

the riches of their ancestors. The study of them influenced all the great prose writers of France, and they could not fail to be influenced in the direction which it was most important that they should take by the racy phrase, the quaint and picturesque vocabulary, and the unconstrained constructions of Montaigne.

It would be impossible, however, for the stoutest defender of the importance of form in literature to assign the chief part in Montaigne's influence to style. It is the method or rather the manner of thinking of which that style is the garment which has in reality exercised influence on the world. Like all writers except Shakespeare, Montaigne thoroughly and completely exhibits the intellectual and moral complexion of his own time. When he reached manhood the French Renaissance (which was perhaps on the whole the most characteristic example of that phenomenon, the religious element being neither in excess as it was in England and Germany, nor in defect as it had been in Italy) was at high water, and the turn of the tide was beginning. Rabelais, who died when Montaigne was still in early manhood, exhibits the earlier and rising spirit, though he needs to be completed on the poetical side. The Renaissance had, as all revolts against authority must have, a certain sceptical element, but it was not at first by any means eminently sceptical. Despite the half ironical, half warning termination of *Pantagruel*, an immense confidence and delight, as of the invader of a promised land, fills the pages of Rabelais. He rejoices in his strength, in his knowledge, in his freedom, in the pleasures of the flesh and the spirit. With Montaigne begins the age of disenchantment. By the time at least when he began to meditate his essays in the retirement of his country house it was tolerably certain that no golden age was about to return. The Reformation had brought not peace but a sword, and the Calvinists were as intolerant as the Catholics. The revival of learning had, whatever its benefits, merely changed the outward guise of pedants instead of extirpating pedantry. The art of printing had multiplied rubbish as well as valuable matter. The discovery of America had brought ruin to the discovered, and disease and discord to the discoverers. The horrors of a disputed succession were already threatening France. These things were enough to make thoughtful men dubious about the blessings of progress and reform; but the extreme dissoluteness which characterized the private life of the time also brought about its natural result of satiety. Physical science had hardly yet emerged to occupy some active minds; scholasticism was dead, while Bacon and Descartes had not arisen; nothing like a theory of politics had been evolved, though Bodin and a few others were feeling after one. As the earlier Renaissance had specially occupied itself with the practical business and pleasures of life, so the later Renaissance specially mused on the vanity of this business and these pleasures. The predisposing circumstances which affected Montaigne were thus likely to incline him to scepticism, to ethical musings on the vanity of life and the like. But to all this there had to be added the peculiarity of his own temperament. This was a decidedly complicated one, and neglect of it has led some readers to adopt a more positive idea of Montaigne's scepticism than is fully justified by all the facts. The municipality of Rome has put up a tablet on the house occupied by Montaigne during his visit there, which speaks of him as a founder of the new philosophy. In Italian mouths at the present day this is equivalent to an assertion that Montaigne was an enemy of Christianity. No assumption can be more gratuitous or less borne out by the text of his works and the reasonable inferences to be drawn from them. The attitude which he assumed was no doubt ephectic and critical chiefly. He decorated his study at Montaigne with inscriptions (still, by dint of accidental preservation and restoration not accidental, legible there), most of which are of the most pessimist and sceptical character. Ecclesiastes, Ecclesiasticus, Horace, Lucretius, Sextus Empiricus, the fragments of the Greek dramatists and philosophers, are ransacked for epigraphs indicating the vanity of human reason, human wishes, human belief, human thoughts and actions of every kind. In one curious essay (if indeed it is to be called an essay), the "Apologie de Raymond Sebonde," he has apparently amused himself with gathering together, in the shape of quotations as well as of reflections, all that can be said against certainty in aesthetics as well as in dogmatics. But the general tenor of the essays is in complete contrast with this sceptical attitude, at least in its more decided form, and it is worth notice that the motto "Que scai-je?" does not appear on the title page till after the writer's death. The general disposition, moreover, manifested in these famous writings is very far from being determinedly Pyrrhonist or despairingly misanthropic. Montaigne is far too much occupied about all sorts of the minutest details of human life to make it for a moment admissible that he regarded that life as a whole but as smoke and vapour. He is much too curious of the varieties of belief, and too keenly interested in following them out, to leave himself in peril of the charge that all belief was to him a matter of indifference. The reason of the misapprehension of him which is current is due very mainly to the fact that he was eminently a humorist in the midst of a people to whom, since his time, humour has been nearly unknown. But there is more than this. The humorist as a recog-

nized genus almost always passes into the satirist. The temper which has been admirably defined as thinking in jest while feeling in earnest naturally throws itself into opposition, though it may not always take the irreconcilable form of the opposition of Swift. Perhaps the only actual parallel to Montaigne in literature is Lamb. There are differences between them, arising naturally enough from differences of temperament and experience; but both agree in their attitude—an attitude which is sceptical without being negative, and humorist without being satiric. There is hardly any writer in whom the human comedy appears treated with such completeness as it is in Montaigne. There is discernible in his essays no attempt to map out a complete plan, and then to fill up its outlines. But in the desultory and haphazard fashion which distinguishes him there are few parts of life on which he does not touch. The exceptions are chiefly to be found in the higher and more poetical strains of feeling to which the humorist temperament lends itself with reluctance and distrust, though it by no means excludes them. The French disposition, by a change which has never been sufficiently accounted for, and of which the most accurate examination of documents fails fully to detect the reason, had become, after being strongly idealist in the earlier Middle Ages, absolutely positive in the later, and from this positiveness it has never since quite freed itself. This positiveness is already noticeable in Rabelais; it becomes more noticeable still in Montaigne. He is always charming, but he is rarely inspiring, except in a very few passages where the sense of vanity and nothingness possesses him with unusual strength. As a general rule, an agreeable grotesque of the affairs of life (a grotesque which never loses hold of good taste sufficiently to be called burlesque) occupies him. There is a kind of anticipation of the scientific spirit in the careful zeal with which he picks up odd aspects of mankind, and comments upon them as he places them in his museum. Such a temperament is most pleasantly shown when it is least personal. The letter to the Bordeaux jurats does not, as has been said, show Montaigne in his best light, nor does another letter to his wife, in which he concedes with her on the death of one of their children in a strain which must have drawn from any woman of sensibility and spirit a torrent of indignant tears. But what is almost offensive in immediate and private relationships becomes not only tolerable but delightful in the impersonal and irresponsible relationship of author to reader. A dozen generations of men have rejoiced in the gentle irony with which Montaigne handles the *ludicrum humani sæculi*, in the quaint felicity of his selection of examples, and in the real though sometimes fantastic wisdom of his comment on his selections.

Montaigne did not very long survive the completion of his book. His sojourn at Paris for the purpose of getting it printed was by no means uneventful, and on his way he stayed for some time at Blois, where he met De Thou. In Paris itself he had a more disagreeable experience, being for a short time committed to the Bastille by the Leaguers, as a kind of hostage, it is said, for a member of their party who had been arrested at Rouen by Henry of Navarre. But he was in no real danger. He was well known to and favoured by both Catherine de' Medici and the Guises, and was very soon released. In Paris, too, at this time he made a whimsical but pleasant friendship. Marie le Jars, Demoiselle de Gournay, one of the most learned ladies of the 16th and 17th centuries, had conceived such a veneration for the author of the *Essays* that, though a very young girl and connected with many noble families, she travelled to the capital on purpose to make his acquaintance. He gave her the title of his "fille d'alliance" (adopted daughter), which she bore proudly for the rest of her long life. She lived far into the 17th century, and became a character and something of a laughing-stock to the new generation; but her services to Montaigne's literary memory were, as will be seen, great. Of his other friends in these last years of his life the most important were Étienne Pasquier and Pierre Charron. The latter, indeed, was more than a friend, he was a disciple; and Montaigne, just as he had constituted Mademoiselle de Gournay his "fille d'alliance," bestowed on Charron the rather curious compliment of desiring that he should take the arms of the family of Montaigne. It has been thought from these two facts, and from an expression in one of the later essays, that the marriage of his daughter Léonore had not turned out to his satisfaction. But family affection, except towards his father, was by no means Montaigne's strongest point.

Not much is known of him in these later years, and indeed, despite the laborious researches of many biographers, of whom one, Dr Payen, has never been excelled in persevering devotion, it cannot be said that the amount of available information about Montaigne is large at any time of his life. It would seem that the essayist had returned to his old life of study and meditation and working up his *Essays*. No new ones were found after his death, but many alterations and insertions. His various maladies grew worse; yet they were not the direct cause of his death. He was attacked with quinsy, which rapidly brought about paralysis of the tongue, and he died on the 11th of September 1592, under circumstances which, as Pasquier reports them, completely disprove any intention, at least on his part, of displaying anti-Christian or anti-Catholic leanings. Feeling himself on the point of death, he summoned divers of his friends and neighbours to his chamber, had mass said before him, and endeavoured to raise himself and assume a devotional attitude at the elevation of the host, dying almost immediately afterwards. He was buried, though not till some months after his death, in a church in Bordeaux, which after some vicissitudes became the chapel of the Collège. During the Revolution the tomb and, as it was supposed, the coffin were transferred with much pomp to the town museum; but it was discovered that the wrong coffin had been taken, and the whole was afterwards restored to its old position. Montaigne's widow survived him, and his daughter left posterity which became merged in the noble houses of Ségur and Lur-Saluces. But it does not appear that any male representative of the family survived, and the chateau is not now in the possession of any descendant of it.

When Mademoiselle de Gournay heard of the death of Montaigne she undertook with her mother a visit of ceremony and condolence to the widow, which had important results for literature. Madame de Montaigne gave her a copy of the edition of 1588, annotated copiously; at the same time, apparently, she bestowed another copy, also annotated by the author, on the convent of the Feuillants in Bordeaux, to which the church in which his remains lay was attached. Mademoiselle de Gournay thereupon set to work to produce a new and final edition with a zeal and energy which would have done credit to any editor of any date. She herself worked with her own copy, inserting the additions, marking the alterations, and translating all the quotations. But when she had got this to press she sent the proofs to Bordeaux, where a poet of some note, Pierre de Brach, revised them with the other annotated copy. The edition thus produced has with justice passed as the standard even in preference to those which appeared in the author's lifetime. Unluckily, Mademoiselle de Gournay's original does not appear to exist, and her text was said, until the appearance of MM. Courbet and Royer's edition, to have been somewhat wantonly corrupted, especially in the important point of spelling. The Feuillants copy is in existence, being the only manuscript or partly manuscript authority for the text. It was edited in 1803 by Naigeon, the disciple of Diderot; but, according to later inquiries, considerable liberties were taken with it. The first edition of 1580, with the various readings of two others which appeared during the author's lifetime, was reprinted by MM. Dezeimeris and Burckhausen. Hitherto the edition of Le Clerc (3 vols., Paris, 1826-28) and in a more compact form that of Louandre (4 vols., Paris, 1854) have been the most useful. The edition, however, of MM. Courbet and Royer, which is based on that of 1595, will undoubtedly be the standard; but, though the text is complete (Paris, Lemerre, 1873-1877), the fifth volume, containing the biography and all the editorial apparatus, has unluckily yet (1883) to make its appearance. The editions of Montaigne in France and elsewhere, and the works upon him during the past three centuries, are innumerable. His influence upon his successors has already been hinted at, and cannot here be traced in detail. In one case, however,—that of Pascal—it is of sufficient importance to deserve mention. Pascal, who has left a special discourse on Montaigne, was evidently profoundly influenced by him, and the attitude towards his teacher is an interesting one. The sceptical method of the essayist is at once tempting and terrible to him. He accepts it in so far as it demolishes the claims of human reason and heathen philosophy, but evidently dreads it in so far as it is susceptible of being turned against religion itself. In England Montaigne was early popular. It was long supposed that the autograph of Shakespeare in a copy of Florio's translation showed his study of the *Essays*. The autograph has been disputed,

but divers passages, and especially one in *The Tempest*, show that at first or second hand the poet was acquainted with the essayist. Towards the latter end of the 17th century, Cotton, the friend of Isaac Walton, executed a complete translation, which, though not extraordinarily faithful, possesses a good deal of rough vigour. It has been frequently reprinted with additions and alterations. The most noteworthy critical handling of the subject in English is unquestionably Emerson's in *Representative Men*. (G. SA.)

MONTALEMBERT, CHARLES FORBES DE (1810-1870), historian, was born on 29th May 1810. The family was a very ancient one, belonging to Poitou, or rather to Angoumois. Direct descent is said to be provable to the 13th century, and charters and other documents carry the history of the house two centuries further back. For some generations before the historian the family had been distinguished, not merely in the army, but for scientific attainments. Montalembert's father, René, emigrated, fought under Condé, and subsequently served in the English army. He married a Miss Forbes, and his eldest son Charles was born at London. At the Restoration René de Montalembert returned to France, was raised to the peerage in 1819, and became ambassador to Sweden (where Charles received much of his education) in 1826. He died a year after the overthrow of the legitimate monarchy. Charles de Montalembert was too young to take his seat as a peer (twenty-five being the necessary age), but he retained other rights; and this, combined with his literary and intellectual activity, made him a person of some importance. He had eagerly entered into the somewhat undefined plans of Lamennais and Lacordaire for the establishment of a school of Liberal Catholicism, and he co-operated with them, both in the *Avenir* (see LAMENNAIS, vol. xiv, pp. 239, 240) and in the practical endeavour, which absorbed some of the best energies of France at the time, to break through the trammels of the system of state education. This latter scheme first brought Montalembert into notice, as he was formally charged with unlicensed teaching. He claimed the right of trial by his peers, and made a notable defence, of course with a deliberate intention of protest. His next most remarkable act was his participation in the famous pilgrimage to Rome of his two friends. This step, as is well known, proved useless to mitigate the measures which private intrigues, and perhaps a not altogether injudicious instinct, prompted the Roman curia to take against the *Avenir* and the doctrines of its promoters. Montalembert, however, submitted dutifully to the encyclical of June 1835, and only devoted himself more assiduously to the work on which he was engaged, the *Life of St Elizabeth of Hungary*. This appeared in 1836. It displayed Montalembert's constant literary characteristics, and, though inferior to *Les Moines d'Occident* in research and labour, is perhaps superior to it as a work of art. The famous speech by which Montalembert is best known,—“Nous sommes les fils des croisés et jamais nous ne reculerons devant les fils de Voltaire”, expresses, or at least indicates, his attitude not insufficiently. He was an ardent student of the Middle Ages, but his mediaeval enthusiasm was strongly tinged with religious sentiment, and at the same time by no means connected with any affection for despotism. Montalembert still clung to his early liberalism, and he made himself conspicuous during the reign of Louis Philippe by his protests against the restrictions imposed on the liberty of the press, besides struggling for freedom in national education. The party which he represented, or rather which he strove to found, was by no means wholly Legitimist at heart, and at the downfall of Louis Philippe Montalembert had no difficulty in accepting the republic and taking, when elected, a seat in the assembly. He had not a little to do with the support given by France to the pope. As he had accepted the republic, he was not disinclined to accept the empire; but the measures which



followed the *coup d'état* disgusted him, though he still sat in the chamber. A defeat in 1857 put an end to his parliamentary appearances. He was still, however, recognized as one of the most formidable of the moderate opponents of the empire, and he was repeatedly prosecuted for anti-imperialist letters and pamphlets. In the ten years between 1840 and 1850 he had written little but political pamphlets, but after the establishment of the empire, and especially after he lost his seat in the chamber, he became more prominent as an author. Even before this he had produced a volume on the *Avenir Politique de l'Angleterre* (1855), and another on *Pie IX. et Lord Palmerston* (1856), besides numerous articles and pamphlets, the chief of which were perhaps *Une Nation [Poland] en Deuil*, and *L'Église Libre dans l'État Libre*.

His great work, the fruit of many years' labour, did not appear till he was fifty years old, and ten years before his death, which occurred before its completion. *Les Moines d'Occident depuis St Benoît jusqu'à St Bernard* has some of the peculiar drawbacks which have characterized almost all historical work of any literary pretensions during the present generation. It is planned on too large a scale, and executed with too much regard to profusion of picturesque detail and abundance of fluent argument on points which the writer has at heart. Its best passages are inferior to the best of a younger writer of very different opinions though not dissimilar style and temperament—M. Ernest Renan; but it is a work of great interest and value.

Montalembert, who had married Mademoiselle de Merode, sister of one of Pius IX.'s ministers, but who had no male offspring, died in March 1870, the year so fatal to France. His health had long been very bad, and was understood to have suffered from the chagrins attending his exclusion from political life and the defeat of most of his plans. Since his death his works have appeared in a complete edition. They have, regarded from the literary point of view, many of the faults of their time. A voluminous and vigorous writer, Montalembert was more of a journalist, a pamphleteer, and an orator than of a man of letters properly so called. His talents were diffused rather than concentrated, and they were much occupied on merely ephemeral topics. But of picturesque eloquence in a fluent and rather facile kind he was no inconsiderable representative.

MONTALVAN, JUAN PEREZ DE (1602-1638), Spanish dramatist and writer of fiction, was the son of the king's bookseller, and was born at Madrid in 1602. At the early age of seventeen he became a licentiate in theology, and in 1626, after entering the priesthood, he received a notarial appointment in connexion with the Inquisition. His overtasked brain succumbed under the numerous literary labours he imposed on it, and he died when only thirty-six years old (25th June 1638).

In 1624 he published eight prose tales (*Sucesos y prodigios en amor, en ocho novelas ejemplares*), one of which, "The Disastrous Friendship," has been characterized by Ticknor as one of the best in the language. This, as well as a subsequent volume of stories (*Para todos: Ejemplos morales, humanos y divinos*, 1633), was frequently reprinted. His last prose writing was a popular panegyric on his lately deceased friend and master Lope de Vega (*Fama póstuma de Lope de Vega*, 1638), whom he almost rivalled in dramatic productiveness, and whose conventional manner, flimsiness in construction, and carelessness in execution he too closely followed. The first volume of his collected *Comedias* appeared in 1638, the second in 1639. On the Spanish stage they were in great request, and Montalvan's repute led inferior writers in some cases to borrow his name. His dramas are distinctly superior to his "Autos sacramentales," but even of the former the tragedy *Los Amantes de Teruel* is the only one that has enjoyed permanent popularity. See Ticknor, *Hist. of Span. Lit.*, vol. ii. (1863).

MONTANA, one of the north-western Territories of the United States, is limited on the N. by British Columbia, on the E. by Dakota, on the S. by Wyoming and Idaho, and on the W. by Idaho. Its boundaries, as established

by statute, are as follows:—on the N., the 49th parallel; on the E., the 27th meridian west of Washington, or the 104th west of Greenwich; on the S. and W. the boundary follows the 45th parallel from the 27th meridian west to the 34th meridian west, then turns south along the latter meridian to its point of intersection with the continental watershed, thence along the crest-line of this watershed westward and north-westward until it reaches the Bitter-root Mountains; it then follows the crest of this range north-westward to the point where it is crossed by the 39th meridian west, which it follows north to the line of British Columbia. The total area is about 146,080 square miles—an approximate estimate, as the boundary along the continental watershed and the Bitter-root Mountains has not been exactly surveyed. The average elevation above sea-level has been estimated at 3900 feet.

Topographically, Montana may be separated into two great divisions—that of the plains comprising the eastern two-thirds, and that of the mountains comprising the western portion. The former, a monotonous rolling expanse, broken only by the beds of the few streams which traverse it, and by a few small groups of hills, extends over nine degrees of longitude in a gentle uniform slope, rising from 2000 feet above the sea at the eastern boundary to 4000 at the base of the Rocky Mountains. Except along the streams and upon the scattered groups of hills, this section is entirely devoid of forest-growth of any kind. Vegetation is limited to the bunch grasses, artemisia, and cacti. The grasses are the most abundant and luxuriant near the mountains, where the rainfall is greatest. The mountain section, comprising the western third of the Territory, is composed, in general terms, of a succession of ranges and valleys running very uniformly somewhat in a north-west and south-east direction. The mountains vary in height from 8000 to 10,000, even in isolated cases reaching 11,000 feet, with mountain-passes 6000 to 8000 feet above the sea. Towards the north the ranges become almost continuous, forcing the streams into long and circuitous courses in order to disentangle themselves from the maze of mountains, while, on the other hand, the ranges of the south-western part of the Territory are much broken, affording numerous low passes and water-gaps.

In the mountainous part of the Territory are the headwaters of the Missouri (Atlantic basin) and Clark's Fork of the Columbia (Pacific basin). The former rises in the south-west of the territory in three large branches, the Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin, which meet at the foot of the Gallatin valley at a point known as the "Three Forks of the Missouri." Here the Missouri is a good-sized stream, fordable with difficulty even when the current is lowest. From this point to its mouth navigation is possible when the stream is not below its mean height; it is interrupted only at the Great Falls of the Missouri, near Fort Benton, above which, however, it is practically little used for navigation. Its other principal tributaries in its upper course are the Sun, Teton, Marias, Musselshell, and Milk rivers, all of which vary much in size with the season,—the last two being nearly or quite dry near their mouths in the fall of the year. The Yellowstone, one of the most important tributaries of the Missouri, has nearly all its course in Montana, and is navigable for small steamers as far as the Crow Agency, except when the water is low. Clark's Fork of the Columbia is formed by the junction of the Flathead and the Missoula or Hellgate river. The former rises in the mountains of British Columbia and flows nearly south through Flathead Lake to its point of junction with the Missoula. The latter rises opposite the Jefferson river and flows north-westward, receiving on its way several large affluents. Below the point of junction of these streams, Clark's Fork flows north-west along the