

in turn, and who sought to forward his own interests by falling in with the king's prejudices. George III. at once took up the position from which he never swerved. He declared that to grant concessions to the Catholics involved a breach of his coronation oath. All thinking men of a later generation are of opinion that the objection was untenable. But no one has ever doubted that the king was absolutely convinced of the serious nature of the objection, or that he believed the measure itself to be beyond measure injurious to church and state. Nor can there be any doubt that he had the English people behind him. Both in his peace ministry and in his war ministry Pitt had taken his stand on royal favour and on popular support. Both failed him alike now, and he resigned office at once. The shock to the king's mind was so great that it brought on a fresh attack of insanity. This time, however, the recovery was rapid. On March 14, 1801, Pitt's resignation was formally accepted, and the late speaker, Mr Addington, was installed in office as prime minister.

The king was well pleased with the change. He was never capable of appreciating high merit in any one; and he was unable to perceive that the question on which Pitt had resigned was more than an improper question, with which he ought never to have meddled. "Tell him," he said, in directing his physician to inform Pitt of his restoration to health, "I am now quite well, quite recovered from my illness; but what has he not to answer for, who has been the cause of my having been ill at all?" Addington was a minister after his own mind. Thoroughly honest and respectable, with about the same share of abilities as was possessed by the king himself, he was certainly not likely to startle the world by any flights of genius. But for one circumstance Addington's ministry would have lasted long. So strong was the reaction against the Revolution that the bulk of the nation was almost as suspicious of genius as the king himself. Not only was there no outcry for legislative reforms, but the very idea of reform was unpopular. The country gentlemen were predominant in parliament, and the country gentlemen as a body looked upon Addington with respect and affection. Such a minister was therefore admirably suited to preside over affairs at home in the existing state of opinion. But those who were content with inaction at home would not be content with inaction abroad. In time of peace Addington would have been popular for a season. In time of war even his warmest admirers could not say that he was the man to direct armies in the most terrible struggle which had ever been conducted by an English Government.

For the moment this difficulty was not felt. On October 1, 1801, preliminaries of peace were signed between England and France, to be converted into the definitive peace of Amiens on March 27, 1802. The ruler of France was now Napoleon Bonaparte, and few persons in England believed that he had any real purpose of bringing his aggressive violence to an end. "Do you know what I call this peace?" said the king; "an experimental peace, for it is nothing else. But it was unavoidable."

The king was right. On May 18, 1803, the declaration of war was laid before parliament. The war was accepted by all classes as inevitable, and the French preparations for an invasion of England roused the whole nation to a glow of enthusiasm only equalled by that felt when the Armada threatened our shores. On October 26 the king reviewed the London volunteers in Hyde Park. He found himself the centre of a great national movement with which he heartily sympathized, and which heartily sympathized with him.

On February 12, 1804, the king's mind was again affected. When he recovered, he found himself in the midst of a ministerial crisis. Public feeling allowed but

one opinion to prevail in the country,—that Pitt, not Addington, was the proper man to conduct the administration in time of war. Pitt was anxious to form an administration on a broad basis, including Fox and all prominent leaders of both parties. The king would not hear of the admission of Fox. His dislike of him was personal as well as political, as he knew that Fox had had a great share in drawing the prince of Wales into a life of profligacy. Pitt accepted the king's terms, and formed an administration in which he was the only man of real ability. Eminent men such as Lord Grenville refused to join a ministry from which the king had excluded a great statesman on purely personal grounds.

The whole question was reopened on Pitt's death on January 23, 1806. This time the king gave way. The ministry of All the Talents, as it was called, included Fox amongst its members. At first the king was observed to appear depressed at the necessity of surrender. But Fox's charm of manner soon gained upon him. "Mr Fox," said the king, "I little thought that you and I should ever meet again in this place; but I have no desire to look back upon old grievances, and you may rest assured I never shall remind you of them." On September 13 Fox died, and it was not long before the king and the ministry were openly in collision. The ministry proposed a measure enabling all subjects of the crown to serve in the army and navy in spite of religious disqualifications. The king objected even to so slight a modification of the laws against the Catholics and Dissenters, and the ministers consented to drop the bill. The king asked more than this. He demanded a written and positive engagement that this ministry would never, under any circumstances, propose to him "any measure of concession to the Catholics, or ever connected with the question." The ministers very properly refused to bind themselves for the future. They were consequently turned out of office, and a new ministry was formed with the duke of Portland as first lord of the treasury and Mr Perceval as its real leader. The spirit of the new ministry was distinct hostility to the Catholic claims. On April 27, 1807, a dissolution of parliament was announced, and a majority in favour of the king's ministry was returned in the elections which speedily followed.

The elections of 1807, like the elections of 1784, gave the king the mastery of the situation. In other respects they were the counterpart of one another. In 1784 the country declared, though perhaps without any clear conception of what it was doing, for a wise and progressive policy. In 1807 it declared for an unwise and retrogressive policy, with a very clear understanding of what it meant. It is in his reliance upon the prejudices and ignorance of the country that the constitutional significance of the reign of George III. appears. Every strong Government derives its power from its representative character. At a time when the House of Commons was less really representative than at any other, a king was on the throne who represented the country in its good and bad qualities alike, in its hatred of revolutionary violence, its moral sturdiness, its contempt of foreigners, and its defiance of all ideas which were in any way strange. Therefore it was that his success was not permanently injurious to the working of the constitution as the success of Charles I. would have been. If he were followed by a king less English than himself, the strength of representative power would pass into other hands than those which held the sceptre.

The overthrow of the ministry of All the Talents was the last political act of constitutional importance in which George III. took part. The substitution of Perceval for Portland as the nominal head of the ministry in 1809 was not an event of any real significance, and in 1811 the reign practically came to an end. The king's reason finally broke

down after the death of the Princess Amelia, his favourite child. The remaining nine years of his life were passed in insanity and blindness, and when he died on January 29, 1820, in his eighty-second year, no political results were to be anticipated.

George III. had nine sons. After his successor came Frederick, duke of York and Albany (1763-1827); William Henry, duke of Clarence, afterwards King William IV. (1765-1837); Edward Augustus, duke of Kent (1767-1825), father of Queen Victoria; Ernest Augustus, duke of Cumberland, afterwards king of Hanover (1771-1851); Augustus Frederick, duke of Sussex (1773-1843); Adolphus Frederick, duke of Cambridge (1774-1850); Octavius (1779-1783); Alfred (1780-1782). He had also six daughters—Charlotte Augusta (1766-1816), married in 1797 to Frederick, king of Württemberg; Augusta Sophia (1768-1840); Elizabeth (1770-1840), married Frederick, landgrave of Hesse-Homburg, 1818; Mary (1776-1857), married to William Frederick, duke of Gloucester, 1816; Sophia (1777-1848); Amelia (1783-1810). (S. R. G.)

GEORGE IV. (*George Augustus Frederick*, 1762-1830), lived long enough to strip the crown of the leadership of the nation which his father had won for it. Born on August 12, 1762, he was noted in the years of his early manhood for good looks, for ease of carriage, and graciousness of manner. He soon plunged into the whirl of sensual excitement. His life was passed in the grossest profligacy. He was false as well as licentious. His word was never to be trusted. Not even an occasional gleam of brightness lights up the dark picture of his career. If he now and then flung to a dependant a kindly word which cost him nothing, no serious project of well-doing ever occupied his thoughts. Politics had no attraction for him except so far as changes of Government might minister to his ease, or bring him money to be squandered in some new scheme of folly.

Such a character was probably beyond the reach of any education. But it is certain that the education which he received in the strict and formal domestic circle of his parents was only fitted to repel him from the path of virtue. His father became to him the type of uninteresting formality. He gladly sought the society of his father's Whig opponents, and was initiated by Fox and Sheridan in the vices of the fashionable world. In 1783 he naturally supported the coalition ministry which his father detested, and the coalition ministry in return proposed to raise his income from £50,000 to £100,000. The king saved the ministry from committing one more blunder in its career by refusing to sanction the proposition. In 1786 the prince's friends urged Pitt to increase the allowance, but Pitt refused to do anything of the kind. All the world knew that the money would be frittered away at the gambling table or in some other equally disreputable way. Applying to the king and getting a distinct refusal, the prince sold his horses and carriages, shut up his house, and dismissed his servants. As it was well known that these were not the expenses which had brought him to distress, he was only laughed at for his pains. A lower depth was soon reached. The prince fell in love with Mrs Fitzherbert who had been twice a widow at twenty-five. She was ready to marry him, but she would yield to him on no other terms. She was a Roman Catholic, and a marriage by the heir of the crown with a Roman Catholic forfeited his succession by the Act of Settlement. Nor, by the Royal Marriage Act, could he legally contract marriage even with a Protestant without his father's consent, unless at the end of a year after formal notice had been given, and then only if parliament had not expressed its disapprobation. Believing truly that he could contract no legal marriage with Mrs Fitzherbert, he was

quite ready to go through the form of marriage. Mrs Fitzherbert, holding that the performance of the ceremony by a priest of her church was of sacramental efficacy, was indifferent to the legality of the proceeding. The marriage took place. Not long afterwards, in April 1787, Alderman Newenham moved in the House of Commons for a grant in relief of the prince. In the course of debate allusion was made to a marriage which might bring in question the succession. Fox went to the prince, and was assured by him that the marriage had never even formally taken place. Fox, deceived by his apparent openness, came down to the House and assured the Commons that the whole story was a malicious falsehood. The next day a friend of Fox's opened his eyes to the trick which had been played on him. "I see by the papers, Mr Fox," he said, "that you have denied the fact of the marriage of the prince of Wales with Mrs Fitzherbert. You have been misinformed. I was present at that marriage." The prince was not content with his original falsehood. He threw out hints to his friends that Fox had exceeded his instructions. He led Mrs Fitzherbert to believe that Fox had uttered the denial unsuggested. "Only conceive, Maria," he said to her, "what Fox did yesterday. He went down to the House and denied that you and I were man and wife." The denial however cleared away for the moment one cause of the prince's unpopularity. With the consent of the Government he received an addition of £10,000 to his income, £161,000 to pay his debts, and £20,000 for the repairs of Carlton House. The temporary insanity of the king in 1788 again brought the prince's name prominently before the public. Fox maintained and Pitt denied that the prince of Wales, as the heir-apparent, had a right to assume the regency independently of any parliamentary vote. Pitt, with the support of both Houses, proposed to confer upon him the regency with certain restrictions. The recovery of the king in February 1789 put an end to the prince's hopes. During the king's illness he had been in the habit of amusing his companions by mimicry of his unfortunate father. The disgust caused by his behaviour had doubtless some part in the enthusiasm with which the king was received when he went in state to St Paul's to return thanks for his recovery. In 1795 the prince married Caroline of Brunswick, because his father would not pay his debts on any other terms. Her behaviour was light and flippant, and he was brutal and unloving. The ill-assorted pair soon parted, and soon after the birth of their only child, the Princess Charlotte, they were formally separated. With great unwillingness the House of Commons voted fresh sums of money to pay the prince's debts. In 1811 the prince at last became regent in consequence of his father's definite insanity. No one doubted at that time that it was in his power to change the ministry at his pleasure. He had always lived in close connexion with the Whig opposition, and he now empowered Lord Grenville to form a ministry. There soon arose differences of opinion between them on the answer to be returned to the address of the Houses, and the prince regent then informed the prime minister, Mr Perceval, that he should continue the existing ministry in office. The ground alleged by him for this desertion of his friends was the fear lest his father's recovery might be rendered impossible if he should come to hear of the advent of the Opposition to power. Lord Wellesley's resignation in February 1812 made the reconstruction of the ministry inevitable. As there was no longer any hope of the king's recovery, the former objection to a Whig administration no longer existed. Instead of taking the course of inviting the Whigs to take office, he asked them to join the existing administration. The Whig leaders however refused to join, on the ground that the question of the Catholic disabilities was too important to be shelved,



and that their difference of opinion with Mr Perceval was too glaring to be ignored. The prince regent was excessively angry, and continued Perceval in office till that minister's assassination on May 11, when he was succeeded by Lord Liverpool, after a negotiation in which the proposition of entering the cabinet was again made to the Whigs and rejected by them. In the military glories of the following years the prince regent had no share. When the allied sovereigns visited England in 1814, he played the part of host to perfection. So great was his unpopularity at home that hisses were heard in the streets as he accompanied his guests into the city. The disgust which his profligate and luxurious life caused amongst a people suffering from almost universal distress after the conclusion of the war rapidly increased. In 1817 the windows of the prince regent's carriage were broken as he was on his way to open parliament.

The death of George III. on January 29, 1820, gave to his son the title of king without in any way altering the position which he had now held for nine years. Indirectly, however, this change brought out a manifestation of popular feeling such as his father had never been subjected to even in the early days of his reign, when mobs were burning jack-boots and petticoats. The relations between the new king and his wife unavoidably became the subject of public discussion. In 1806 a charge against the princess of having given birth to an illegitimate child had been conclusively disproved, and the old king had consequently refused to withdraw her daughter, the Princess Charlotte, from her custody. When in the regency the prince was able to interfere, and prohibited his wife from seeing her daughter more than once a fortnight. On this, in 1813, the princess addressed to her husband a letter setting forth her complaints, and receiving no answer published it in the *Morning Chronicle*. The prince regent then referred the letter, together with all papers relating to the inquiry of 1806, to a body of twenty-three privy councillors for an opinion whether it was fit that the restrictions on the intercourse between the Princess Charlotte and her mother should continue in force. All except two answered as the regent wished them to answer. But if the official leaning was towards the husband, the leaning of the general public was towards the wife of a man whose own life had not been such as to justify him in complaining of her whom he had thrust from him without a charge of any kind. Addresses of sympathy were sent up to the princess from the city of London and other public bodies. The discord again broke out in 1814 in consequence of the exclusion of the princess from court during the visit of the allied sovereigns. In August in that year she left England, and after a little time took up her abode in Italy. The accession of George IV. brought matters to a crisis. He ordered that no prayer for his wife as queen should be admitted into the Prayer Book. She at once challenged the accusation which was implied in this omission by returning to England. On June 7 she arrived in London. Before she left the Continent she had been informed that proceedings would be taken against her for adultery if she landed in England. Two years before, in 1818, commissioners had been sent to Milan to investigate charges against her, and their report, laid before the cabinet in 1819, was made the basis of the prosecution. On the day on which she arrived in London a message was laid before both Houses recommending the criminating evidence to parliament. A secret committee in the House of Lords after considering this evidence brought in a report on which the prime minister founded a Bill of Pains and Penalties to divorce the queen and to deprive her of her royal title. The Bill passed the three readings with diminished majorities, and when on the third reading it obtained only a majority of nine, it was aben-

done by the Government. The king's unpopularity, great as it had been before, was now greater than ever. Public opinion, without troubling itself to ask whether the queen was guilty or not, was roused to indignation by the spectacle of such a charge being brought by a husband who had thrust away his wife to fight the battle of life alone, without protection or support, and who, whilst surrounding her with spies to detect, perhaps to invent, her acts of infidelity, was himself living in notorious adultery. In the following year (1821) she attempted to force her way into Westminster Abbey to take her place at the coronation. On this occasion the popular support failed her; and her death not long afterwards relieved the king from further annoyance.

Immediately after the death of the queen, the king set out for Ireland. He remained there but a short time, and his effusive declaration that rank, station, honours, were nothing compared with the exalted happiness of living in the hearts of his Irish subjects gained him a momentary popularity which was beyond his attainment in a country where he was better known. His reception in Dublin encouraged him to attempt a visit to Edinburgh in the following year (August 1822). Since Charles II. had come to play the sorry part of a covenanting king in 1650 no sovereign of the country had set foot on Scottish soil. Sir Walter Scott took the leading part in organizing his reception. The enthusiasm with which he was received equalled, if it did not surpass, the enthusiasm with which he had been received in Dublin. But the qualities which enabled him to fix the fleeting sympathies of the moment were not such as would enable him to exercise the influence in the government which had been indubitably possessed by his father. He returned from Edinburgh to face the question of the appointment of a secretary of state which had been raised by the death of Lord Londonderry, better known to the world by his earlier title of Castlereagh. It was upon the question of the appointment of ministers that the battle between the Whigs and the king had been fought in the reign of George III. George IV. had neither the firmness nor the moral weight to hold the reins which his father had grasped. He disliked Canning for having taken his wife's side very much as his father had disliked Fox for taking his own. But Lord Liverpool insisted on Canning's admission to office, and the king gave way. Tacitly and without a struggle the constitutional victory of the last reign was surrendered. But it was not surrendered to the same foe as that from which it had been won. The coalition ministry in 1784 rested on the great landowners and the proprietors of rotten boroughs. Lord Liverpool's ministry had hitherto not been very enlightened, and it supported itself to a great extent upon a narrow constituency. But it did appeal to public opinion in a way that the coalition did not, and what it wanted itself in popular support would be supplied by its successors. What one king had gained from a clique another gave up to the nation. Once more, on Lord Liverpool's death in 1827, the same question was tried with the same result. The king not only disliked Canning personally, but he was opposed to Canning's policy. Yet after some hesitation he accepted Canning as prime minister; and when, after Canning's death and the short ministry of Lord Goderich, the king in 1828 authorized the duke of Wellington to form a ministry, he was content to lay down the principle that the members of it were not expected to be unanimous on the Catholic question. When in 1829 the Wellington ministry unexpectedly proposed to introduce a Bill to remove the disabilities of the Catholics, he feebly strove against the proposal and quickly withdrew his opposition. The worn-out debauchee had neither the merit of acquiescing in the change nor the courage to resist it.

George IV. died on June 26, 1830. He had rendered to

the constitution of his country the service of tacitly abandoning a position which had been perhaps necessarily achieved by his father, but which it was not desirable that the sovereigns of England should permanently occupy.

His only child by his wife Queen Caroline was the Princess Charlotte Augusta, married in 1816 to Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, afterwards king of the Belgians. She died in childbirth November 6, 1817. (s. r. g.)

GEORGE OF CAPPADOCIA, who from 356 to 361 was Arian archbishop of Alexandria, was born about the beginning of the 4th century. According to Ammianus (xxii. 11), he was a native of Epiphania, in Cilicia; but universal tradition makes him a Cappadocian. Gregory Nazianzen tells us that his father was a fuller, and that he himself soon became notorious as a parasite of so mean a type that he would "sell himself for a cake." By his powers of insinuation he succeeded in obtaining a lucrative contract for supplying bacon to the army, but fulfilled its terms so ill that he was soon compelled to abscond after he had with difficulty escaped death at the hands of the indignant soldiers. After many wanderings, in the course of which he seems to have lived for some time at Constantinople, and to have amassed a considerable fortune as receiver of taxes, he ultimately reached Alexandria. It is not known how or when he obtained ecclesiastical orders; but, after Athanasius had been banished in 356, George was promoted by the influence of the then prevalent Arian faction to the vacant see. His persecutions and oppressions of the orthodox ultimately raised a rebellion which compelled him to flee for his life; but his authority was restored, although with difficulty, by a military demonstration. Untaught by experience he resumed his course of selfish tyranny over Christians and heathen alike, and raised the irritation of the populace to such a pitch that, within a few days after the accession of Julian, they rose *en masse*, dragged him out of prison, where he had been placed by the magistrates for safety, paraded him with every indignity through the streets on the back of a camel, burnt his dead body, and cast the ashes into the sea (December 24, 361). With much that was sordid and brutal in his character George combined a highly cultivated literary taste, and in the course of his chequered career he had found the means of collecting a splendid library, which Julian ordered to be carefully preserved and conveyed to Antioch for his own use. The original sources for the facts of the life of George of Cappadocia are Ammianus, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, and Athanasius. In modern times his character has been drawn with graphic fidelity by Gibbon in the 23d chapter of the *Decline and Fall*.

GEORGE, SAINT, according to Metaphrastes the Byzantine hagiologist, whose narrative is substantially repeated in the Roman *Acta Sanctorum* and in the Spanish breviary, was born in Cappadocia of noble Christian parents, from whom he received a careful religious training. Having embraced the profession of a soldier, he rapidly rose under Diocletian to high military rank. When that emperor had begun to manifest a pronounced hostility towards Christianity George sought a personal interview with him, in which he made deliberate profession of his faith, and earnestly remonstrating against the persecution which had begun, resigned his commission. He was immediately laid under arrest, and after various tortures, finally put to death at Nicomedia (or, according to other accounts, at Lydda) April 23, 303. His festival is observed on that anniversary by the entire Roman Church as a semi-duplex, and by the Spanish Catholics as a duplex of the first class with an octave. The day is also celebrated as a principal feast in the Greek Church, where the saint is distinguished by the titles *μεγαλόμεγαλυτος* and *τροπαιοφόρος*.

In the canon of Pope Gelasius (494) George is mentioned

among the martyrs whom the Roman Church venerates, but whose gesta it does not read.<sup>1</sup> The language implies that even at that date much had been written concerning him, but little that the Catholic Church could accept as trustworthy. Numerous traits from the biography of the heretical archbishop had already crept, it would seem, into the acts of the orthodox soldier; and it was feared that any vigorous attempt to eliminate these would leave but a small residue of fact. Modern investigation has proved that apprehension to have been well-founded, for even on the Catholic side in the controversy regarding the existence and character of St George, the chief contention is simply the improbability that within the space of 150 years a turbulent and unscrupulous Arian ecclesiastic should have come to be reputed a holy martyr for the Catholic faith. The caution displayed with regard to St George in the 5th century was not long preserved; Gregory of Tours, for example, asserts that his relics actually existed in the French village of Le Maine, where many miracles were wrought by means of them; and the venerable Bede, while still explaining that the gesta of St George are reckoned apocryphal, commits himself to the statement that the martyr was beheaded under Dacian, king of Persia, whose wife Alexandra, however, adhered to the Catholic faith. The dragon was a still later introduction into the legend, which, as given by Jacobus de Voragine and later writers, ceases to represent the hero as in any sense a sufferer. In its current popular form the story of his successful conflict is probably a mere modification of the old Aryan mythus, to which many interpreters are now disposed to attach a solar interpretation.

The popularity of the name of St George in England dates from the time of Richard Cœur de Lion, who, it was said, had successfully invoked his aid during the first crusade; but it was not till the time of Edward III. that he was made patron of the kingdom, although at the council of Oxford in 1222 it had already been ordered that his feast should be kept as a national festival. The republics of Genoa and Venice were also under his protection; and his name is much revered in all the Oriental churches.

See Heylin, *The History of that most famous Saynt and Soldier of Christ Jesus, St George of Cappadocia* (1631); and Milner, *An Historical and Critical Inquiry into the Existence and Character of St George, Patron of England* (1795). For some account of the numerous artistic representations, whether of his martyrdom or of his triumph, see Jamieson's *Sacred and Legendary Art*, vol. ii.

GEORGE, known as PISIDES or PISIDA, a Byzantine writer of the 7th century, was, as his surname implies, a native of Pisidia; but of his personal history nothing is known except that he had been ordained a deacon, and that he held either simultaneously or successively the offices of "Chartophylax," "Scenophylax," and "Referendarius" in the "Great Church" (that of St Sophia) at Constantinople. He is also believed to have accompanied the first expedition (622) of the emperor Heraclius against the Persians; at all events his earliest work, consisting of 1098 iambic trimeter verses under the title *Ἐἰς τὴν κατὰ Περσῶν ἐκστρατείαν Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως ἀκροάσεις τρεῖς*, is devoted to such a description of that campaign as could hardly have come from any other than an eye-witness. This composition was followed by the *Ἀβαρική* or *Πόλεμος Ἀβαρικός* in 541 verses, containing the details of a futile attack on Constantinople made by the Avari in 626, while the emperor was absent and the Persian army in occupation of Chalcedon; and by the *Ἡρακλίς*, a general survey of the exploits both at home and abroad of Heraclius down to the final overthrow of Chosroes in 627, which is believed to have been written before the end of 628. In addition to these three works, which have been edited by Bekker in the *Corpus scriptorum histor. Byzant.* (1836), we have from the pen of

<sup>1</sup> The full text of this canon is given by Heylin, p. 1. 2. 9.



George of Pisidia the *Ἐξαήμερον ἤτοι Κοσμογονία*, a poem upon the creation of the world, containing in its present form 1910 trimeter iambic verses; a treatise on the vanity of life, *Ἐπὶ τὸν μάταιον βίον*, in 262 verses; a controversial composition against Severus of Antioch, *Κατὰ Σεβήρον*, in 731 verses; two short poems upon the resurrection of Christ and upon the temple of the Virgin at Blachernæ respectively, and a prose encomium upon Anastasius the martyr, (*Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Ἀναστάσιον μάρτυρα*). George of Pisidia is known to have written several other works, which, however, are no longer extant; and there is no sufficient reason for assigning to him the compilation of the *Chronicon Paschale*, or the astronomical poem entitled *Empedoclis Sphæra*. The *Hexameron* and *De Vanitate Vitæ* were first printed along with a Latin version at Paris in 1584 or 1585 by Federicus Morellus. They are also to be found in the *Max. Bibliotheca Vett. Patrum*, xii. p. 322 (1677); and in the 46th vol. of Migne's *Patrologia Græca*. The only complete edition of all the extant works is that of Quercus in Foggini's *Corp. Hist. Byzant. Nova Appendix* (Rome, 1777). As a versifier George is correct and even elegant; as a chronicler of contemporary events he is exceedingly useful; but the modern verdict on his merits as a poet has not confirmed that of those later Byzantine writers whose enthusiastic admiration led them to compare him with and even prefer him to Euripides. Recent criticism is unanimous in characterizing his composition as artificial and almost uniformly dull.

GEORGE OF TREBIZOND (1396-1486), one of the distinguished writers in the great controversy between Aristotelianism and Platonism in the 15th century, was born at Chandace in the island of Crete. He received his cognomen: apparently from the fact that his ancestors had come from Trebizond. At what period he came to Italy is not absolutely certain; according to some accounts he arrived as early as 1430, and settled as teacher of philosophy and rhetoric at Venice; according to others he did not come over to Italy till the period of the council of Florence (1438-9). His reputation as a teacher and as translator of Aristotle was very great, and he was selected as secretary by Pope Nicholas V., an ardent Aristotelian. The needless bitterness of his attacks upon Plato (in the *Comparatio Aristotelis et Platonis*), which drew forth a powerful response from BESSARION (*q.v.*), and the manifestly hurried and inaccurate character of his translations both of Plato and of Aristotle, combined to ruin his fame as a scholar, and to endanger his position as a teacher of philosophy. The indignation against him on account of his first-named work was so great that he would probably have been compelled to leave Italy, had not Alphonso V. given him protection at the court of Naples. He died at Rome in 1486. Many of his translations of Aristotelian treatises are to be found in the older editions of Aristotle. A notice of his other writings is given in Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*.

GEORGETOWN, the port of entry for the District of Columbia in the United States of North America, is situated on the left bank of the Potomac at the head of navigation, about 2½ miles W.N.W. of the capitol of Washington City, with which it communicates by four iron bridges thrown across Rock Creek. Founded by the colonial Government of Maryland in 1751, Georgetown was a city with a distinct administration from 1789 to 1871; but in the latter year it was merged in the District of Columbia, and in 1878 it was incorporated with the city of Washington, so that now it has properly no distinct existence. It is beautifully situated along a range of hills, whose loftier eminences, locally called the Heights, afford delightful positions for villas and country seats, with extensive prospects over the river and Washington. The most noteworthy institution is Georgetown College, the oldest Roman Catholic college

in the United States, which occupies two handsome brick buildings in the midst of extensive grounds at the west end. It was founded as an academy in 1789, was chartered as a college in 1799, and in 1815 received the right of conferring degrees. Its medical department, originated in 1851, and the legal department, dating from 1870, are both in Washington. The university has a library of upwards of 30,000 volumes, an extensive apparatus for physical science, and a museum of natural history. In 1873 the teaching staff numbered 35. Among the other institutions in the town may be mentioned the Convent of the Visitation, with a female academy attached; the Peabody library; the Linthicum institute (founded in 1872 by a retired merchant, who left \$50,000 for the education of poor white boys); the aged women's house, maintained by voluntary subscription; and the industrial home for juvenile vagrants. The aqueduct which conveys a branch of the Chesapeake and Ohio canal over the Potomac is 1446 feet long, and its granite piers, nine in number, rise 36 feet above the ordinary surface of the water, and rest on the solid rock 17 feet below the bottom of the river. A great decline has taken place in the commercial activity of Georgetown. Its foreign trade is very slight, being represented in the year ending June 30, 1878, by no more than 6113 dollars of imports and 10,056 dollars of exports; but its share in the coasting trade is still considerable, 187 steamers and 45 sailing vessels, affording a total tonnage of 96,339 tons, having entered in the year already mentioned; its position at the terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio canal secures for it a fair share in the shipping of the coal from the Alleghany fields; and its fisheries render it a great market for shad and herrings. Among the industrial establishments the first place is held by the flour-mills, six in number; but there are also corn-mills, timberyards, tanneries, foundries, breweries, a paper-mill, and a vinegar factory. The principal cemetery for Washington occupies a beautiful situation on Georgetown Heights. In 1830 the population of Georgetown was 8441; in 1840 it was only 7312; by 1860 it had reached 8733; and in 1870 it was 11,384.

GEORGETOWN, known as Stabroek during the Dutch period, now the capital of British Guiana, is situated in the county of Demerara on the east bank of the Demerara river, about a mile from its mouth, in 6° 49' 30" N. lat. and 58° 11' 30" W. long. It is one of the prettiest towns of that part of the world, and presents an unusually attractive appearance to the approaching voyager. The streets are wide and straight, intersecting each other at right angles, and recalling, by the canals that run along the centre, the memory of the Dutch; and the houses are so richly embosomed by cabbage-palms, cocoa-nut trees, and other trees and shrubs, that they look rather like a collection of villas than a town. The street along the river side, where the shops and stores are mainly situated, forms, however, an exception; there everything is plain, bare, and business-like. Private dwelling-houses are usually built of wood and raised 3 or 4 feet above the soil on wooden piles or brick pillars; they are painted in various simple colours, for the most part in white; in front they have open verandahs. Among the public edifices the first place is due to a building in the centre of the town which was erected between 1829 and 1834 at a cost of £60,000, to accommodate the legislative council, the courts of justice, the custom house, the treasury, and other administrative offices; it is of considerable extent and architectural beauty, with shady porticoes and marble-paved galleries supported on cast-iron columns. Besides a cathedral, which cost £15,000, there are churches belonging to the Wesleyans, the Baptists, the London Missionary Society, and other ecclesiastical organizations, several liberally-maintained hospitals, an icehouse, and two market-

places, of which the one opened in 1844 cost £11,400, and the other opened in 1852 cost £2450. The prison, a large building, or rather collection of buildings, surrounded by a strong wooden wall, can accommodate upwards of 200 prisoners. A fort, the Frederick William, situated below the town, only contains a small battery, but in the vicinity there are extensive and well-organized barracks. One of the principal disadvantages due to the position of Georgetown is the lack of drinking water; but this is so far remedied by the construction of both private and public tanks for the storage of the rain, by the introduction of water from the Lamaha creek, by a canal, and further by the boring of Artesian wells. The first attempts to apply the Artesian principle was made in 1831 by Major Staple, and his example has been widely imitated not only in the town itself but also in the surrounding country. Though the water thus obtained is strongly impregnated with iron, carbonic acid gas, salt, and magnesia, it is readily drunk by horses and cattle, and after it has been scummed and filtered it can be used for cooking. As it rises to the surface the water has a temperature of 84° Fahr., 5° higher than the water in the river. Ice is almost a necessity of life in the town, and it forms a regular import from Boston, along with fresh meat and other northern produce. The population of Georgetown in 1851 was 25,508; in 1861 it was 29,174; and by 1871 it had reached 36,562. (See Appun, *Unter den Tropen*, Jena, vol. ii.)

GEORGIA, a kingdom in central Transcaucasia, remarkable for the long list of its sovereigns, the monarchy having extended over a period of upwards of 2000 years, the kings reigning at times independently, or under the rule of Persia, Turkey, or the Eastern empire. The earliest name of the country was Karthli; the ancients knew it as Iberia, bounded on the one side by Colchis and on the other by Albania; and it has for centuries been called Georgia.

Georgia proper, which includes Karthli and Kakhetia, is bounded on the N. by Ossety and Daghestan, on the E. by Shekynn, on the S. by Shamshadyl and the khanates of Erivan and Kars, and on the W. by Gouria and Imeritia; but the kingdom at times included Gouria, Mingrelia, Abkhasia, Imeritia, and Daghestan, and extended from the great mountain range to the Araxes. It now forms the government of Tifis, divided into the districts of Doushett, Telav, Sygnal, Gori, and Akhalzikh, having an area of nearly 25,000 square miles, and in 1873 a population of 635,313, made up chiefly of Georgians and Armenians, there being also Persians, Tatars, and a few Jews and Europeans. The chief city is the ancient capital of Tifis, the seat of government, under a governor-general, for the whole of Transcaucasia, and the principal centre of commerce. See CAUCASUS and TIFLIS.

*Vegetable Products.*—The valleys and declivities are fertile, producing maize, millet, barley, oats, rice, beans, lentils, and corn (which is best in the plains near Gori), also cotton, flax, and hemp, now exported exclusively to Russia. The vineyards cover 75,400 acres, the average produce of wine being at the rate of 230 gallons per acre; the valley of the Alazan yields the best qualities. It is consumed in the country and adjoining districts, the only wine exported being that produced from vine-canoe brought from the Crimea. Grapes are gathered in September, and the wine is fit for use one month after it has been put into a *bourdyout*, "skin," or *kvevry*, a huge earthen jar in which it may be preserved for years. New vines are planted every six, eight, or ten years, according to the nature of the soil, and are cut after the fruit is gathered, and again in March and April when the soil is turned up. The *Lecanium vitis* and *Oidium* have attacked the plants from time to time, though not in severe form, but the *Phylloxera vastatrix* has been hitherto quite unknown. In the vineyards are often seen

the apple, pear, and quince trees; other fruits include the pomegranate, peach, apricot, plum, almond, mulberry, pistachio, fig, cherry, walnut, hazel-nut, medlar, melon and water melon, raspberry, &c. In summer the banks of streams are covered with beautiful wild flowers,—the primrose in double form, the crocus of varied colours, and snowdrops appearing early in March in the greatest profusion.

*Animals.*—The domestic animals are the camel, ox, mule, ass, and buffalo as beasts of burden, with the goat, and an immense number of pigs, pork being favourite food. The horse—small, hardy, and enduring—is ridden more frequently unshod, except in the hills; no pains are taken to improve the breed. The wild animals of greatest importance are the bear, ibex, wolf, hyæna, fox, wild boar, wild goat, and antelope; while the pheasant, woodcock, quail, and "partridge of the Caucasus" are the principal winged game. The fish taken in the Kour and other rivers are the sturgeon, silurus, carp, perch, trout, gudgeon, and a fish resembling the salmon, called *oragouda* by the Georgians. The great sturgeon, *belouga* or hansen, is taken at the estuary of the Kour in the Caspian.

*Communication.*—A railroad connects Tifis with Poti on the Black Sea, the line over the Souram pass, 3037 feet above the sea, being laid at gradients of 1 in 22, over a distance of about 8 miles. Lines of rail are projected for connecting Vladykavkaz in the north, and Djoulpha at the Persian frontier, with the capital. Post-roads are excellent, and saddle-horses and comfortable vehicles for post-horses are to be obtained at the principal towns. Locomotion is very inexpensive.

*History.*—The material at the disposal of the historian of Georgia is scanty. An anonymous work of the 12th century gives the history from the earliest times to the year 1124; another, also anonymous, is a continuation to the division of the kingdom in 1445; and a third is the compilation by the Czarévitch Wakhoucht, being the complete annals from the earliest times to the year 1745. These, and a few pamphlets indifferently edited, if we except the memoirs of his family by Stephen Orbeliani, archbishop of Siouny in the 18th century, comprise all that is left to us during an interval of upwards of 2000 years.

The earliest Armenian chroniclers have included facts on Georgia, which it is believed were founded on traditions they received from the Georgians. According to these authorities, the Georgian, Armenian, Kakhetian, Lesghian, Mingrelian, and other races in Transcaucasia are the descendants of Thargamos, who was the great-grandson of Japhet, the son of Noah, though we read in Gen. x. 3 that Togarmah was the son of Gomer, who was the son of Japhet. Those different populations were afterwards included under the general name of Thargomosian. The second son of Thargamos, named Karthlos, having settled in that part where is now the rivulet Karthli, became the patriarch and king of the people in the land around, called Karthli after himself. His son Mtzkhethos founded the city of Mtzkhetha, which became the capital; and a son of Mtzkhethos, named Ouphlis, was the author of the rock-cut town near Gori. At that period the title assumed by the ruler was *mamasaktysy*, "lord or head of the house," the worship being that of the sun, moon, and five planets. The first to revive the title of king was Pharnawaz, 302-237 B.C., who rid the country of the tyrant Ason, a governor appointed by Alexander the Great. Pharnawaz originated the orthography of the Georgian language, and is said to have invented the military alphabet. In 140 B.C. Mirvan became king. His son and successor was dethroned by his own subjects, and the crown offered to Ardaaces I., whose son, Arshag, ascended the throne 71 B.C., the dynasty of Arsaces thus commencing its rule. The deeds of Sulla, Lucullus, Pompey, and Mithradates next serve to illustrate the courage and warlike qualities of the people of Iberia. In 265 the Sassanian dynasty commenced in the person of Miriam, son of Shapour I., who was married to a daughter of the late king Asphagor. Miriam and all his subjects were converted to Christianity by Nouna or Nina, a poor captive, who had escaped the persecution of Tiridates, king of Armenia. She prevailed upon the people of Karthli to desist from offering human victims, and to overturn their pagan altars; and the king erected a sanctuary, which was afterwards replaced by a noble edifice, 364-379, on the spot where now stands the cathedral at M'zhett. Miriam applied to Constantine for priests to instruct his people, and many were sent, among them being Eustace of Antioch. In 469 King Vakhtang, surnamed *Gourgasal*, "wolf-lion," founded