

the practical tests of truth set forth in Herschel's *Discourse on Natural Philosophy* with the theoretic views of induction propounded in Whately's *Logic*. But in the history of thought the great importance of the work is due not so much to its endeavour to formulate the methods of science and lay bare the first principles on which they rest as to its systematic application of scientific method to what he called the moral sciences. Mill has often been criticized as if he had pretended to teach men how to conduct their investigations and how to make discoveries in the physical sciences. His work was rather to educe from the practice of men of science the principles on which they proceed in testing and proving their speculations concerning cause and effect in the physical world, and see whether the same principles could not be applied in testing and proving speculations concerning cause and effect in the moral world. What is the effect upon human character and human happiness of given social and physical conditions—climate, institutions, customs, laws? How can conclusions upon such points be proved? These were the questions in which Mill was interested, and the striking novelty of his work was its endeavour to show that propositions of cause and effect in human affairs must be proved, if they admit of proof at all, absolute or approximate, on the same principles with propositions of cause and effect in the material world.

The *Logic* was published in 1843. In 1844 appeared his *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy*. These essays were worked out and written many years before, and show Mill in his first stage as a political economist. Four out of the five essays are elaborate and powerful solutions of perplexing technical problems—the distribution of the gains of international commerce, the influence of consumption on production, the definition of productive and unproductive labour, the precise relations between profits and wages. Though Mill appears here purely as the disciple of Ricardo, striving after more precise statement, and reaching forward to further consequences, we can well understand in reading these essays, searching, luminous, large and bold in outline, firmly wrought in detail, how about the time when he first sketched them he began to be conscious of power as an original and independent thinker.

That originality and independence became more conspicuous when he reached his second stage as a political economist, struggling forward towards the standpoint from which his systematic work was written. It would seem that in his fits of despondency one of the thoughts that sat upon him like a nightmare and marred his dreams of human improvement was the apparently inexorable character of economic laws, condemning thousands of labourers to a cramped and miserable existence, and thousands more to semi-starvation. From this oppressive feeling he found relief in the thought set forth in the opening of the second book of his *Political Economy*—that, while the conditions of production have the necessity of physical laws, the distribution of what is produced among the various classes of producers is a matter of human arrangement, dependent upon alterable customs and institutions. There can be little doubt that this thought, whether or not in the clear shape that it afterwards assumed, was the germ of all that is most distinctive in his system of political economy. It was as far as possible from the rigidity of his method of exposition to fall into the confusion of supposing that it was for political economy to discuss the equity of different modes of distribution, or the value of other objects of human endeavour conflicting with the production of wealth; but he put economic inquiries clearly in their proper place as leading to conclusions that were not always final and bind-

ing on the practical statesman, but had to be taken with other considerations as governing rational human action. Besides thus putting political economy in its just correlation with other parts of social science and conduct, Mill widened the scope of economic inquiries by discussing the economic consequences of various ideal social arrangements, and more especially different modes of distributing produce between landlord, capitalist, and labourer. Mill certainly redeemed political economy from the reproach of being a dry science. Nobody with any interest in human improvement can read his work with indifference. And he did this without in any way disturbing the original conception of political economy as the science of cause and effect in the production of wealth. One of his most eminent successors, the late Professor Cairnes, thus admirably summed up his work as a political economist:—"As he himself used to put it, Ricardo supplied the backbone of the science; but it is not less certain that the limbs, the joints, the muscular developments—all that renders political economy a complete and organized body of knowledge—have been the work of Mill."

While his great systematic works were in progress, Mill wrote very little on events or books of the day. He turned aside for a few months from his *Political Economy* during the winter of the Irish famine (1846-47) to advocate the creation of peasant-proprietorships as a remedy for distress and disorder in Ireland. He found time also to write elaborate articles on French history and Greek history in the *Edinburgh Review* apropos of Michelet, Guizot, and Grote, besides some less elaborate essays.

The *Political Economy* was published in 1848. Mill could now feel that the main work he had proposed for himself was accomplished; but, though he wrote comparatively little for some years afterwards, he remained as much as ever on the alert for opportunities of useful influence, and pressed on with hardly diminished enthusiasm in his search for useful truth. Among other things, he made a more thorough study of socialist writers, with the result that, though he was not converted to any of their schemes as being immediately practicable, he began to look upon some more equal distribution of the produce of labour as a practicability of the remote future, and to dwell upon the prospect of such changes in human character as might render a stable society possible without the institution of private property. This he has called his third stage as a political economist, and he says that he was helped towards it by the lady, Mrs Taylor, who became his wife in 1851, and with whom he had lived in intimate friendship for more than twenty years before. It is generally supposed that he writes with a lover's extravagance about this lady's powers when he compares her with Shelley and Carlyle. But a little reflexion will show that he wrote with his usual accuracy and sobriety when he described her influence on him. He expressly says that he owed none of his technical doctrine to her, that she influenced only his ideals of life for the individual and for society; and his language about her is really only a measure of the importance that he attached to such ideals above any systems of reasoned truth. There is very little propositional difference between Mill and his father; but it is obvious from what he says that his inner life became very different after he threw off his father's authority. This new inner life was strengthened and enlarged by Mrs Taylor. We must remember also that Mill in his early years had been so strictly secluded from commonplace sentiment that what the general world would consider commonplace must have come to him with all the freshness of a special revelation.

During the seven years of his married life Mill published less than in any other period of his career, but four of his

most closely reasoned and characteristic works, the *Liberty*, the *Utilitarianism*, the *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*, and the *Subjection of Women*, besides his posthumously published essays on *Nature* and on the *Utility of Religion*, were thought out and partly written in collaboration with his wife. In 1856 he became head of the examiner's office in the India House, and for two years, till the dissolution of the Company in 1858, his official work, never a light task, kept him fully occupied. It fell to him as head of the office to write the defence of the Company's government of India when the transfer of its powers was proposed. Mill was earnestly opposed to the transfer, and the documents in which he substantiated the proud boast for the Company that "few governments even under far more favourable circumstances have attempted so much for the good of their subjects or carried so many of their attempts to a beneficial issue," and exposed the defects of the proposed new government, are models of trenchant and dignified pleading. His prediction that the Indian Secretary's council would serve as a screen and not as a check was in the opinion of many amply verified a few years ago.

On the dissolution of the Company, Mill was offered a seat in the new council, but declined. His retirement from official work was followed almost immediately by his wife's death, and from this calamity he sought relief in active literary occupation. Politics, sociology, and psychology divided as before the energies of his active mind. One of his first cares was to publish with a touching dedication to his wife the treatise on *Liberty*, which they had wrought out together, principle by principle and sentence by sentence. This pious duty discharged, he turned to current politics, and published, in view of the impending Reform Bill, a pamphlet on parliamentary reform. The chief feature in this was an idea concerning which he and Mrs Mill often deliberated, the necessity of providing checks against uneducated democracy. His fanciful suggestion of a plurality of votes, proportioned to the elector's degree of education, was avowedly put forward only as an ideal; he admitted that no authentic test of education could for the present be found. An anonymous Conservative caught at the scheme in another pamphlet, proposing income as a test. Soon after, Mill supported in *Fraser's*, still with the same object, Mr Hare's scheme for the representation of minorities. In the autumn of the same year he turned to psychology, reviewing Mr Bain's works in the *Edinburgh Review*.

In this way the indefatigable thinker worked on, throwing himself by turns into the various lines along which he saw prospects of fulfilling his mission as an apostle of progress. In his *Representative Government* (1860) he systematized opinions already put forward in many casual articles and essays. His *Utilitarianism* (published in *Fraser's* in 1861) was a closely reasoned systematic attempt to answer objections to his ethical theory and remove misconceptions of it. As the inventor of the term Utilitarianism, he was entitled to define its meaning; and he was especially anxious to make it clear that he included in utility the pleasures of the imagination and the gratification of the higher emotions, and to show how powerfully the good of mankind as a motive appealed to the imagination. His treatise on the *Subjection of Women*, in its ruling intention a protest against the abuse of power, was Mill's next work, though it was not published till 1869. His *Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy*, published in 1865, had engaged a large share of his time for three years before. When it first occurred to him that a criticism of the chief of our native intuitional psychologists would cause a wholesome stir and serve enlightenment, he thought only of an article such as he wrote about Austin's *Jurisprudence* or Grote's

*Plato*. But he soon found that the subject required a book, and a book appeared which certainly answered the purpose of rousing the sleepy realms of philosophy and theology.

While mainly occupied in those years with philosophical studies, Mill did not remit his interest in current politics. He made his voice heard on the contest in America in 1862, taking the side of the North—then very unpopular in London—and using all his strength to explain what has since been universally recognized as the issue really at stake in the struggle, the abolition of slavery. It was characteristic of the closeness with which he watched current events, and of his zeal in the cause of "Incidity," that, when the *Reader*, an organ of science and unpartisan opinion, fell into difficulties in 1865, Mill joined with some distinguished men of science and letters in an effort to keep it afloat. He supplied part of the money for carrying it on, contributed several articles, and assisted the editor, Mr Fraser Rae, with his advice. The effort was vain, though such men as Herbert Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, Cairnes, Mark Pattison, F. Harrison, Sir Frederick Pollock, and Lockyer were among the contributors.

In 1865 a new channel was opened to his influence. He was requested to stand for Westminster, and agreed on conditions strictly in accordance with his principles of parliamentary election. He would not canvass, nor pay agents to canvass for him, nor would he engage to attend to the local business of the constituency. He was with difficulty persuaded even to address a meeting of the electors. The story of this remarkable election has been told by Mr James Beal, one of the most active supporters of Mill's candidature. In parliament he adhered to his lifelong principle of doing only work that needed to be done, and that nobody else seemed equally able or willing to do. It may have been a consciousness of this fact which prompted a remark made by the Speaker that Mill's presence in parliament elevated the tone of debate. The impression made by him in parliament is in some danger of being forgotten, because he was not instrumental in carrying any great measure that might serve as an abiding memorial. But, although in one of his first speeches against the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland he was very unfavourably received, Mill thoroughly succeeded in what is called "gaining the ear of the House." The only speech made by him during his three years in parliament that was listened to with impatience was, curiously enough, his speech in favour of counteracting democracy by providing for the representation of minorities. His attack on the conduct of General Eyre in Jamaica was listened to, but with repugnance by the majority, although his action in this matter in and out of parliament was far from being ineffectual. He took an active part in the debates on Mr Disraeli's Reform Bill, and helped to extort from the Government several useful modifications of the Bill for the Prevention of Corrupt Practices. The reform of land tenure in Ireland, the representation of women, the reduction of the national debt, the reform of London government, the abrogation of the declaration of Paris, were among the topics on which he spoke with marked effect. He took occasion more than once to enforce what he had often advocated in writing, England's duty to intervene in Continental politics in support of the cause of freedom. As a speaker Mill was somewhat hesitating, pausing occasionally as if to recover the thread of his argument, but he showed great readiness in extemporaneous debate. Viewed as a candidate for ministerial office, he might be regarded as a failure in parliament, but there can be no doubt that his career there greatly extended his influence.

Mill's subscription to the election expenses of Mr Bradlaugh, and his attitude towards Governor Eyre, are



generally regarded as the main causes of his defeat in the general election of 1868. But, as he suggests himself, his studied advocacy of unfamiliar projects of reform had made him unpopular with "moderate Liberals." When he was first elected on a sudden impulse of enthusiasm, extremely little was known about him by the bulk of the electorate; and his writing about checks against democracy had prepared many for a more conservative attitude on questions of practical politics. He retired with a sense of relief to his cottage and his literary life at Avignon. His parliamentary duties and the quantity of correspondence brought upon him by increased publicity had absorbed nearly the whole of his time. The scanty leisure of his first recess had been devoted to writing his St Andrews rectorial address on higher education and to answering attacks on his criticism of Hamilton; of the second, to annotating, in conjunction with Mr Bain and Mr Findlater, his father's *Analysis of the Mind*. But now he could look forward to a literary life pure and simple, and his letters show how much he enjoyed the change. His little cottage was filled with books and newspapers; the beautiful country round it furnished him with a variety of walks; he read, wrote, discussed, walked, botanized. His step-daughter, Miss Taylor, his constant companion after his wife's death, "architect and master-mason all in one," carried out various improvements in their quiet home for the philosopher's comfort. "Helen," he wrote to Mr Thornton, "has carried out her long-cherished scheme (about which she tells me she consulted you) of a 'vibratory' for me, and has made a pleasant covered walk, some 30 feet long, where I can vibrate in cold or rainy weather. The terrace, you must know, as it goes round two sides of the house, has got itself dubbed the 'semi-circumgyratory.' In addition to this Helen has built me a herbarium, a little room fitted up with closets for my plants, shelves for my botanical books, and a great table whereon to manipulate them all. Thus, you see, with my herbarium, my vibratory, and my semi-circumgyratory, I am in clover; and you may imagine with what scorn I think of the House of Commons, which, comfortable club as it is said to be, could offer me none of these comforts, or, more perfectly speaking, these necessities of life." Mill was an enthusiastic botanist all his life long; and a frequent contributor of notes and short papers to the *Phytologist*. One of the things that he looked forward to during his last journey to Avignon was seeing the spring flowers and completing a flora of the locality. His delight in scenery frequently appears in letters written to his friends during his summer and autumn tours.

No recluse ever had a more soothing retreat than Mill's Avignon cottage, but to the last he did not relax his laborious habits nor his ardent outlook on human affairs. The essays in the fourth volume of his *Dissertations*—on endowments, on land, on labour, on metaphysical and psychological questions—were written for the *Fortnightly Review* at intervals after his short parliamentary career. One of his first tasks was to send his treatise on the *Subjection of Women* through the press. The essay on *Theism* was written soon after. The last public work in which he engaged was the starting of the Land Tenure Reform Association. The interception by the state of the unearned increment, and the promotion of co-operative agriculture, were the most striking features in his programme. He wrote in the *Examiner* and made a public speech in favour of the association a few months before his death. The secret of the ardour with which he took up this question, probably was his conviction that a great struggle was impending in Europe between labour and capital. He regarded his project as a timely compromise. Mill died at Avignon on the 8th of May 1873.

Within the limits of this article it is impossible to attempt a criticism of Mill's conclusions in so many fields of research; one must be content with trying to indicate the purpose and the spirit of his work. Perhaps we still stand too near to judge without bias; some years hence men will be better able to say whether he made sciolism less reckless or brought mankind appreciably nearer that dominion of the wisest which was the remote goal of his endeavour. It will be long before humanity finds a nobler example of the searcher after the best means of social improvement. He sought after clear ideas with the ardour of a mystic, the patience and laborious industry of a man of science; he encountered opponents with a generosity and a courtesy worthy of any *preux chevalier* of mediæval romance, while he was not inferior to that ideal in the vigour of his blows against injustice. As regards his influence, it has been well said that "no calculus can integrate the innumerable pulses of knowledge and of thought that he has made to vibrate in the minds of his generation." He quickened thought upon every problem that he touched. Any estimate of Mill's service to political or philosophical thought at this moment is liable to be injuriously affected by the temporary discredit into which some of his doctrines have fallen. He was not infallible; he made no claim to dogmatic authority. But in criticism of detail, according to our present light, we may easily blind ourselves to the greatness of the work that Mill accomplished in the development of opinion. (W. M.)

MILLAU, or MELHAU, capital of an arrondissement on the left bank of the Tarn, half a mile below the point at which that river is joined by the Dourbie, and 48 miles to the south-east of Rodez, on the Rodez and Montpellier line. Itself 1210 feet above the level of the sea, it is overlooked by hills covered with vineyards and fruit trees or by bare and scarpèd rocks. The streets of Millau are narrow, and some of the houses of great antiquity, but the town is surrounded by spacious boulevards. On two sides the Place d'Armes is adorned by stone columns supporting galleries of wood; the only buildings of special interest are the Romanesque church of Notre Dame, and the belfry of the old hôtel de ville. The principal industry is the manufacture of gloves, but various branches of the leather manufacture are also carried on. The chief articles of commerce are wool (both raw and prepared), Roquefort cheese, wine, almonds, and live stock. The population in 1881 was 16,628.

The viscounts of Millau are mentioned as early as the 10th century; in the 16th it became one of the leading strongholds of the Reformed party in the south of France. Its industry suffered severely by the revocation of the edict of Nantes.

MILLENNIUM. In the history of Christianity three main forces are found to have acted as auxiliaries of the gospel. They have elicited the ardent enthusiasm of many whom the bare preaching of the gospel would never have made decided converts. These are (1) a belief in the speedy return of Christ and in His glorious reign on earth; (2) mystical contemplation, which regards heavenly blessings as a possible possession in the present life; and (3) faith in a divine predestination of some to salvation and others to perdition. Each of these forces has at particular times proved too strong for church authority and burst the embankments with which the church had at once narrowed and protected Christian life and thought. They have produced ecclesiastical, social, and political convulsions, where the elemental force of religious conviction has destroyed all organization, whether of church or of state. They have released from its fetters the free spirit of Christianity, though often enough they have associated with it a fanaticism more damaging to the gospel than the temporizing policy of the hierarchy.

First in point of time came the faith in the nearness of Christ's second advent and the establishing of His reign of glory on the earth. Indeed it appears so early that it might be questioned whether it ought not to be regarded as an essential part of the Christian religion. That question, however, will scarcely be answered in the affirmative. The ideas of the Sermon on the Mount, or the pregnant thoughts of the Pauline theology, are independent of the expectation that the kingdom of glory will shortly

be established. On the other hand, it must be admitted that this expectation was a prominent feature in the earliest proclamation of the gospel, and materially contributed to its success. If the primitive churches had been under the necessity of framing a "Confession of Faith," it would certainly have embraced those pictures by means of which the near future was distinctly realized. But then these pictures and dreams and hopes were just the things that made systematized doctrine impossible, it is possible to formulate the mythological ideas, but not the shifting imagery of the imagination.

In the anticipations of the future prevalent amongst the early Christians (c. 50-150) it is necessary to distinguish a fixed and a fluctuating element. The former includes (1) the notion that a last terrible battle with the enemies of God was impending; (2) the faith in the speedy return of Christ; (3) the conviction that Christ will judge all men, and (4) will set up a kingdom of glory on earth. To the latter belong views of the Antichrist, of the heathen world-power, of the place, extent, and duration of the earthly kingdom of Christ, &c. These remained in a state of solution; they were modified from day to day, partly because of the changing circumstances of the present by which forecasts of the future were regulated, partly because the indications—real or supposed—of the ancient prophets always admitted of new combinations and constructions. But even here certain positions were agreed on in large sections of Christendom. Amongst these was the expectation that the future kingdom of Christ on earth should have a fixed duration,—according to the most prevalent opinion, a duration of one thousand years. From this fact the whole ancient Christian eschatology was known in later times as "chiliasm,"—a name which is not strictly accurate, since the doctrine of the millennium was only one feature in its scheme of the future.

1. This idea that the Messianic kingdom of the future on earth should have a definite duration has—like the whole eschatology of the primitive church—its roots in the Jewish apocalyptic literature, where it appears at a comparatively late period. At first it was assumed that the Messianic kingdom in Palestine would last for ever (so the prophets; cf. Jerem. xxiv. 6; Ezek. xxxvii. 25; Joel iv. 20; Daniel vi. 27; Sibyll. iii. 49 sq., 766; Psalt. Salom. xvii. 4; Enoch lxii. 14), and this seems always to have been the most widely accepted view (John xii. 34). But from a comparison of prophetic passages of the Old Testament learned apocalyptic writers came to the conclusion that a distinction must be drawn between the earthly appearance of the Messiah and the appearance of God Himself amongst His people and in the Gentile world for the final judgment. As a necessary consequence, a limited period had to be assigned to the Messianic kingdom. It is not altogether improbable that the mysterious references to the sufferings of the Messiah had also an influence on some minds. This, however, is doubtful. It is certain at all events that the whole conception marks the beginning of the dissolution of realistic and sensuous views of the future. The age was too advanced to regard the earthly Messianic kingdom as the end. There was an effort to find a place among the hopes of the future for those more spiritual and universal anticipations, according to which eternal and heavenly blessedness will be the portion of the faithful, this earth and heaven will pass away, and God will be all in all. As to the period to be assigned to this earthly kingdom, no agreement was ever reached in Judaism, any more than in the detailed descriptions of its joys and pleasures. According to the Apocalypse of Baruch (xl. 3) this kingdom will last "donec finiat mundus corruptionis." In the Book of Enoch (xc. 12) "a week" is specified, in the Apocalypse of Ezra (vii. 28 sq.) four

hundred years. This figure, corresponding to the four hundred years of Egyptian bondage, occurs also in the Talmud (Sanhedrin 99a). But this is the only passage; the Talmud has no fixed doctrine on the point. The view most frequently expressed there (see Von Otto in *Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift*, 1877, p. 527 sq.) is that the Messianic kingdom will last for one thousand (some said two thousand) years. "In six days God created the world, on the seventh He rested. But a day of God is equal to a thousand years (Ps. xc. 4). Hence the world will last for six thousand years of toil and labour; then will come one thousand years of Sabbath rest for the people of God in the kingdom of the Messiah." This idea must have already been very common in the first century before Christ. The combination of Gen. i., Dan. ix., and Ps. xc. 4 was peculiarly fascinating.

2. Jesus Himself speaks of only one return of the Son of Man—His return to judgment. In speaking of it, and of the glorious kingdom He is to introduce, He makes use of apocalyptic images (Matt. viii. 11, xxvi. 29; Luke xxii. 16; Matt. xix. 28); but nowhere in the discourses of Jesus is there a hint of a limited duration of the Messianic kingdom. The apostolic epistles are equally free from any trace of chiliasm (neither 1 Cor. xv. 23 sq. nor 1 Thess. iv. 16 sq. points in this direction). In the Apocalypse of John, however, it occurs in the following shape (chap. xx.). After Christ has appeared from heaven in the guise of a warrior, and vanquished the antichristian world-power, the wisdom of the world, and the devil, those who have remained steadfast in the time of the last catastrophe, and have given up their lives for their faith, shall be raised up, and shall reign with Christ on this earth as a royal priesthood for one thousand years. At the end of this time Satan is to be let loose again for a short season; he will prepare a new onslaught, but God will miraculously destroy him and his hosts. Then will follow the general resurrection of the dead, the last judgment, and the creation of new heavens and a new earth. That all believers will have a share in the first resurrection and in the Messianic kingdom is an idea of which John knows nothing. The earthly kingdom of Christ is reserved for those who have endured the most terrible tribulation, who have withstood the supreme effort of the world-power,—that is, for those who are actually members of the church of the last days. The Jewish expectation is thus considerably curtailed in the hands of John, as it is also shorn of its sensual attractions. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years." More than this John does not say. But other ancient Christian authors were not so cautious. Accepting the Jewish apocalypses as sacred books of venerable antiquity, they read them eagerly, and transferred their contents bodily to Christianity. Nay more, the Gentile Christians took possession of them, and just in proportion as they were neglected by the Jews—who, after the war of Bar-Cochba, became indifferent to the Messianic hope and hardened themselves once more in devotion to the law—they were naturalized in the Christian communities. The result was that these books became "Christian" documents; it is entirely to Christian, not to Jewish, tradition that we owe their preservation. The Jewish expectations are adopted, for example, by Papias, by the writer of the epistle of Barnabas, and by Justin. Papias actually confounds expressions of Jesus with verses from the Apocalypse of Baruch, referring to the amazing fertility of the days of the Messianic kingdom (Papias in Iren. v. 33). Barnabas (*Ep.*, 15) gives us the Jewish theory (from Gen. i. and Ps. xc. 4) that the present condition of the world is to last six thousand years