy, papal despotism in Rome, and Bourbon despotism in Sicily and Naples. The hope of a real German unity based on constitutional

principles, which had been raised by the great Frankfort parliament, died away; Austria was still in the ascendant, and under her countenance and support all liberal movements were violently suppressed in the south German states. The first great disturbance of the sullen and sultry peace which settled down over Europe was occasioned by the claim of Russia to the protectorate of the Greek Christians in the Turkish empire, and her invasion of the Danubian principalities. England and France determined to maintain the integrity of Turkey, and the Crimean war was the result. By the treaty of Paris, which closed the contest (March 1856), Russia ceded a small piece of territory to the north of the Danube, the navigation of the river was declared free, Moldavia and Wallachia were increased by the addition of the Russian surrender and placed along with Serbia under the protection of the contracting powers, and the neutrality of the Black Sea was established. The real power of Turkey was hardly increased; and in 1859 she had to utter useless protests against the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, which united into one under the name of Roumania, and chose Alexander Cusa, a Moldavian nobleman, as their chief. The Italian kingdom of Sardinia, which had joined in the Crimean war as an ally of England and France, was soon to play a much more brilliant part in Europe. With the powerful assistance of France it drove Austria out of Lombardy, and practically secured the leadership among the states of Italy. In 1860 the first Italian parliament contained representatives, not only of Sardinia and Lombardy, but also of Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and the Roman Legations, all these states having voted by general suffrage to cast in their lot with Sardinia. The same year saw the marvellous campaigns of Garibaldi; and on the 17th March 1861 Victor Emmanuel was recognized as king of Italy by all the Italian states except Austrian Venetia and the city of Rome. In 1864 another important alteration of political boundaries was effected in the north. The provinces of Schleswig-Holstein, occupied by a partly Danish and partly German population, were conquered by the united forces of the German confederation. Before long it was evident that Prussia meant to appropriate them to herself as of great service to the development of her marine. By the Gastein convention of 1865 it was arranged that the government of Schleswig should fall to Prussia and that of Holstein to Austria, while Lauenburg was yielded to Prussia for 2½ millions of Danish rixdollars. This treaty, however, proved only a very temporary settlement,—the real question at issue being whether Prussia or Austria was to be the dominant power in Germany. The diet, which, according to the treaty of Vienna, ought to have been arbiter between them, was too weak to give effect to any decision: it sided with Austria, and mobilized its army by the decree of 14th July. By 3d July 1866 the fate of Germany was decided by the battle of Königgrätz or Sadowa, and on the 23d of August the treaty of Prague was signed. The Austrians ceded the Venetian territory to the Italians (who had naturally seized the opportunity of the war), gave up their claim to Schleswig-Holstein, and promised to recognize the German confederation and any territorial changes effected within its limits. In 1866-67 the confederation was constituted, under the direction of Prussia, to include all the German states to the north of the Maine; they were to have one common federal legislation and a federal army, while in everything Prussia was to have the pre-eminence. The duchy of Luxembourg in the same years threatened to involve Europe in a new war, as Prussia refused to permit its transfer by the king of Holland to the French emperor; but peace was secured by a conference of the great powers in London (May 1867), who guaranteed the neutrality of the territory and secured the dismantling of its fortresses.

Another step in the unification of Germany was taken in 1868 by the reconstruction of the Zollverein or customs union. Meanwhile Austria had been turning her attention to her domestic difficulties, and had settled the most important by the recognition of the autonomy of Hungary, which was henceforth to be associated with Austria proper on equal terms. In June 1867 Francis Joseph and his consort were formally crowned at Pesth as king and queen of Hungary. The year 1870 saw the completion of Italian unity by the occupation and annexation of the city of Rome, and, what was of still greater consequence to Europe at large, the rise of a dispute between France and Prussia about the succession to the throne of Spain. The matter was of little real moment to either, but the French Government was eager for the fray, and Prussia was not slow to take up the gage. If the strength of the two combatants be considered, the terrible conflict was soon over. The German troops, who had crossed the frontier in August 1870, entered Paris in March 1871; the preliminary peace had been signed at Versailles in February; and the final peace was concluded 10th May. Prussia's position in Germany and Europe was established, and her king had been recognized as emperor of the German confederation on 18th June, in the palace of Versailles. Europe again enjoyed peace for a few years; but in 1877 Russia declared war against Turkey, ostensibly as protector of the Christian populations who were suffering from the anarchy of her government. In Europe and Armenia the conflict continued with growing success on the part of the Russians till the preliminary peace of San Stefano. The alterations demanded by Russia were of the most sweeping kind, and would practically have removed Turkey from the rank of a European power, as the territory to be left under her control was both of small extent and discontinuous. The conclusion of the treaty on such conditions was strongly opposed by the British Government, and for a time it almost appeared as if Europe were to be involved in a far more terrible war than that which had come to a close. After much political fessing it was at length decided that the matter in dispute should be submitted to an international congress, and the plenipotentiaries of the various powers accordingly met at Berlin on Thursday, 13th June 1878.

Such in the most meagre outline are the principal changes in the political distribution of the territory of Europe. A clearer idea of the rise of the several powers of the present time may be obtained from the following equally rapid survey.

Great Britain began in the little Saxon kingdom of Wessex, which, according to the usual account, dates from Cerdic's settlement in 519 A.D., and by 880 had extended its authority as far north as the Forth and Clyde. The remoter portions of this territory afterwards gravitated now to England and now to Scotland, till at last the boundaries between the two kingdoms became what they still remain. Wales was subjugated by Edward I. in 1282; and the conquest of Ireland, begun in 1169 under Henry II., was completed by 1610. The English and Scottish crowns were united on the accession of James of Scotland to the English throne in 1603, and the two countries became politically one by the Act of Union in 1707. The representation of Ireland in the English parliament dates only from 1801.

France practically had its commencement when Hugh Capet united the duchy of Francia with the minor territories still left in the hands of the petty Carolingian kings, and established the capital at Paris. Its subsequent growth was very gradual, and the successive additions were obtained partly by conquest, partly by purchase, and partly by matrimonial alliances. Philip I. bought the duchy of Berri; Philip Augustus secured possession of Anjou, Maine,

¹ See Kolb, *Handbuch der Statistik*.

Touraine, and Poitou, and of Normandy, Vermandois, Alençon, Auvergne, and Evreux; St Louis obliged the count of Toulouse not only to give up part of his territory, but also to recognize the reversionary rights of the crown; Philip IV. added the countship of Lyonnais, and John incorporated Champagne and Brie. With the accession of the house of Valois the duchy of that name naturally became part of the royal domain, and shortly afterwards Dauphiné was obtained from the childless Hubert II. The long English wars interrupted the advance and dismembered the kingdom, and it was not till 1450 that the king of France was again in possession of his full inheritance. In 1477 the great duchy of Burgundy was incorporated with the crown; Provence, the Boulonnais, and Picardy were all acquired in 1481; and in 1488 the death of the last duke of Brittany paved the way for the incorporation of his duchy. Henry IV. brought part of Navarre, Bearn, and Foix; Louis XIII. united Artois with the crown; and Louis XIV. secured not only the greater part of Alsace, but also French Flanders, and Franche Comté. Corsica, which had been conquered from Genoa in 1768, and Avignon and the Venaisin, which had been held by the popes, were incorporated in 1791.

Austria was originally a *mark* established by Charles the Great for the defence of Bavaria against the Avars. It was made a duchy by Frederick Barbarossa in 1156, and in 1192 was increased by the addition of Styria. The acquisition of Carinthia, Tyrol, and Trieste took place in the 14th century; and in 1453 the duchy was made an archduchy by the emperor Frederick. Dalmatia was gained by the treaty of Cambray in 1508; Hungary, Bohemia, and Silesia, by the marriage of the archduke Ferdinand, the brother of Charles V., with the Hungarian princess in 1526; Galicia and Lodomeria at the partition of Poland in 1772; and Bukovina from Turkey in 1778.

The present German empire dates, as has been seen, only from 1872. Prussia, conquered from the pagan Slavonians by the Teutonic knights of the 13th century, was in 1525 granted by the Polish king Sigismund I. as an hereditary duchy to Albert of Brandenburg, and in 1611 became independent of the Polish crown. In 1701 Duke Frederick was permitted by the emperor to assume the title of king of Prussia; and under his grandson Frederick the Great the territory of the new kingdom was increased by Silesia and large parts of Poland. In 1866 Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Frankfurt were annexed.

The battle of Morgarten in 1315 secured the independence of the Forest Cantons of Switzerland; and in 1352 the first real confederation was formed by Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Lucerne, Zurich, Glarus, Zug, and Bern. Aargau or Argovia and Thurgau or Thurgovia were annexed in 1415, and Ticino or Tessin in 1418. Soleure or Solothurn and Freiburg or Fribourg joined the confederacy in 1481, Basel and Schaffhausen in 1501, and Appenzell in 1513; St Gall, Geneva, Neufchatel or Neuenburg, Valais or Wallis, and the Grisons or Graubünden shortly afterwards became associated states; and in 1536 Vaud or Waadt was conquered from the dukes of Savoy.

The kingdom of Spain was formed by the union of Castile and Aragon in 1479. Castile had become a kingdom in 1033, and had successively incorporated Toledo, Leon, and Galicia; and Aragon, which represented the older kingdom of Sobrarve, had gradually got possession of Catalonia and the countship of Barcelona, Valencia, Majorca, Minorca, and Ivica. The conquest of Granada in 1492 and of Navarre in 1512 completed the territorial extension. Portugal, which has more than once been incorporated with Spain, was erected into a kingdom in 1139.

The beginnings of the Russian empire are usually traced to a body of Scandinavian adventurers in the 9th century,

but the real commencement of the present monarchy is the grand duchy of Moscow, which, in the 14th century, under Ivan Kalita, began to be paramount among the various Russian principalities. During the next 200 years these were gradually subdued, the last and greatest of all, Novgorod, being incorporated in 1478. In 1654 the chief of the Zaporogian Cossacks recognized the Russian supremacy, and Smolensk and part of White Russia were annexed. In 1721 Livonia, Esthonia, Ingermanland, and part of Finland were ceded by Sweden; in 1742 another part of Finland was added; in 1772 the northern and eastern portions of White Russia, and in 1774 Azoff, Kertch, Yenikale, and Kinburn. The whole of the Crimea was incorporated in 1783, and ten years after, Volhynia, Podolia, and the government of Minsk. The year 1795 saw the annexation of Lithuania, Courland, and Samogitia, and the first decade of the 19th century the successive incorporation of Georgia, Mingrelia, and the remainder of Finland. Imeritia was added in 1810, Bessarabia in 1812, and the duchy of Warsaw in 1815; and the conquest of the Caucasian region was completed in 1859-1864.

The Scandinavian kingdoms date from the 8th and 9th centuries; and their territory has been at various periods very differently distributed among themselves. An amalgamation was effected by the union of Calmar in 1397, and lasted till 1524. The present union of Norway and Sweden dates from the treaty of Kiel in 1814.

To no man, however vast his experience and varied his sympathies, is it granted to form even an approximate estimate of all the multitudinous forces that are at work within the limits of a single country, and still less is it possible to form such an estimate if the field of observation include the heterogeneous activities of such an area as Europe. The local current is apt to be taken for the general, and the recoil of the wave for the retreat of the tide. Still there are movements and tendencies which force themselves on the notice of even the superficial observer, about whose present potency there can be no question, whatever antagonistic tendencies may be secretly gathering strength below the surface or in the remoter parts of the area. Of several of these mention more or less distinct has already been made, but it may be well to attempt a more systematic survey.

We have seen that nationalism is powerfully at work; the tendency to give practical application in the political domain to the principle familiarly expressed in the phrase *qui se ressemble s'assemble*, birds of a feather flock together. The so-called nations of Europe are still in painful process of formation,—some in one stage and some in another, but all without exception very imperfectly organized. As a mere vocable the word nation is old enough, but the thought which it now vaguely expresses is a thought that men are but beginning to think. Europe has had its tribes and its kingdoms, its village-communities, its cities, its Achæan leagues, its Hanseatic confederations, its republics, its empires; it is only developing its nations. Hence in part the difficulty of attaining a satisfactory definition of nationality; and hence the endless collisions and confusions that arise in the practical application of the principle. If all people of the same blood spoke the same language, held the same religion, and occupied continuous territory, the whole question would be solved. But, as has been seen, this is as far as possible from being the case in Europe; and neither blood, nor language, nor religion, nor continuity of territory can be accepted as master of the practical arrangement. The principle of nationalism has consequently to work by compromise. It sometimes appears as a restorative and conservative, sometimes as an innovating and creative force; and any attempt to insist that it shall be exclusively this or that is certain to be abortive.

Here it is on the side of the weak and oppressed, and seems humane and benign; there on the side of the strong and despotic, and seems stern and cruel. In spite of all difficulties and opposition it is making rapid progress, and is likely to be a powerful factor in Europe for generations to come,—building up political unities, rehabilitating decadent languages, and calling new literatures into life. Greece and Italy, Belgium and Bohemia, Hungary and Roumania, are testimonies of its power in the past decades of the century: who will say what it will have accomplished before the century is done?

As a natural complement of nationalism we have internationalism, which in certain aspects may be regarded as a stage in the progress to cosmopolitanism. Just in proportion as the various nations develop and recognize their national individuality they become conscious of their true relations to each other, and find the necessity of regulating their mutual intercourse and common activity; isolation is impossible. Reciprocity must increase with the capacities and desires of each: there are many things which can be attained only by concerted action or division of labour. The tendency of internationalism is displayed in the purely political domain by the growth of international law, and the gradual endeavours after a system by which international disputes may be settled by arbitration and discussion rather than by armaments and devastation. That it will end before long in something like a confederation of European states the optimist believes and the philanthropist hopes. Every European congress familiarizes the idea and establishes the habit. In the social domain the tendency is equally potent. Facilities of travel and accumulation of wealth are annually leading a greater proportion of the citizens of one country to make personal acquaintance with the citizens of another. Ignorance and bigotry are naturally lessened, though there are indeed an ignorance and a bigotry which return from abroad only more ignorant and bigoted than before. It needs no special insight to recognize the importance to the great progress of the world of such an innovation as the railway; but it would require more than human grasp of intellect to estimate the enormous extent and complexity of its influence. It is the one touch of art which will make the whole world kin. As a mighty upheaval lifts an archipelago of islands into a continent, so is this one power heaving Europe into unity. The movement is perhaps most noticeable in matters of little intrinsic importance as in the gradual dying out of national and provincial costumes before the invasions of Parisian taste: but to the philanthropist nothing can be uninteresting that either indicates or accelerates the advance. In literature and art we have a still more important development of internationalism; for it was in this domain that it first made itself powerfully felt. Though Spain, France, England, Germany, and Holland have each given birth to distinct schools of painting, the influence of Italy has been paramount from the beginning; and though the literatures of the several countries are distinguished from each other by much that is characteristically local and national, they have all been based more or less directly on the classical work of Greece and Rome, and undergone continual modifications from their mutual interaction. It is hard to conceive what would have been the progress of English literature apart from the influence of Dante and Boccaccio, or, in later times, the progress of French literature if Voltaire and his contemporaries had received no inspiration from this side the Channel. To write the history of any literature is impossible if no account is taken of its foreign indebtedness. This mutual interaction is rapidly increasing, and in spite of the recent additions to the number of distinct literary areas, it is imprinting more and more of a common character on the whole. The novels of

a Scott or the poems of a Byron sweep over the Continent, and come back in manifold reverberations from Germany and France, from Sweden and Spain. If the phrase the republic of letters is appropriate, still more appropriate is the republic of science; if literature is becoming international, science is international. However bitter the jealousies that may separate France and Germany, the French savant watches eagerly for the work of his German compeer, and the German cannot afford to disdain the contributions of the Frenchman. International congresses of the representatives of particular departments of research are becoming mere matters of course; a meteorological congress met at Vienna in 1868, a health congress at Brussels in 1877. An association ultimately joined by nearly all the Continental nations was formed at Berlin in 1866 to determine the meridian between Palermo and Christiania, and thus furnish a standard unit for Europe; and in 1877 a geographical congress for the exploration of Africa was opened under the presidency of the king of the Belgians. How necessary such co-operation really is is shown by the loss that science has already sustained from the existence of different methods of registration and observation: the labour of years has not unfrequently been rendered utterly useless to the general progress by the employment of incommensurable systems. Considerable advances have happily been made towards the universal adoption of the same metrical and monetary standards. The French system of weights and measures was introduced into the Netherlands in 1820, into Spain in 1859, into Portugal in 1868, into Germany in 1872, and into Roumania in 1876. In 1881 it will become obligatory in Norway and Sweden. A monetary league, by which they agreed to perfect reciprocity of currency, was formed in 1865 by France, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland, and they were joined by Greece in 1875, and by Roumania in 1876. Uniformity of coinage was established throughout the German empire in 1872, and in 1875 the Scandinavian states agreed to adopt a common system. In 1874 a postal union was constituted by a convention at Bern between Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Servia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey; and this has been followed by a similar telegraphic union.

A third tendency fostered by the same conditions as internationalism is what is known as religious and political toleration. The name is an unhappy one, as it implies the mutual obnoxiousness of the various religious and political parties, but the time has hardly come when it can be considered a misnomer; the foremost countries of Europe are still far from having attained the full enjoyment of that intellectual liberty which formed the ideal of a Milton, a De Tocqueville, or a Stuart Mill. Thanks, indeed, to the influence of the French Revolution, rapid progress has been made during the present century, and the severer forms of persecution have fallen decidedly out of fashion. The Jews are the most notable monument of the change. Their history for centuries was full of blood and tears; they were despised and rejected; their very name was a byword and reproach. The 19th century has seen them gradually admitted to all the rights of citizens in the most flourishing countries of the continent, guiding the destinies of nations and mingling their blood with the proudest nobilities. In the more backward and conservative countries they still labour under many disadvantages: from Norway and Russia Proper they are excluded by law, and in Portugal and Spain they are emphatically aliens. The same number of Dr Lehmann's *Der Israelit*, one of the organs of the orthodox party, reports that Roumania is preparing a law for the civic and political equalization of the native Jews, and that in

Bulgaria the hatred against the Jews is so great that, on the evacuation of Rustchuk by the Turks, the Bulgarians sent a deputation requesting the Russian commander to expel the whole Jewish community and to plunder their shops. The liberal movement of Roumania was dictated partly by a desire to obtain the sympathy of Western Europe; for until recently persecution of the Jews was carried on as vigorously there as in the neighbouring countries. Between Roman Catholics and Protestants the ancient feud has lost some of its bitterness. In Scotland and England the legal emancipation of the Catholics in 1829 has been followed by social changes of great importance, the extent of which may be estimated by the little opposition which was offered to the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Scotland in 1878. In Prussia and throughout the German empire there has been a recrudescence of animosity between the confessions; but it is to be observed that the contest is rather between the state and a political party than between the Catholics as Catholics and the Protestants as Protestants. In fact, it is only part of a wider contest which is being fought under varying forms throughout the greater part of Europe, as to whether the state or the church is to be the dominant power. Many of the measures which the Government has adopted have certainly led to what is practically religious persecution; but this persecution is totally different in its character from the persecutions of the Huguenots in the 17th century. The most extreme exertions of power have been the suppression of religious communities, the removal and appointment of priests and bishops by the civil authorities, the prohibition of religious processions, and in 1876 the closing of all Catholic schools and the assertion of complete state control over all church property. In Switzerland the movement was similar; the Old Catholic party was recognized by the state in 1875, and the cathedrals of Bern and Geneva handed over to its clergy. In Belgium the Liberal and Protestant minority have excited violent disturbances in several cities, as Ghent and Brussels, and the social fermentation has been carried to dangerous extremes; but by the constitution there is full religious liberty, all the churches are subsidized by the Government, and by a curious anomaly the heaviest subsidy is paid to the weakest denomination. The relations established between Italy and the pope, by the absolute irreconcilability of their territorial claims, has naturally led the Italian Government to adopt a strongly anti-ecclesiastical policy: the state religion is Roman Catholicism, but the suppression of monasteries has been vigorously carried out, and religious processions outside of the churches can only take place by special permission of the prefects. The constitution sanctions full religious liberty. In France Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews all receive grants from the public treasury. The Russian Government exercises its authority in favour of the Greek church in a way that frequently infringes on the liberties of other religionists, and no secession can take place from

the pale of the establishment; but at the same time the profession of any creed is legally allowed. Spain, by the last of her many revolutions, has taken a step backwards: private worship is still permitted to non-Catholic religions, and foreigners are considered inviolable, but all public manifestations, by printed notices, emblems, or otherwise, are strictly prohibited.

It has happily become impossible for even the most retrograde of nations to recall the days of the Inquisition,—a fact that is at least partly due to the influence of another great movement, which may be distinguished as humanitarianism. This movement is evident in so many departments of thought and action, here introducing a less painful process of killing into the slaughter-house, and there affecting the decision of questions of speculative theology, that only a few suggestive facts need be mentioned. The penal codes of all European nations have been cleared of most of their mediæval barbarism; and the infliction of direct physical suffering is reserved for the more brutal class of criminals. Instruments of torture are mere antiquarian curiosities. The punishment of death, once the common penalty for trivial and heinous offences, already appears to many minds as altogether inhuman, and has been completely abolished or discontinued in Holland, Belgium, Portugal, Switzerland, and Roumania. The bill for its abolition in Italy in 1875 was lost by 73 to 36, and the district of Tuscany, which had adopted the abolition about twenty years before, was forced to conform to the general law. In 1876, however, the committee for the revision of the penal code unanimously voted for the abolition. The introduction of private instead of public executions is a step in the same direction, though like many other partial measures it may delay the complete disuse of capital punishment. Mention may also be made of the amelioration of prison discipline, of the magnificent progress in the treatment of the insane which has been effected by the philanthropists of the last two generations, of the enormous increase which has taken place in the number of our hospitals, asylums, and benevolent institutions, and of the growing attention that is paid to relief of the sufferings of the lower animals. Whatever be the wisdom of the measure, the law of 1876 in England in regard to vivisection speaks volumes for the advance of the humanitarian movement. In this respect as in others the various European nations are in very different stages: while the English magistrate is fining a collier or carter for lending his countenance to a cockfight, the Spanish magistrate is applauding the exploits of a *picador* or *matador*. That we are approximating to a unity of sentiment is shown among other things by the support which has been given to the Geneva convention for the mitigation of the sufferings of the wounded in war, which was formed in 1864 by the representatives of Baden, Belgium, Denmark, France, Hesse, Italy, the Netherlands, Prussia, Switzerland, and Württemberg, and which has since obtained the adhesion of Greece, Great Britain, and Turkey. (H. A. W.)

INDEX.

Animals, 693; domestic, 696.
Birds, 694.
Botany, 690.
Boundaries, 681.
Canals, 710.
Charlemagne, empire of (with map), 714.
Cities, population of, 7.5.
Climate, 689.
Coast-line, 681.
Commerce, 707.
Countries, table of, 703.
Crusades, period of (with map), 715.
Cultivated plants, 691.
Debts, national, 706.
Domestic animals, 696.
Earthquakes, 683.

Education, 710.
Ethnology, 697.
Extent, 681.
Fishes, 695.
Forests, 692.
Geological formations, 687.
Highlands and lowlands, ratio of, 683.
Humanitarianism, 720.
Industries, 707.
Insects, 695.
Internationalism, 719.
Lakes, 687.
Land and sea, changes of, 682.
Languages, 699.
Mammals, 693.
Manufactures, 702.

Metals, 688.
Military forces, 705.
Minerals, 688.
Mountains, 684.
National debts, 706.
Nationalism, 718.
Naval forces, 706.
Plants, cultivated, 691.
Political divisions, 702; historical changes in, 713-718.
Population, 704.
Races, 697.
Railways, 709.
Rainfall, 689.
Relief, 683.
Religion, 712.

Reptiles, 695.
Rivers, 684; table of, 686.
Roman empire (with map), 713.
Sea and land, changes of, 682.
Sexes, proportions of, 704.
Shipping, commercial, 707.
Snow-line, 690.
Telegraphs, 709.
Tendencies, general, 718.
Territorial distribution, changes of, 713-718.
Tolerant, 719.
Universities, 711.
Volcanoes, 683.
Winds, 690.
Zoology, 692.

EURYDICE. See ORPHEUS.

EURYMEDON, an Athenian general, who, in the 5th year of the Peloponnesian war, 428 B.C., was sent by the Athenians, with a fleet of 60 vessels, to intercept the Peloponnesian fleet which was sailing to attack Corcyra, at that time rendered defenceless through internal feuds. On his arrival he found that Nicostratus with a small squadron from Naupactus had placed the island in security, but he took the command of the combined fleet, which, however, the absence of the enemy prevented from achieving any other end than merely to countenance and support by its presence the cruelties inflicted by the democratic party on their political opponents. In the following summer, in joint command along with Hippocles of the land forces of the Athenians, he, in concert with the fleet commanded by Nicias, ravaged the district of Tanagra; and in 425 B.C., conjointly with Sophocles, he was sent in command of an expedition destined for Sicily. After leaving they learned that the enemy's fleet was at Corcyra, but they were delayed by stormy weather from arriving there in time to attack them. They had been commanded in any case to touch at Corcyra, in order to deliver the democratic party from the attacks of the oligarchical exiles, who had taken up a position on a hill near the city, and were threatening it with capture. On the arrival of the Athenian fleet the oligarchical leaders surrendered themselves on condition that they should be sent to Athens to be judged; but they were treacherously induced to make an attempt to escape, and on that account were delivered up to the fury of their opponents. Eurymedon then proceeded to Sicily, but immediately on his arrival there a pacification was concluded by Hermocrates, to which Eurymedon and Sophocles were induced to agree. The terms of the pacification did not, however, satisfy the Athenians, who attributed its conclusion to bribery, and punished two of the chief agents in the negotiation by banishment; while Eurymedon was sentenced to pay a heavy fine. In 414 Eurymedon, sent with Demosthenes to reinforce the Athenians at the siege of Syracuse, was defeated and slain in the first of two battles fought before its walls.

EURYSTHEUS. See HERCULES.

EUSEBIUS, of Caesarea, surnamed Pamphili, i.e., the friend of Pamphilus, and well known as the father of ecclesiastical history, was born probably in Palestine about the year 265. The date of his birth is, however, uncertain, and varies between 260 and 270. We know little of his youth beyond the fact that he was a diligent student of sacred literature, his biography by his episcopal successor Acacius having perished. It was as a student, and probably as holding some inferior office in the church at Caesarea, that he became connected with Pamphilus who was at the head of a theological school there, and devoted himself to the collection of a church library, especially to the care and defence of the writings of his great master Origen. In the course of the Diocletian persecution, which broke out in 303, Pamphilus was imprisoned for two years, and finally suffered martyrdom. During the time of his imprisonment (307-9) Eusebius distinguished himself by assiduous devotion to his friend, spent days with him in affectionate intercourse, and is supposed to have actively assisted him in the preparation of an apology for Origen's teaching, which survives in the Latin of Rufinus (*Routh, Reliq.*, iv. 339). After the death of Pamphilus, Eusebius withdrew to Tyre, where he was kindly received by the Bishop Paulinus, and afterwards, while the Diocletian persecution still raged, went to Egypt, where he was imprisoned, but soon released. His release at the time suggested an accusation made against him more than twenty years afterwards by Pctamon, the fiery bishop of Heraclea, that he had apostatized. "Who art thou, Eusebius," exclaimed Pctamon at the famous

council of Tyre, which condemned Athanasius, "to judge the innocent Athanasius. Didst thou not sit with me in prison in the time of the tyrants? They plucked out my eye for my confession of the truth; thou camest forth unhurt. How didst thou escape?" The coarseness of the accusation, however, was only in the spirit of the times, and it rests on no evidence whatever. The elevation of Eusebius to the see of Caesarea so soon afterwards, in 310 at latest—probably 313—is of itself sufficient to dispose of any such charge. Here Eusebius laboured and became a conspicuous figure in the church till the year of his death, 340. The patriarchate of Antioch was put within his offer in 331, but he preferred the less eminent sphere associated with his early studies and friends, and as probably more congenial to his literary tastes and pursuits.

The character of Eusebius, both as a man and a theologian, is intimately bound up with the part which he took at the council of Nicea, and afterwards in the great controversy connected with the work of that council. His conduct and his views have been differently judged, according to the estimate which later critics have formed of the merits of this controversy, and the dogmatic prejudices which on one side or the other it is apt to engender. Dr Newman, for example, in his history of the Arians in the 4th century, speaks of him as "openly siding with the Arians, and sanctioning and sharing their deeds of violence," while most Anglican scholars, from Bull and Cave to Dr Samuel Lee of Cambridge, who translated the *Theophania* of Eusebius in 1843 from a recently recovered Syriac MS., have warmly defended his orthodoxy. The same division of opinion regarding him has prevailed more or less in other quarters, and even in the age succeeding his own. It is only in the scientific theology of Germany, and especially in Dorn's great work on the *Person of Christ*, that his true theological position can be said to have been made clear. He was certainly not Arian, however he may have defended Arius personally, any more than he was Athanasian. He was really the representative of the indeterminate theology of the church on the great point in dispute, before the lines of controversy on the one side and the other had hardened into the formula which have become identified with the two positions known as Arianism and Athanasianism. To judge and still more to condemn him from one side or the other is to mistake the law of the historical development of dogma, and to apply to him conclusions which belong to a later type of thought than that in which he had been trained. This will be best seen by a brief explanation of his stand-point, both personal and theological, throughout the controversy.

When the Arian controversy broke forth, about 319, Arius, who possibly may have known something of Eusebius during his stay in Egypt, besought his intervention to pacify the misunderstanding between him and his bishop, Alexander. Eusebius responded so far as to write two letters to Alexander explaining that Arius was misrepresented (Fragm. in Mansi, xiii. 316). This fact is of interest, as showing his natural attitude in the controversy before the calling of the council of Nicea. At this council he attended as the special friend of Constantine, whom he was appointed to receive with a panegyric oration, and at whose right hand he enjoyed the honour of sitting. Not only so, but he prepared and submitted the first draft of the creed which was afterwards, with well-known and significant additions, adopted by the council. The whole difference between Eusebius and the Athanasians centred in these additions, and in fact in the famous expression "Homousion"—"of the same substance" which was judged necessary by the council to express the true relation of the Father and the Son. He resisted this expression to the last, and only at length accepted it and subscribed the creed