

that monarchy was a species of government unavoidably corrupt," and from desiring a government of the simplest construction, he gradually came to consider that "government by its very nature counteracts the improvement of original mind." Believing in the perfectibility of the race, that there are no innate principles, and therefore no original propensity to evil, he considered that "our virtues and our vices may be traced to the incidents which make the history of our lives, and if these incidents could be divested of every improper tendency, vice would be extirpated from the world." All control of man by man was more or less intolerable, and the day would come when each man, doing what seems right in his own eyes, would also be doing what is in fact best for the community, because all will be guided by principles of pure reason. But all was to be done by discussion, and matured change resulting from discussion. Hence, while Godwin thoroughly approved of the philosophic schemes of the precursors of the Revolution, he was as far removed as Burke himself from agreeing with the way in which they were carried out. So logical and uncompromising a thinker as Godwin could not go far in the discussion of abstract questions without exciting the most lively opposition in matters of detailed opinion. An affectionate son, and ever ready to give of his hard-earned income to more than one ne'er-do-well brother, he maintained that natural relationship had no claim on man, nor was gratitude to parents or benefactors any part of justice or virtue. In a day when the penal code was still extremely severe, he argued gravely against all punishments, not only that of death. Property was to belong to him who most wants it; accumulated property was a monstrous injustice. Hence marriage, which is law, is the worst of all laws, and property the worst of all properties. A man so passionless as Godwin could venture thus to argue without suspicion that he did so only to gratify his wayward desires. Portions of this treatise, and only portions, found ready acceptance in those minds which were prepared to receive them. Perhaps no one received the whole teaching of the book. But it gave cohesion and voice to philosophic radicalism; it was the manifesto of a school without which the milder and more creedless liberalism of the present day had not been. Godwin himself in after days modified his communistic views, but his strong feeling for individualism, his hate of all restrictions on liberty, his trust in man, his faith in the power of reason remained; it was a manifesto which enunciated principles modifying action, even when not wholly ruling it.

In May 1794 Godwin published the novel of *Caleb Williams, or Things as they are*, a book of which the political object is overlooked by many readers in the strong interest of the story. It is one of the few novels of that time which may be said still to live. A theorist who lived mainly in his study, Godwin yet came forward boldly to stand by prisoners arraigned of high treason in that same year—1794. The danger to persons so charged was then great, and he deliberately put himself into this same danger for his friends. But when his own trial was discussed in the Privy Council, Pitt sensibly held that *Political Justice*, the work on which the charge could best have been founded, was priced at three guineas, and could never do much harm among those who had not three shillings to spare.

From this time Godwin became a notable figure in London society, and there was scarcely an important person in politics, on the liberal side, in literature, art, or science, who does not appear familiarly in the pages of Godwin's singular diary. For forty-eight years, beginning in 1788, and continuing to the very end of his life, Godwin kept a record of every day, of the work he did, the books he read, the friends he saw. Condensed in the highest degree, the diary is yet

easy to read when the style is once mastered, and it is a great help to the understanding of his cold, methodical, unimpassioned characters. He carried his method into every detail of life, and lived on his earnings with extreme frugality. Until he made a large sum by the publication of *Political Justice*, he lived on an average of £120 a year. In 1797, the intervening years having been spent in strenuous literary labour, Godwin married Mary Wollstonecraft (see last article). Since both held the same views regarding the slavery of marriage, and since they only married at all for the sake of possible offspring, the marriage was concealed for some time, and the happiness of the avowed married life was very brief. Mrs Godwin died in giving birth to a daughter, afterwards the second wife of Percy Bysshe Shelley, on September 10, 1797, leaving Godwin, prostrated by affliction, and with a charge for which he was wholly unfit—his own little daughter Mary, and her step-sister, Fanny Imlay, who ever afterwards bore the name of Godwin. His unfitness for the cares of a family, far more than love, led him to contract a second marriage with Mrs Clairmont, in 1800. She was a widow with two children, energetic and painstaking, but a harsh stepmother; and it may be doubted whether the children were not worse off under her care than they would have been under Godwin's neglect. The second fiction which proceeded from Godwin's pen was called *St Leon*, and published in 1799. It is chiefly remarkable for the beautiful portrait of Marguerite, the heroine, which was drawn from the character of his own wife.

The events of Godwin's life were few. Under the advice of the second Mrs Godwin, and with her active co-operation, he carried on business as a bookseller under the pseudonym of Edward Baldwin, under which name he published several useful school-books and books for children, some by Charles and Mary Lamb. But the speculation was unsuccessful, and for many years Godwin struggled with constant pecuniary difficulties, for which more than one subscription was raised by the leaders of the Liberal party, and by literary men. In his later years the Government of Earl Grey conferred upon him the office known as "Yeoman Usher of the Exchequer," to which were attached apartments in Palace Yard, where he died in the full possession of his faculties, April 7, 1836, having completed his eightieth year.

In his own time, by his writings and by his conversation, Godwin had a great power of influencing men, and especially young men. Though his character would seem, from much which is found in his writings, and from anecdotes told by those who still remember him, to have been unsympathetic, it was not so understood by enthusiastic young people, who hung on his words as those of a prophet. The most remarkable of these was Percy Bysshe Shelley, who in the glowing dawn of his genius turned to Godwin as his teacher and guide. The last of the long series of young men who sat at Godwin's feet was Edward Lytton Bulwer, afterwards Lord Lytton, whose early romances were formed after those of Godwin, and who, in *Eugene Aram*, succeeded to the story as arranged, and the plan to a considerable extent sketched out, by Godwin, whose age and failing health prevented him from completing it.

Godwin's more important works are—*The Inquiry concerning Political Justice, and its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness*, 1793; *Things as they are, or the Adventures of Caleb Williams*, 1794; *The Inquiry, a series of Essays*, 1796; *Memoirs of the Author of the Rights of Woman*, 1798; *St Leon, a Tale of the Sixteenth Century*, 1799; *Antonio, a Tragedy*, 1801; *The Life of Chaucer*, 1803; *Fleetwood, a Novel*, 1805; *Faulkner, a Tragedy*, 1807; *Essay on Sepulchres*, 1809; *Lives of Edward and John Phillips, the Nephews of Milton*, 1815; *Mandeville, a Tale of the Times of Cromwell*, 1817; *History of the Commonwealth*, 1824–1828; *Cloudestley, a Novel*, 1830; *Thoughts on Man, a series of Essays*, 1831; *Lives of the Neeromancers*, 1834. A volume of essays was also collected from his papers

and published in 1873, as left for publication by his daughter Mrs Shelley. Many other short and anonymous works proceeded from his ever busy pen, but many are irrecoverable, and all are forgotten. Godwin's place in literature is permanent, in that he produced one work which proved effective in changing the course of thought in its time, but not permanent in the sense that his writings will continue to be widely read. His life was published in 1876 in two volumes, under the title *William Godwin, his Friends and Contemporaries*, by C. Kegan Paul. The best estimate of his literary position is that given by Mr Leslie Stephen in his *English Thought in the 18th Century*. (C. K. P.)

GODWINE, son of Wulfnoth, earl of the West-Saxons, is the leading Englishman in the first half of the 11th century, and he holds a special place in English history generally. He is the first Englishman who plays the part of a minister and parliamentary leader, of one high in office under the crown who at the same time sways the assemblies of the nation by his power of speech. Such a position was perfectly possible before the Norman Conquest; it did not again become possible for some ages. Godwine appears as the chief champion of England against Norman influence, and as the father of the last English king of the native stock. In these two characters he drew on himself the fullest bitterness of Norman hatred; and to this hatred is doubtless largely, though not wholly, owing the extraordinary contradiction with which the chief events of his life are told, and the amazing slanders which have been heaped upon his memory.

His birth and origin are utterly uncertain. The highest authorities, the contemporary English Chronicles, are silent. There are two alternative statements, which are seemingly quite irreconcilable, but either of which alone would have much to be said for it. By putting together certain passages in the English Chronicles, in Domesday, and in the will of the Ætheling Æthelstan, son of King Æthelred, a strong presumption is raised that Godwine was the son of Wulfnoth the South-Saxon who was outlawed in 1009, and that his services in the war against Cnut were deemed to entitle him to a restitution of his father's forfeited lands. There is no direct statement to this effect, but a number of undesigned coincidences point towards such a belief. On the other hand, there is a story which appears in various quarters, and which seems to come from more than one independent source, which makes Godwine's father Wulfnoth a churl somewhere on the borders of Gloucestershire and Wiltshire, and which makes Godwine win the favour of the Danish earl Ulf by showing him his way after the battle of Sherstone in 1016. A third account connects Godwine with the family of Eadric the traitor of Æthelred's day; but this version seems at once to be impossible to reconcile with either of the other two stories, and to rest on less authority than either.

But, whatever was Godwine's origin, there is no doubt that, according to Cnut's rule of preferring Englishmen to high office, he rose to power very early in that king's reign. He was an earl in 1018. The next year he distinguished himself at the head of the English troops in Cnut's Northern wars, and received in marriage Gytha, the sister of the king's brother-in-law Earl Ulf. In 1020 he became earl of the West-Saxons, that is, of all England south of the Thames, a new office, doubtless connected with Cnut's frequent absences from England. All this again is not in the Chronicles, though particular points are incidentally confirmed by them. Still this stage of his history seems to be fairly made out from other sources.

From Cnut's death in 1035 the events of Godwine's life are recorded in the Chronicles, often with great minuteness. Much is also learned from the contemporary biographer of Eadward. He asserted the claims of Harthacnut, the son of Cnut and Emma, to the crown of his father; but he had to consent to a division of the kingdom, and could only secure Wessex for Harthacnut, while Harold reigned in Northum-

berland and Mercia. He then acted as the chief minister of Emma, while she was regent on behalf of Harthacnut during his first reign. During this time the Ætheling Ælfred, son of Æthelred and Emma, landed in England in the hope of winning back his father's crown; but coming into the power of Harold, he was blinded by his order, and died of his wounds. Godwine was said to have betrayed Ælfred to Harold, and the charge was eagerly seized upon by the Norman writers. But it was not invented by them. At the beginning of Harthacnut's second reign in 1040, Godwine was formally accused of the death of Ælfred, and was regularly tried and acquitted. His guilt is asserted in a poem inserted in one of the Chronicles, but the words which tell against him are carefully altered in another version. The story is told with great confusion and contradiction, and the version unfavourable to Godwine seems to be inconsistent with his position at the time as minister, not of Harold, to whom he is said to have betrayed Ælfred, but of Harthacnut, whose kingship seems to be forgotten in the story. Godwine remained in power during the reigns of Harold and Harthacnut, and on the death of the last-named king in 1042, he was foremost in promoting the election of Eadward, the son of Æthelred and Emma, to the vacant throne. As earl of the West-Saxons he was the first man in the kingdom, but his power was still balanced by that of the other great earls, Leofric in Mercia and Siward in Northumberland. His sons Swegen and Harold, together with Beorn, the nephew of his wife Gytha, were promoted to earldoms (1043–1045), and his daughter Eadgyth was married to the king (1045). We hear much of his good and strict government of his earldom, and of his influence with the king and with the whole nation. He was not, however, all-powerful; in one very remarkable case, which is most instructive as a piece of constitutional history, he was out-voted in the witenagemot on a question of foreign policy. In 1047, when his wife's nephew Swegen Estrithson, now king of the Danes, was at war with Magnus of Norway, Godwine proposed to help Swegen with fifty ships; but the notion was opposed by Leofric, and "all folk" accepted the amendment of the Mercian earl. Godwine had also to strive against the king's fondness for Normans and other strangers, above all in the disposal of ecclesiastical offices. Godwine's policy, in this and in other matters, was opposed to all French connexions of every kind. Next to Englishmen he favoured natives of the kindred Continental lands, and he supported a policy of alliance with the empire and its princes. In all this, at home and abroad, he had specially to withstand the influence of the king's Norman favourite Robert of Jumièges, appointed bishop of London in 1044 and archbishop of Canterbury in 1051. Godwine was supported by the English bishops Stigand of Winchester and Lyfing of Worcester. The appointment of Robert to the archbishopric marks the decline of Godwine's power; the foreign influence was now at its height, and the English earl was to feel the strength of it.

In the course of 1051 a series of outrages committed by the king's foreign favourites led to a breach between the king and the earl. The king's brother-in-law, Eustace count of Boulogne, returning with his followers from a visit to the king, tried to obtain quarters by force in the houses of the burgesses of Dover. An Englishman who withstood them was killed; a fight followed, in which the count and his company were driven out of the town. The king, hearing the tale from Eustace, bade Godwine inflict military chastisement on the townsmen; the earl refused, and demanded a fair trial of the charge before the witan. About the same time men's minds were stirred by the outrages of several Normans who had received estates in Herefordshire. The influence of the archbishop was used against Godwine, and he was summoned to appear before the witan at

Gloucester as a criminal. He and his sons now gathered the whole force of their earldoms, and marched towards Gloucester in arms. They demanded the surrender of Count Eustace and of the other strangers who had done outrages, whether at Dover or in Herefordshire. The king called the other earls to his help; war was hindered by the mediation of Leofric, and matters were adjourned to another meeting in London. There the king appeared with an army; Godwine and his sons were arraigned as criminals, and, on refusing to appear without a safe-conduct, were outlawed. Godwine and his whole family now left the kingdom, except his daughter, the Lady Eadgyth, who was banished from court to the monastery of Wherwell. The foreign favourites of the king were now supreme.

The next year the tide turned; the feeling of the nation showed itself in favour of Godwine. When his petition for a removal of his outlawry was refused, he came back from his shelter in Flanders at the head of a fleet. In most parts of England he was welcomed; he sailed up the Thames to London; the army gathered by the king refused to fight against him; and, in a great meeting outside the walls of London, he and his family were restored to all their offices and possessions, and the archbishop and many other Normans were banished. Godwine's friend Stigand succeeded to the archbishopric. The next year Godwine was smitten with a fit at the king's table, and died three days later, April 15, 1052. His death was worked up into a fabulous tale by his Norman enemies.

The patriotism and good government of Godwine are undoubted; but it is plain that he accumulated vast wealth for himself. Sometimes, it was said, he showed little regard to the rights of the church; but in the only case where we hear both sides, that of some lands in Kent disputed between him and the Norman archbishop, it appears that he had a legal claim. It is much more certain that he was unduly bent on the promotion of his own family. His eldest son Swegen gave great and deserved offence by the seduction of Eadgifu, abbess of Leominster, and still more by the treacherous murder of his cousin Beorn. He was outlawed, but was afterwards restored to his earldom. He accompanied his father to Flanders, but did not come back, having gone on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, on his return from which he died. Of his other sons, the second, Harold, succeeded Godwine in his earldom and Eadward in his kingdom; Tostig, Gyth, and Leofric, all earls, play a part in the later history; Wulfnoth, the youngest, was a captive of William. Of his daughters the Lady Eadgyth survived her father, husband, and brother, and lived in great honour under the Conqueror. The others were Gunhild and Ælfifu, the latter of whom appears in the story of Harold's oath to William.

See the English Chronicles and Florence of Worcester, 1035-52; the Life of Eadward, published in the Chronicles and Memorials; the *Encomium Emmae* or *Gesta Ematonis*, published by Pertz, and elsewhere; various notices in Domesday, and in the writers of the time generally. All the passages, historical and legendary, bearing on Godwine's life, are collected and examined in the appendices to Freeman's *History of the Norman Conquest*, vols. i. ii. (E. A. F.)

GODWIT, a word of unknown origin, the name commonly applied to a marsh-bird in great repute, when fattened, for the table, and formerly abundant in the fens of Norfolk, the Isle of Ely, and Lincolnshire. In Turner's days (1544) it was worth three times as much as a Snipe, and at the same period Belon said of it—"C'est un Oyseau es delices des François." Casaubon, who Latinized its name "*Dei ingenium*" (*Ephemerides*, 19th September 1611), was told by the "*ornithotrophæus*" he visited at Wisbech that in London it fetched twenty pence. Its fame as a delicacy is perpetuated by many later writers, Ben Jonson among them, and Pennant says that in his time (1766) it sold for half-a-crown or five shillings. Under the name Godwit two perfectly distinct species of British birds were included,

but that which seems to have been especially prized is known to modern ornithologists as the Black-tailed Godwit, *Limosa egocephala*, formerly called, from its loud cry, a Yarwhelp,¹ Shrieker, or Barker, in the districts it inhabited. The practice of netting this bird in large numbers during the spring and summer, coupled with the gradual reclamation of the fens, to which it resorted, has now rendered it but a visitor; and it probably ceased from breeding regularly in England in 1824 or thereabouts, though under favourable conditions it may have occasionally laid its eggs for some thirty years later or more (Stevenson, *Birds of Norfolk*, ii. p. 250). This Godwit is a species of wide range, reaching Iceland, where it is called *Jardveika* (= earth-raker), in summer, and occurring numerous, it is said, in India in winter. Its chief breeding-quarters seem to extend from Holland eastwards to the south of Russia. The second British species is that which is known as the Bar-tailed Godwit, *L. lapponica*, and this seems to have never been more than a bird of double passage in the United Kingdom, arriving in large flocks on the south coast about the 12th of May, and, after staying a few days, proceeding to the north-eastward. It is known to breed in Lapland, but its eggs are of great rarity. Towards autumn the young visit our coasts, and a few of them remain, together with some of the other species, in favourable situations throughout the winter. One of the local names by which the Bar-tailed Godwit is known to the Norfolk gunners is Scamell, a word which, in the mouth of Caliban (*Tempest*, act ii. scene 2), has been the cause of much perplexity to Shakespearian critics.

The Godwits belong to the group *Limicolæ*, and are about as big as a tame Pigeon, but possess long legs, and a long bill with a slight upward turn. It is believed that in the genus *Limosa* the female is larger than the male. While the winter plumage is of a sober greyish-brown, the breeding-dress is marked by a predominance of bright bay or chestnut, rendering the wearer a very beautiful object. The Black-tailed Godwit, though varying a good deal in size, is constantly larger than the Bar-tailed, and especially longer in the legs. The species may be further distinguished by the former having the proximal third of the tail-quills pure white, and the distal two-thirds black, with a narrow white margin, while the latter has the same feathers barred with black and white alternately for nearly their whole length.

America possesses two species of the genus, the very large Marbled Godwit or Marlin, *L. fedoa*, easily recognized by its size and the buff colour of its axillaries, and the smaller Hudsonian Godwit, *L. hudsonica*, which has its axillaries of a deep black. This last, though less numerous than its congener, seems to range over the whole of the continent, breeding in the extreme north, while it has been obtained also in the Strait of Magellan and the Falkland Islands. The first seems not to go further southward than the Antilles and the Isthmus of Panama.

From Asia, or at least its eastern part, two species have been described. One of them, *L. melanuroides*, differs only from *L. egocephala* in its smaller size, and is believed to breed in Amurland, wintering in the islands of the Pacific, New Zealand, and Australia. The other, *L. uropygialis*, is closely allied to and often mistaken for *L. lapponica*, from which it chiefly differs by having the rump barred like the tail. This was found breeding in the extreme north of Siberia by Dr von Middendorff, and ranges to Australia, whence it was, like the last, first described by Mr Gould. (A. N.)

GOES, or TER GOES, a town of the Netherlands in the province of Zealand, on the island of South Beveland, with railway communication since 1868 with Bergen-op-Zoom, and since 1872 with Middelburg, its distances from these

¹ This name seems to have survived in Whelp Moor, near Brandon, in Suffolk.

places being respectively 12 and 15 miles. The Reformed church, called in the olden times St Mary Magdalen's, is considered the finest ecclesiastical building of Zealand, and dates from 1423. In the one half, known as the Preekkerk or preaching church, there is a splendid organ, and in the other half, known as the Wandelkerk or walking church, stands the tomb of Frans Naerebout the philanthropist. Goes further boasts of a fine old town-house, a high school, and the remains of the old castle of Ostende, which was the nucleus round which it began to form itself in the 14th century. The industries of the town are varied but not extensive, dealing with linen, dyes, chocolate, oil, flour, straw hats, wood, and cigars. Shipbuilding is also carried on, as well as a trade in wood and coals. The harbour, which is defended by a fort, is formed by a short canal communicating with the eastern Scheldt, extended and improved in 1818-19. The population of the town, which received its municipal rights in 1406, and was surrounded with a wall about 1420, numbered 4916 in 1860, 5205 in 1870, and 6063 in 1876.

GOES, HUGO VAN DER (? -1482), a painter of considerable celebrity at Ghent, was known to Vasari, as he is known to us, by a single picture in a Florentine monastery. At a period when the family of the Medici had not yet risen from the rank of a great mercantile firm to that of a reigning dynasty, it employed as an agent at the port of Bruges Tommaso Portinari, a lineal descendant, it was said, of Folco, the father of Dante's Beatrice. Tommaso, at that time patron of a chapel in the hospital of Santa Maria Nuova at Florence, ordered an altar-piece of Hugo van der Goes, and commanded him to illustrate the sacred theme of "*Quem genuit adoravit*." In the centre of a vast triptych, comprising numerous figures of life size, Hugo represented the Virgin kneeling in adoration before the new-born Christ attended by Shepherds and Angels. On the wings he portrayed Tommaso and his two sons in prayer under the protection of Saint Anthony and St Matthew, and Tommaso's wife and two daughters supported by St Margaret and St Mary Magdalen. The triptych was sent to Florence, and placed on the altar upon which it still remains. Van der Goes, like Hubert Van Eyck and Jodocus of Ghent, has bequeathed but this one picture to posterity; but it is a picture which shows that he was an artist of whom Ghent might be proud, as Bruges was proud of John Van Eyck and Brussels of Roger van der Weyden. Unhappily the triptych of Santa Maria Nuova suffered so much from decay

and restoring that the defects peculiar to the Flemings became unduly prominent as time and neglect effaced the brilliancy and harmony of the principal colours. We can only discern at the present day that the art of Van der Goes is a variety of that which characterizes Van Eyck and Van der Weyden. Less finished and less coloured than the work of the first, it is less subtle and expressive than that of the second. It lacks depth of religious feeling, and hardly rises above the common level of the school in respect of feeling or execution. It is a cold and stiff art, marked by hardness of surface, dryness of contour, angularity of drapery, overlaid ornament, and ill-balanced light and shade. Imposing because composed of figures of unusual size, the altar-piece is more remarkable for portrait character than for charms of ideal beauty. There are small pieces in public galleries which claim to have been executed by Van der Goes, but none that are certified as the work of his hands. One of these pictures in the National Gallery in London is more nearly allied to the school of Memling than the triptych of Santa Maria Nuova; another, a small and very beautiful John the Baptist, at the Pinakothek of Munich, is really by Memling; whilst numerous fragments of an altar-piece in the Belvedere at Vienna, though assigned to Hugo, are by his more gifted countryman of Bruges. Any one who visits Continental collections will see that the name of Van der Goes was given to pictures of which he could not have been the author. None of the compositions mentioned by historians have survived except the altar-piece of Florence. But Van der Goes was not habitually a painter of easel pieces. He made his reputation at Bruges by producing coloured hangings in distemper. After he settled at Ghent, and became a master of his guild in 1465, he designed cartoons for glass windows. He also made decorations for the wedding of Charles the Bold and Margaret of York in 1468, for the festivals of the Rhetoricians and papal jubilees on repeated occasions, for the solemn entry of Charles the Bold into Ghent in 1470-1, and for the funeral of Philip the Good in 1474. The labour which he expended on these occasions might well add to his fame without being the less ephemeral. About the year 1475 he retired to the monastery of Rouge Cloitre near Ghent, where he took the cowl. There, though he still clung to his profession, he seems to have taken to drinking, and at one time to have shown decided symptoms of insanity. But his superiors gradually cured him of his intemperance, and he died in the odour of sanctity in 1482.

GOETHE

JOHANN WOLFGANG VON GOETHE (1749-1832) was born in Frankfort on August 28, 1749. His parents were citizens of that imperial town, and Wolfgang was their only son and their eldest child. His father was born on July 31, 1710, and in 1742 received the title of imperial councillor. He married on August 20, 1748, at the age of thirty-eight, Catherine Elizabeth Textor, a girl of seventeen. Her family was better than his own, and held a higher position in the town. Her father was imperial councillor, and had been schultheiss or chief magistrate. In December 1750 was born a daughter, Cornelia, who remained until her death, at the age of twenty-seven, her brother's most intimate friend. She was married in 1773 to John George Schlosser. The house in which Goethe was born is still to be seen in the Hirschgraben. Goethe has described to us how it was rebuilt, and it has since been much altered. His education was irregular; he went to no school, and his father rather stimulated than instructed him. But the atmosphere by which he was surrounded gave him, perhaps, the best education he could have received. Frankfort, a

free town of the empire, still preserved the appearance of the Middle Ages. It had lost the reality of power, but its citizens naturally grew up with a strong sense of independence, and a power of realizing the unity of Germany which was wanting in a small state. The boy from his earliest youth was accustomed to the companionship of his elders. His father was strict and formal, his mother quick and lively, inspired with no small share of the genius of her son. Goethe lived in the freest intercourse with every kind of society in the town, in which he might expect some day to be an important personage. There was no capital like London or Paris to call him away; Berlin was poor and distant, Vienna half Italian and half Spanish. Goethe must have been brought up with the ambition to take his degree at the university as doctor, to return home and become an advocate, to make a rich marriage, to go through the regular course of civil offices, to inherit his father's house, and perhaps one day to be burgomaster. His home was a cultivated one. The father was fond of art and of the German poetry