

and pairs of extremities. Two distinct heads (with more or less of neck) may surmount a single trunk, broad at the shoulders but with only one pair of arms. The fusion, again, may be from the middle of the thorax downwards, giving two heads and two pairs of shoulders and arms, but only one trunk and one pair of legs. In another variety, the body may be double down to the waist, but the pelvis and lower limbs single. The degree of union in the region of the head, abdomen, or pelvis may be so slight as to permit of two distinct organs or sets of organs in the respective cavities, or so great as to have the viscera in common; and there is hardly ever an intermediate condition between those extremes. Thus, in the Janus head there may be two brains, or only one brain. The Siamese twins are an instance of union at the umbilical region, with the viscera distinct in every respect except a slight vascular anastomosis and a common process of peritoneum; but it is more usual for union in that region to be more extensive, and to entail a single set of abdominal and thoracic viscera. The pelvis is one of the commonest regions for double monsters to be joined at, and, as in the head and abdomen, the junction may be slight or total. The Hungarian sisters Helena and Judith (1701-1723) were joined at the sacrum, but had the pelvic cavity and pelvic organs separate; the same condition obtained in the South Carolina negroes Millie and Christina, known as the "two-headed nightingale," and in the other recent case of the Bohemian sisters Rosalie and Josepha. More usually the union in the pelvic region is complete, and produces the most fantastic shapes of two trunks (each with head and arms) joining below at various angles, and with three or four lower limbs extending from the region of fusion, sometimes in a lateral direction, sometimes downwards. A very curious kind of double monster is produced by two otherwise distinct fetuses joining at the crown of the head and keeping the axis of their bodies in a line. It is only in rare instances that double monsters survive their birth, and the preserved specimens of them are mostly of foetal size.

*Unequal Double Monsters, Fetus in Fetu.*—There are some well-authenticated instances of this most curious of all anomalies. The most celebrated of these parasite-bearing monsters was a Genoese, Lazarus Johannes Baptista Colloredo, born in 1716, who was figured as a child by Licetus, and again by Bartholinus at the age of twenty-eight as a young man of average stature. The parasite adhered to the lower end of his breast-bone, and was a tolerably well-formed child, wanting only one leg; it breathed, slept at intervals, and moved its body, but it had no separate nutritive functions. The parasite is more apt to be a miniature acardiac and acephalous fragment, as in the case of the one born in front of the abdomen of a Chinaman figured by I. Geoffroy St-Hilaire. Sometimes the parasite is contained in a pouch under the skin of the abdominal wall, and in another class (of which there is a specimen in the Hunterian Museum) it has actually been included, by the closure of the ventral laminae, within the abdominal cavity of the fetus,—a true *fetus in fetu*. Shapeless parasitic fragments containing masses of bone, cartilage, and other tissue are found also in the space behind the breast-bone (mediastinal teratoma), or growing from the base of the skull and protruding through the mouth ("epignathous teratoma," appearing to be seated on the jaw), and, most frequently of all, attached to the sacrum. These last pass by a most interesting transition into common forms of congenital sacral tumours (which may be of enormous size), consisting mainly of one kind of tissue having its physiological type in the curious gland-like body (coccygeal gland) in which the middle sacral artery comes to an end. The congenital sacral tumours have a tendency to become cystic, and they are probably related to

the more perfect congenital cysts of the neck region, where there is another minute gland-like body of the same nature as the coccygeal at the point of bifurcation of the common carotid artery. Other tumours of the body, especially certain of the sarcomatous class, may be regarded from the point of view of *monstra per excessum*; but such cases suggest not so much a question of aberrant development within the blastoderm as of the indwelling spontaneity of a single post-embryonic tissue; and they fall to be considered more properly, along with tumours in general, in the article PATHOLOGY (*q.v.*).

The scientific appreciation of monsters hardly began before the 18th century; even so great a rationalist in surgical practice as Ambroise Paré (1517-1590), although he was attracted as a scholar in later life to the subject, did not advance in it materially beyond the fantastic and credulous standpoint of the time, which is exemplified in the elaborate treatise of Lycosthenes, *Prodigiorum ac ostentorum chronicon*, Basel, 1557. Throughout the 17th century fabulous monsters continued to be described along with actual specimens; the embryological studies of Harvey (1651) were doubtless calculated to help in the growth of rational opinion about monsters, though Harvey himself mentions them only casually. The first systematic discussion of them from a strictly objective or anatomical point of view occurs in various writings of Haller from 1735 to 1753, and the subject continued after that to engage a large amount of precise and philosophical thought on the part of Caspar Friedrich Wolff (1735-1794), who first stated the relation of monstrosities to embryonic deviations in words that even now hardly require to be altered, and of Blumenbach, Sömmering, Autenrieth, Tiedemann, and others. The engrossing interest of the subject in the early part of the 19th century is shown by the fact that J. F. Meckel's *Handbuch der pathologischen Anatomie* (1817) was largely occupied with congenital malformations. Geoffroy St-Hilaire, the father, gave them a prominent place in his *Philosophie Anatomique* (Paris, 1822), and his son Isidore made them the subject of a special and very elaborate treatise in 3 vols. (Paris, 1832-37), illustrated by a small and inadequate atlas of plates. Monstrosities were at this period a prominent part of all text-books of morbid anatomy. From 1840 to 1850 may be regarded as the period in which human teratology reached its highest point; in 1840-42 the special treatise of Vrolik was published (2 vols., Amsterdam), containing an introduction on the normal development, and his sumptuous and incomparable atlas to the same followed in 1849; in 1841 Otto published at Warsaw a description of 600 monsters with 30 folio plates; and in 1842 the embryologist Bischoff contributed to Wagner's *Handwörterbuch der Physiologie*, vol. i., an article on teratology as elucidated by the best information on mammalian development. An article by Allen Thomson in the *London and Edinburgh Monthly Journal of Medical Science*, July 1844, followed by a critical survey in the next number, is of the first importance for the theory of double monsters, and it is one of the few notable English contributions to animal teratology apart from museum catalogues,—the general article in Todd's *Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Physiology* having been written by Vrolik, while the special subject of Hermaphroditism is treated of in a long and learned article by J. Y. Simpson (reprinted in his collected works). One of the latest important works on monsters is that by Förster (Jena, 1861), *Die Missbildungen des Menschen systematisch dargestellt*, with an atlas of 26 4to plates containing 524 figures (on a small scale), of which 162 were drawn from original specimens, mostly in the Würzburg Museum; this work has a very great variety of illustrations from all sources, and most copious bibliographical references. The newest treatise is Ahlfeld's *Missbildungen des Menschen* (Leipzig, 1880-82), with an extensive atlas of folio plates, as comprehensive as Förster's and on a larger scale. Monsters have of late been assigned a comparatively subordinate position in pathological teaching, owing, doubtless, to the more immediate interest of microscopic and experimental pathology. Among recent pathological text-books that of Perls (Stuttgart, 1877-79) may be named as containing an adequate treatment of the subject. The two most considerable contributors to teratology recently have been Panum (Berlin, 1860), and Dareste (Paris, 1877), both of whom have occupied themselves mainly with producing monstrosities artificially in the bird's egg by varying the temperature in the hatching oven. See also L. Gerlach, *Die Entstehungsweise der Doppelmissbildungen bei den höheren Wirbeltieren*. Stuttgart, 1883. (C. C.)

MONSTRELET, ENGUERRAND DE (ob. 1453) (who, rather owing to accident than to merit, held, until within the present century, the same position as chronicler of French affairs during the early part of the 15th century as Froissart deservedly holds with regard to the last half of the 14th), was born at an uncertain date, apparently not later than 1400, and died in July 1453. He was of

a noble family in the district of Boulogne. He held in 1436, and later, the office of lieutenant-gavener (receiver of the *gave*, a kind of church rate) in the city of Cambrai, and seems to have usually resided there. Besides this he was for some time bailiff of the chapter of that city, and later provost. He was married, and left children. But this almost exhausts the amount of our knowledge respecting him, except that he was present, not at the capture of the Maid of Orleans, but at her subsequent interview with the duke of Burgundy. As a subject of this latter prince he naturally takes the Burgundian side in his history, which extends in the genuine part of it to two books, and covers the period from 1400 to 1444. At this time, as another chronicler Matthieu de Coucy informs us, Monstrelet ceased writing. But, according to a habit by no means uncommon in the Middle Ages, a clumsy sequel, extending to a period long subsequent to his death, was formed out of various other chronicles and tacked on to his work. The genuine part of this, dealing with the last half of the Hundred Years War, is valuable because it contains a large number of documents which are certainly, and reported speeches which are probably, authentic. It has, however, little colour or narrative merit, is dully, though clearly enough, written, and is strongly tinged with the pedantry of its century,—the most pedantic in French history. The best edition is that published for the Société de l'Histoire de France by M. Douet d'Arcoq in 1856.

MONTAGU, LADY MARY WORTLEY (1690-1762), one of the most brilliant letter-writers of the 18th century, was the eldest daughter of Evelyn Pierrepont, duke of Kingston, and Lady Mary Fielding, daughter of the earl of Denbigh. Her near relationship with Fielding the novelist is worth remarking. She was born at Thoresby in Nottinghamshire in 1690. Her mother died when she was a child, and by some chance she received or gave herself an unusually wide literary education, had the run of her father's library, was encouraged in her studies by Bishop Burnet, and while still a girl translated the *Enchiridion* of Epictetus. After a courtship in which she showed a singular power of thinking for herself, she was married in 1712, against her father's wish, to Mr. E. Wortley Montagu, an accomplished and scholarly friend of the Queen Anne wits. At the new court of George I. her beauty and wit brought her much homage; Pope was among her most devoted worshippers, and she even gained and kept the friendship of the great duchess of Marlborough. Her husband being appointed ambassador to the Porte in 1716, she accompanied him to Constantinople, and wrote to her friends at home brilliant descriptions of Eastern life and scenery. These letters were not published till 1763, the year after her death; but, copies being handed about in fashionable circles, their lively, witty style, graphic pictures of unfamiliar life, and shrewd and daring judgments gave the writer instant celebrity. In one of them she described the practice of inoculation for the smallpox, and announced her intention of trying it on her own son, and of introducing it in spite of the doctors into England. The most memorable incident in her life after her return from the East was her quarrel with Pope, caused, according to her account, by her laughing at him when he made love to her in earnest. He satirized her under the name of Sappho, and she teased him with superior ingenuity and hardly inferior wit. From 1739 to 1761 Lady Mary lived abroad, apart from her husband, maintaining an affectionate correspondence with her daughter Lady Bute, in which she set forth views of life largely coloured by the asceticism of her master Epictetus, and wearing an appearance of oddity and eccentricity from their contrast with conventional thought. The character of coldness and unwomanliness which Pope contrived to fasten on his

enemy was far from being deserved; her letters show her to have been a very warm-hearted woman, though on principle she turned the hard side to the world. She died 21st August 1762. The best edition of her works is that of 1861, with a memoir by Moy Thomas.

MONTAIGNE, MICHEL DE (1533-1592), essayist, was born, as he himself tells us, between eleven o'clock and noon on 28th February 1533. The patronymic of the Montaigne family, who derived their title from the chateau at which the essayist was born and which had been bought by his grandfather, was Eyquem. It was believed to be of English origin, and the long tenure of Gascony and Guienne by the English certainly provided abundant opportunity for the introduction of English colonists. But the elaborate researches of M. Malvézin have proved the existence of a family of Eyquems or Ayquems before the marriage of Eleanor of Aquitaine to Henry II. of England, though no connexion between this family, who were Sieurs de Lesparre, and the essayist's ancestors can be made out. Montaigne is not far from Bordeaux, and in Montaigne's time was in the province of Perigord. It is now in the arrondissement of Bergerac and the department of Dordogne. The Eyquem family had for some time been connected with Bordeaux. Indeed, though they possessed more than one estate in the district, they were of doubtful and certainly very recent nobility. Pierre Eyquem, Montaigne's father, had been engaged in commerce (a herring-merchant Scaliger calls him), had filled many municipal offices in Bordeaux, and had served under Francis I. in Italy as a soldier. The essayist was not the eldest son, but the third. By the death of his elder brothers, however, he became head of the family. He had also six younger brothers and sisters. His father appears, like many other men of the time, to have made a hobby of education. Michel was not a strong boy, indeed he was all his life a valetudinarian, and this may have especially prompted his father to take pains with him. At a time when the rod was the universal instrument of teaching it was almost entirely spared to Montaigne. He was, according to the French fashion common at all times, put out to nurse with a peasant woman. But Pierre Eyquem added to this the unusual fancy of choosing his son's sponsors from the same class, and of accustoming him to associate with it. He was taught Latin orally by servants who could speak no French, and many curious fancies were tried on him, as, for instance, that of waking him every morning by soft music. But he was by no means allowed to be idle. A plan of teaching him Greek, still more out of the common way than his Latin course, by some kind of mechanical arrangement, is not very intelligible, and was quite unsuccessful. These details of his education (which, like most else that is known about him, come from his own mouth) are not only interesting in themselves, but remind the reader how, not far from the same time, the other greatest writer of French during the Renaissance was also exercising himself, though not being exercised, in plans of education almost as fantastic. At six years old (for the father's reforming views in education do not seem to have disgusted him with the extremely early age at which it was then usual to begin school training) Montaigne was sent to the Collège de Guienne at Bordeaux, then at the height of its reputation, having more than double the number of scholars (two thousand) that even the largest English public school has usually boasted. Among its masters were Buchanan, afterwards the teacher of James I., and Muretus, one of the first scholars of the age. These, with their colleague Guérente, composed Latin plays for their pupils to act, and are held to have given no small impulse to the production of the classical French tragedy

of the *Pléiade*. Montaigne remained at school seven years, and, like almost all Frenchmen of all times, retained no pleasant or complimentary memory of it. At thirteen he left the Collège de Guienne and began to study law, it is not known where, but probably at Toulouse, the most famous university, despite its religious intolerance, of the south of France. Of his youth, early manhood, and middle life extremely little is known. Allusions to it in the *Essays* are frequent enough, but they are rarely precise. In 1548 he was at Bordeaux during one of the frequent riots caused by the gabelle, or salt tax. Six years afterwards, having attained his majority, he was made a counsellor in the Bordeaux parliament. In 1558 he was present at the siege of Thionville. Like his father, he certainly served in the army, for he has frequent allusions to military experiences. He was also much about the court, and he admits very frankly that in his youth he led a life of pleasure, if not exactly of excess. In 1566 he married Françoise de la Chassaingne, whose father was, like himself, a member of the Bordeaux parliament. Three years later his father died, and he succeeded to the family possessions. Finally, in 1571, as he tells us in an inscription still extant, he retired to Montaigne to take up his abode there. This was the turning-point of his life.

It has been said that his health was never strong, and it had been further weakened by the hard living (in both senses of that phrase) which was usual at the time. He resolved, accordingly, to retire to a life of study and contemplation, though he did not in the least seclude himself, and indulged in no asceticism except careful diet. Montaigne was a large country house unfortified (in which circumstance its astute possessor saw rather safety than danger from the turbulence of the religious wars), and its owner's revenues, without being large, appear to have been easy. He neither had nor professed any enthusiastic affection for his wife, but he lived on excellent terms with her, and bestowed some pains on the education of the only child (a daughter) who survived infancy. In his study, which he has minutely described, he read, wrote, dictated, meditated, inscribed moral sentences, which still remain on the walls and rafters, and in other ways gave himself up to learned ease. He was not new to literature. In his father's lifetime, and at his request, he had translated the *Theologia Naturalis* of Raymond de Sebonde, a Spanish schoolman. On first coming to live at Montaigne he edited the works of his deceased friend Étienne de la Boétie, who had been the comrade of his youth, who died early, and who, with poems of real promise, had composed a declamatory and schoolboyish theme on republicanism, entitled the *Contr' Un*, which is one of the most over-estimated books in literature. But the years of his studious retirement were spent on a work of infinitely greater importance. Garrulous after a fashion, as Montaigne is, he gives us no clear idea of any original or definite impulse leading him to write the famous *Essays*. It is very probable that if they were at first intended to have any special form at all it was that of a table-book or journal, such as was never more commonly kept than in the 16th century. But the author must have been more or less conscious of an order existing in the disorder of his thoughts, and this may have induced him to keep them apart in chapters, or at least under chapter-headings, and at the same time not to cut them up into mere *pensées*. It is certainly very noticeable that the earlier essays, those of the first two books, differ from the later in one most striking point, in that of length. Speaking generally, the essays of the third book average fully four times the length of those of the other two. This of itself would suggest a difference in the system of composition. For the present, however, we may confine ourselves to the first

two books. These appeared in 1580, when their author was forty-seven years old.

They contain, as at present published, no less than ninety-three essays, besides an exceedingly long apology for the already-mentioned Raymond Sebonde, which amounts to about a quarter of the whole in bulk, and differs curiously from its companions in matter no less than in scale. The book begins with a short *avis* (address to the reader), opening with the well-known words, "C'est icy un livre de bon foy lecteur," and sketching in a few lively sentences the character of meditative egotism which is kept up throughout. His sole object, the author says, is to leave for his friends and relations a mental portrait of himself, defects and all; he cares neither for utility nor fame. The essays then begin without any attempt to explain or classify their subjects. Their titles are of the most diverse character. Sometimes they are proverbial sayings, or moral adages, such as: "Par divers moyens on arrive à pareille fin", "Qu'il ne faut juger de notre heur qu'après la mort", "Le profit de l'on est le dommage de l'autre." Sometimes they are headed like the chapters of a treatise on ethics: "De la tristesse", "De l'oïseté", "De la peur", "De l'amitié." Sometimes a fact of some sort which has awaked a train of associations in the mind of the writer serves as a title, such as: "On est puni de s'opiniâtrer à une place sans raison", "De la bataille de Dreux", &c. Occasionally the titles seem to be deliberately fantastic, as: "Des puces", "De l'usage de se vestir." Sometimes, though not very often, the sections are in no proper sense essays, but merely commonplace book entries of singular facts or quotations with hardly any comment. These point to the haphazard or indirect origin of them which has been already suggested. But generally the essay-character—that is to say, the discussion of a special point, it may be with wide digressions and divergences—displays itself. The digressions are indeed constant, and sometimes have the appearance of being absolutely wilful. The nominal title, even when most strictly observed, is rarely more than a starting-point; and, though the brevity of these first essays for the most part prevents the author from journeying very far, he contrives to get to the utmost range of his tether. Quotations are very frequent. These are the principal external characteristics of the book; its internal spirit had better be treated when it can be spoken of completely.

Between the publication of the first two books of essays in 1580 and the publication of the third in 1588, Montaigne's life as distinguished from his writings becomes somewhat better known, and somewhat more interesting. He had, during the eight years of composition of his first volume, visited Paris occasionally and travelled for health or pleasure to Caunterets, Eaux Chaudes, and elsewhere. Charles IX., apparently, had made him one of his gentlemen in ordinary, and perhaps conferred on him the order of St Michael. The fiercest period of the religious wars, save that yet to come of the League, passed over him without harming him, though not without subjecting him to some risks. But his health grew worse and worse, and he was tormented by stone and gravel. He accordingly resolved to journey to the baths of Lucca. Late in the 18th century a journal was found in the chateau of Montaigne, giving an account of this journey, and it was published in 1774; part of it is written in Italian and part dictated in French, the latter being for the most part the work of a secretary or servant. Whatever may be the biographical value of this work, which has rarely been reprinted with the *Essays* themselves, it is almost entirely destitute of literary interest. Written, moreover, according to its own showing merely for the author's own eye, it contains abundance of details as to the medicinal effect of the various baths which he visited, details which may be said to be superfluous to a medical reader, and disgusting to any other. The course of the journey was first northwards to Plombières, then by Basel to Augsburg and Munich, then through Tyrol to Verona and Padua in Italy. Montaigne visited most of the famous cities of the north and centre, staying five months at Rome, and finally establishing himself at the baths of Lucca for nearly as long a time. There he received news of his election as mayor of Bordeaux, and after some time journeyed homewards. The tour contains much minute information about roads, food, travelling, &c., but the singular condition in which it exists, and the absence of a really good critical

edition hitherto, make it rather difficult to use it as a document. The freak of writing part of it in a strange dog-Italian is not uncharacteristic of Montaigne, but the words of his last and best editors, M. Courbet and Royer, who speak of the letters as "l'unique complément des essais," seem to indicate that they are not of those who accept the published *Voyage* as authentic. Of the fact of the journey there is no doubt whatever.

Montaigne (as was not unnatural in a man of his temperament, who had for some years, if not for the greater part of his life, lived solely to please himself) was not altogether delighted at his election to the mayoralty, which promised him two years of responsible if not very hard work. The memory of his father, however, and the commands of the king, which seem to have been expressed in a manner rather stronger than a mere formal confirmation, induced him to accept it; and he seems to have discharged it neither better nor worse than an average magistrate. Indeed, he gave sufficient satisfaction to the citizens to be re-elected at the close of his term, and it may be suspected that the honour of the position, which was really one of considerable dignity and importance, was not altogether indifferent to him. Unfortunately, it cannot be said that nothing in his office became him like the leaving of it, for it was at the close of his second tenure that he gave the only sign of the demoralizing effect which is sometimes alleged by severe moralists to come of the half epicurean, half sceptical philosophy which he undoubtedly professed. It was his business, if not exactly his duty, to preside at the formal election of his successor, the maréchal de Matignon; but there was a severe pestilence in Bordeaux, and Montaigne writes to the jurats of that town, in one of the few undoubtedly authentic letters which we possess, to the effect that he will leave them to judge whether his presence at the election is so necessary as to make it worth his while to expose himself to the danger of going into the town in its then condition, "which is specially dangerous for men coming from a good air as he does." That is to say, the chief magistrate of one of the greatest towns in France not only declined to visit it because of sickness prevailing there, but had left it to itself at a time when nearly half the population perished, and when, according to the manners of the age, civil disturbance was almost sure to follow accordingly. Attempts have been made to justify Montaigne, and it may be at least said that he at no time pretended to unselfish heroism; but it is to be feared that the facts and the inference drawn from them admit of no dispute. At the least, Montaigne's conduct must be allowed to contrast very little to his advantage with that of Rotrou in the next century under somewhat similar circumstances though in a position of much less responsibility. It may, however, be urged in Montaigne's favour that the general circumstances of the time, where they did not produce reckless and foolhardy daring, almost necessarily produced a somewhat excessive caution. The League was on the point of attaining its greatest power; the extreme Calvinist and Navarrese party, on the other side, was (as may be seen in Agrippa d'Aubigné) no less fanatical than the League itself, and the salvation of France seemed to lie in the third party of *politiques*, or trimmers, to which Montaigne belonged. The capital motto of this party was that of the Scotch saying, "Jouk and let the jaw gang by," and the continual habit of parring and avoiding political dangers might be apt to extend itself to dangers other than political. However this may be, Montaigne had difficulty enough during this turbulent period, all the more so from his neighbourhood to the chief haunts and possessions of Henry of Navarre. He was able, however, despite the occupations of his journey, his mayoralty, and the pressure of civil war and pestilence, which was not confined to the town, to continue his essay

writing, and in 1588, after a visit of some length to Paris, the third book of the *Essays* was published, together with the former ones considerably revised. The new essays, as has been remarked, differ strikingly from the older ones in respect of length; there being only one which confines itself to the average of those in the first two books. The whimsical unexpectedness of the titles, moreover, reappears in but two of them: "Des coches" and "Des boiteux." They are, however, identical with the earlier ones in spirit, and make with them a harmonious whole—a book which has hardly been second in influence to any of the modern world.

This influence is almost equally remarkable in point of matter, and in point of form, as regards the subsequent history of thought and as regards the subsequent history of literature. The latter aspect may be taken first. Montaigne is one of the few great writers who have not only perfected but have also invented a literary form. The essay as he gave it had no forerunner in modern literature, and no direct ancestor in the literature of classical times. It is indeed not improbable that it owes something to the body of treatises by different authors and of different dates, which goes under the name of Plutarch's *Morals*, and it also bears some resemblance to the miscellaneous work of Lucian. But the resemblance is in both cases at most that of suggestion. The peculiar desultoriness and tentative character of the essay proper were alien to the orderly character of the Greek mind, as were also its garrulity and the tendency which it has rather to reveal the idiosyncrasy of the writer than to deal in a systematic manner with the peculiarities of the subject. It has been suggested that the form which the essays assumed was in a way accidental, and this of itself precludes the idea of a definite model even if such a model could be found. Beginning with the throwing together of a few stray thoughts and quotations linked by a community of subject, the author by degrees acquires more and more certainty of hand, until he produces such masterpieces of apparent desultoriness and real unity as the essay "Sur des vers de Virgile." In matter of style and language Montaigne's position is equally important, but the ways which led him to it are more clearly traceable. His favourite author was beyond all doubt Plutarch, and his own explicit confession makes it undeniable that Plutarch's translator Amyot was his master in point of vocabulary, and (so far as he took any lessons in it) of style. Amyot was unquestionably one of the most remarkable writers of French in the 16th century, and to him more than to any one else is due the beauty of the prose style which marked the second half of that century, a style which, though unequal and requiring to be modified for general use, is at its best the very flower of the language. Montaigne, however, followed with the perfect independence that characterized him. He was a contemporary of Ronsard, and his first essays were published when the innovations of the *Pléiade* had fully established themselves. He adopted them to a great extent, but with much discrimination, and he used his own judgment in Latinizing when he pleased. In the same way he retained archaic and provincial words with a good deal of freedom, but by no means to excess. In the arrangement as in the selection of his language he is equally original. There is little or no trace in him of the interminable sentence which is the drawback of early prose in all languages when it has to deal with anything more difficult to manage than mere narrative. He has not the excessive classicism of style which mars even the fine prose of Calvin, and which makes that of some of Calvin's followers intolerably stiff. As a rule he is careless of definitely rhythmical cadence, though his sentences are always pleasant to the ear. But the principal characteristic of Montaigne's prose style is its remarkable ease and flexibility. These peculiarities, calculated in themselves to exercise a salutary influence on a language as yet somewhat undisciplined, acquired by accident an importance of an extraordinary kind. A few years after Montaigne's death a great revolution, as is generally known, passed over French. The criticism of Malherbe, followed by the establishment of the Academy, the minute grammatical censures of Vaugelas, and the severe literary censorship of Boileau turned French in less than three-quarters of a century from one of the freest languages in Europe to one of the most restricted. The Latinisms and Grecisms of the *Pléiade* were ta'ooed at the same time with the most picturesque expressions of the older tongue. The efforts of the reformers were directed above all things to weed and to refine, to impose additional difficulties in the way of writing exquisitely, at the same time that, by holding out a strictly-defined model, they assisted persons of little genius and imagination to write tolerably. During this revolution only two writers of older date held their ground, and those two were Rabelais and Montaigne,—Montaigne being of his nature more generally readable than Rabelais. The *Essays*, the popularity of which no academic censorship could touch, thus kept before the eyes of the 17th and 18th centuries a treasury of French in which every generation could behold