V.—THE LIFE OF JAMES MILL. (III. CONCLUSION).

IN the previous paper (*MIND*, No. IV., p. 509), the end of the year 1808 was reached, and from this point we now make our start. One purposed omission, however, must first be supplied.

The numerous local traditions respecting his father's family are tinged with dissatisfaction, not to say censure, of James Mill's conduct towards his relatives. Many years ago I heard from a native of Montrose that he had allowed his only sister to sink into absolute poverty without rendering her any assistance. My recent inquiries have revealed a similar strain of disapproval. He is commonly styled "a hard unfeeling man". There is a confidently received tradition, that he was in vain applied to for a contribution to purchase a cow for his father in place of one that had died; another version putting his sister in place of his father. Fortunately, the letters to Mr. Barclay make us aware of the true state of his relations with his family, and are calculated to produce an impression considerably at variance with the popular view.

At the time of Mill's going to London (Feb., 1802) his family may be said to have been a wreck. His mother was dead. The precise date is unknown; but she listened to her son's sermon, formerly described, sitting not in a pew of her own but out of sight behind the stair. She had then a consumptive cough, and was in a state of great debility. The father had become paralysed, and was unfit for work. As if this was not enough, the only brother, William, who worked with his father, and should have been the stay of the house, was also disabled (said to be from some accident), and soon after died. The one active person was the sister, May, and she was not equal to the burdens thrown upon her. A journeyman, named William Greig, had worked with the father for some time, and on him devolved the carrying on of the business. Soon after James Mill went to London, Greig married May, and so became the head of the house, with its invalid charge.

The picture is not yet at its darkest. The old man was bankrupt. The explanation is casually furnished by his son, in a letter written long after. He had been asked on one occasion to give his name as a security, and in answer wrote as follows:—"You will not wonder that the risks of being security for others should appear to me terrible, when I tell you, as I think you must know already, that my own father ruined himself by that means and, instead of being (for his station) a man of opulence, lived and died a poor one; and that the horror of being liable to risks in this way was therefore one of the earliest and deepest

of my impressions." No farther light is gained as to the circumstances referred to; and the fact was entirely unknown to all my informants in the locality. Indeed, the surviving relations are not disposed to credit the circumstance.

This complicated situation of distress was what Mill had to deal with while he was commencing his career in London. Every one of his letters to Barclay contains some reference to the subject; and, indeed, most of them are written expressly on that account, although other matters are thrown in by the way. In the first communication, April 17 (the letter where he describes his journey and first impressions in London), there is a thankful acknowledgment of a letter from Barclay respecting the family, but no particulars stated, except in a postscript anxiously desiring another letter of information, in case his brother William should not be well enough to write. The next letter, June 2, implies that Barclay has written very fully about the family, and taken much pains with their affairs, and it is emphatic in thanks, while disclosing the depths of their misery: "By long distress they are less able to manage their affairs than I could wish, and their affairs are more difficult than they have been"; "I shall never forget the friendship of you and of a very few more"; "you understand their circumstances better than any other body"; "I shall look upon it as a very particular act of friendship, if you will pay them some attentions, and not let them be in want of anything, and whatever assistance they receive from you, I shall be most happy to repay". The third letter, three months later, states that he has not heard from the family in the interval, which he attributes to William's inability to write, and desires to hear again from Barclay soon, not, however, exclusively with regard to his own relations. The next letter is at an interval of five months, Feb. 11, 1803, and makes the first reference to his father's bankruptcy; Barclay being still his indefatigable deputy. The creditors are soon to be called together. Mill is impatient to hear that they have met, and announces his own intentions. "I want them to get fairly divided among them all that is to divide. Peter Laing, of course too, must get his share, for that for which I became security to him. And as to that particular at which you hinted in your last letter, I cannot but be obliged to you, for your desire to ease me of my burden, which I am not obliged to bear—but I am resolved to pay every farthing of debt which my father owes to every creature, with all the haste that I possibly can; and he and I both must try to live as moderately as possible, till that be accomplished. I wish you to let his creditors know that this is my intention." He then adverts to the arrangements of the household, and

gives us the truth in the story of the cow. Approving of Barclay's advice that his father and May should have the 'ben' house, and W. Greig and his sister the other (the marriage had not yet taken place), he thinks they will do better to part with the cow, which had hitherto been a part of the family *ménage*; milk, &c., they could get from Barclay's farm, and May would be able to turn her time to profitable work, probably in shoe-binding. The next allusion is to William's death; and the letter expresses pleasure at Barclay's information that he was "perfectly happy till his death, his spirits not sunk, nor had he lost hopes of recovery"; circumstances strongly suggestive of consumption. At an interval of three months we have another letter charged with troubles. William Greig, who has just become May's husband, has written to his brother-in-law complaining that he is not communicated with respecting the state of the family; he has further detailed some very unpleasant interference with him and his wife, on the part of the neighbours, who are indignant at their neglect of the old man. Mill is very much distressed at all this. He exculpates his sister from any cruelty to her father, but dilates upon her youth, her inexperience, and her being a spoiled child; on this last head, he had often remonstrated with her father, with the usual amount of thanks for his pains. He laments that he is thwarted in his attempts to make his father happy in his last years. At the same time, he strongly censures the neighbours for their interference, and trusts to Barclay to give him "a true and sensible account"; reiterating his thanks for the management of his father's affairs. In less than a month he writes again. He has received a satisfactory explanation of the disagreeable incident, and is well pleased with the advice given to his sister by Barclay and Barclay's mother. "She (May) has now, poor creature, but few friends about her, to whom she can look either for advice or for protection; and though her conduct has often vexed me, and still more the conduct of both her parents with regard to her, I cannot forget that now she is not in a very happy situation." He ends by desiring Barclay to ask his mother to give "some idea of what will be necessary in the year to maintain my father". Six weeks afterwards, we have a letter chiefly occupied with the settlement of his father's affairs. One of the creditors had been raising an action, on his own account, before the business could be wound up. He reiterates his "sincere and unalterable resolution" to pay off the whole of the debts, as he is able; but refuses to be bullied by any individual creditor, or to give a pledge as to time. He is at this date (Aug. 15, 1803), "oppressed with business". No further communication, till the new year. In the intervening months, his father's affairs had

been advanced towards a settlement through Barclay and Mr. Peters, who had both written to him. He is full of gratitude for their friendship. He returns to the point of his father's maintenance. William Greig declined to mention a sum although putting in strong terms the trouble of keeping him. Mill wished to give as much as any other creditable family would think reasonable. We are left to infer that an arrangement speedily followed this letter. There is no other till August, when he writes to clear up some misapprehensions about the payment of the money to Greig. He apologises for writing few letters, "from the necessity of writing so much every day, that I am glad to take a little rest when my necessary task is done". There is now a gap in the correspondence of nearly two years. On April 4, 1806, he writes from Rodney Street, seemingly with no other object than to get some personal news of his old friends. He had had, as usual, from Sir John Stuart, a pretty full history of the recent doings in the neighbourhood, but he wants other particulars still. The same frank enclosed a letter to Mr. Peters about his father. On the 7th Feb. following, there is a letter on another unpleasant incident in the bankruptcy. One creditor, Laing, a tanner in Brechin, had been harrassing his father, before he left Scotland, and he had stopped his mouth by a written promise to pay the debt as soon as he was able. Laing is now bankrupt, and has given up Mill's letter to a London creditor, who bases on it a sudden demand for £50. Mill writes for information, as the immediate payment of this sum will not a little distress him. The interval separating this from the only other letter that has been preserved is thirteen years. Before mentioning its purport, I may state what is known of the circumstances of his family in the meantime. His father appears to have died in 1808. His sister has given birth to three children, a daughter and two sons. All accounts represent her as extremely poor in the early years of her wedded life. Very strong expressions on this head were used in my hearing, by those that remembered her well. There was no good reason for such a state of things; and it is attributed to the want of business steadiness of her husband, who carried on the father's occupation. When her two sons were old enough to enter the shop, they, by their industry, redeemed the fortunes of the family, and strove, with ultimate success, to better their position. In October, 1820, when the eldest son was fifteen, and the second about nine, Mill writes once more to Barclay. A friend named M'Conachie had said that it was both his and Barclay's opinion, that "it would be a good thing for my sister and her family if they were enabled to open a little shop". He now asks what is the sum that it would be necessary for him to

advance; "much cannot be expected, both because my income is small, and because my own family is large"; "however, I am anxious to be of use to them according to my means". What was the result of this application, I cannot tell; but probably nothing came of it. Mill had now been a year in the India House, but his salary was as yet only £800, and we do not know what liabilities may have survived from previous years; he certainly would have been as good as his word. May's family remained in the cottage long after this date; she herself died in 1837, in the bed where she was born. Some time later, her sons went to Montrose, and set up business as drapers, which the elder (James) still carries on. Their father died in Montrose, at an advanced age.

These are the facts as given in Mill's own letters. I have now to add that there is in the minds of his sister's family a strong conviction that their mother was unjustly treated in consequence of the large sums spent by the father in the education of his eldest son; they hold that there was even some express stipulation whereby May was to be repaid her share of this money, which she never was. There is no collateral testimony bearing upon this point: and the statement being *ex parte*, I cannot give an opinion upon it. If the claim has no other foundation than the fact that Mill's parents expended much more money upon him than upon the other children, I suspect that neither in the higher nor in the lower ranks would usage support it. Moreover, as Mill cleared off his father's debts, he did much more than make up for all that had been done in bringing himself forward. He also took upon himself the exclusive burden of his father's declining years; and we see that he was ready to listen to any proposal for helping his sister. It is evident, too, that, from the moment of May's marriage, her husband took up a hostile position towards him, such as to repel whatever good offices he might be disposed to render to her family.

The only other matter that I will notice in this painful part of the biography is that among some members of the Barclay family there is a tone of disparagement for the want of gratitude on Mill's part for all the kindness he had received from them. The feeling has not been expressed to me by those that I have conversed with. I cannot learn that it is borne out by any facts; and it is belied by the existing correspondence. Two members of the family, who especially exerted themselves to procure information for me, were greatly moved in Mill's favour by perusing the letters after these had been put into my hands by their cousin, the daughter of Mill's correspondent.

Returning now to the main story, we resume at the year

1808, and shall have no convenient break for eleven years. The narrative cannot be conducted onwards year by year; at least until a number of subjects that overlap and entangle have been viewed as preliminary.

And first of Mill's connection with Bentham. There is no record of how or when this began, but it was not later than 1808. The wonder is that Mill was six years in London before obtaining the introduction. Most of the incidents of the friendship are given in Bowring's *Life of Bentham*, and the extant correspondence between the two has been inserted there. Unfortunately, the narrative of facts as far as Mill is concerned is not always correct. In one place Bentham is reported as saying that Mill's family lived with him (in the country) half of every year from 1808 to 1817 inclusive; while, in a letter to Rammohun Roy, he says that for the half of each of five years "he and his family have been my guests". Neither is the exact truth. About 1807, Bentham had for his summer residence Barrow Green House, Oxted, in the Surrey hills. Here, by John Mill's account, his father and family must have spent parts of several summers; but probably no one whole summer. In 1859, this house became the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Grote, and I remember meeting John Mill there, and hearing his early recollections of the place and neighbourhood and of Bentham's walks and habits. In 1814, Bentham rented the still more magnificent residence, Ford Abbey in Devonshire, and there the Mill family lived with him in the four consecutive years from 1814 to 1817. Bentham was exceedingly attached to this residence, and gave it up with great reluctance. I find from his and from Mill's letters, that they left London in early spring, and did not return till after the new year, so that in point of fact their stay each year must have lasted nine or ten months.

The questionable part of the allusions to Mill in the *Life of Bentham* is contained in two passages (*Bentham's Works*, X. pp. 450, 482) professing to quote remarks made by Bentham in conversation. So inaccurate seemed the statement of facts, and so unfair the estimate of Mill's character, that, on the occasion of the passages being quoted in the *Edinburgh Review*, they were controverted by John Mill, in a letter to the Editor, published in the number for October, 1843. From that letter it would appear that the visits to Barrow Green were comparatively short; for although spread over several years they are said not to have exceeded six months in all.

Bentham was insatiable for Mill's company, and did everything he could to secure it. From the house at Pentonville, Mill frequently walked down to dine at Queen's Square, a

distance of nearly four miles. In 1810, Bentham gave Mill for a residence Milton's house, of which he was proprietor, and which was close to his own. Mill's family lived there a few months, but it was found unhealthy especially for Mrs. Mill, and it had, unfortunately, to be given up. To make matters worse, Mill seemed unable to find a house to his liking nearer than Newington Green, a mile and half farther off than Rodney street. It was the house, No. 45; and next to it is one much larger, 43, where lived the grandfather of Mr. Taylor, the first husband of Mrs. J. S. Mill. The family stayed here four years; John Mill's recollections of this period are given in the *Autobiography*. Mill still trudged down at short intervals to dine with Bentham. There is a tradition in the family that during the panic of the Williams murders (Dec., 1811) Mrs. Mill used to sit trembling for his return from Bentham's late in the evening. At last, in 1814, Bentham succeeded in obtaining Mill as a neighbour. He leased the house, No. 1 Queen's Square, now 40 Queen Anne's Gate, and let it to Mill (it is said) at the rent he had been paying for his previous houses, between £50 and £60 a year. It is a large commodious house, worth nearly double that money, and gave good accommodation to the growing family for sixteen years. It is, in fact, the residence principally identified with Mill's London career. It was in the same year that Bentham entered upon Ford Abbey.

The intimate and amicable relations with Bentham, and their intellectual communion, are already in print. Mill took a great deal from Bentham, and expended much of his strength in expounding Bentham's views; in which respect he was the foremost of Bentham's disciples. Latterly, when Bentham found many other associates, and some flatterers, he was less dependent on Mill, and allowed himself to use the expressions that John Mill commented on. Not unfrequently he spoke of Mill as 'cold,' 'selfish,' and 'ungrateful'. Even in the height of their familiarity, there is a curious letter written in 1814 under Bentham's roof in Ford Abbey (*Works*, Vol. X., p. 481), which deliberately assumes that they were too much together, and proposes that in future they should see less of each other, and in particular, that he should not come another season to Ford Abbey. The occasion of the letter was that Bentham was offended, because Mill had remitted walking with him for a short time; Joseph Hume having been on a visit and having given Mill the benefit of his horses to see the more distant country. The difference must have been patched up by Bentham's coming round, for no interruption of intercourse actually followed. At a much later time, an incident occurred that pained Mill, and operated somewhat towards their estrange-

ment. He had the full range of Bentham's library, and made free use of the privilege. One morning, he being absent at his official work in the India House, Bentham, without warning, sent across and removed all his own books from Mill's shelves. That Mill, on his return, should feel indignant, we do not wonder.

About the same time that he knew Bentham, he became acquainted with Ricardo; their friendship is amply stated in the *Autobiography*. On his death, Mill wrote an eulogy upon him in the *Morning Chronicle*; this, John Mill said to me, was the only newspaper article his father ever wrote; so completely was his early newspaper editorship discounted.

One other friendship must be mentioned. Probably it was through Bentham that Mill became acquainted with General Miranda, a native of Venezuela, who spent his life in endeavouring to emancipate his native province from Spanish rule. He had an eventful and chequered career; and at various times resided in England, being well received by the highest political personages. He was an admirer of Bentham, and was to have introduced into his own country a Benthamic code. His last residence in England seems to have included the years 1808, 1809, and 1810; he left for good on his last revolutionary attempt, in October, 1810. By an act of basest treachery, he was delivered, in 1812, into the hands of the Spanish Government, conveyed in chains to Madrid, and there immured under the Inquisition, till his death in 1816. In the last years of his stay in London, he was a frequent visitor to Mill. There has been preserved a record of one of his visits to Mill's house at Pentonville, on the 16th May, 1810. On that occasion he told an anecdote of Pitt so curious that Mill jotted it down at the time, and it remains among his papers.*

There is reason for supposing that his views on Religion took their final shape between 1808 and 1810. What little I am able to add to John Mill's explanations on this point (*Autobiography*, p. 38) I will state here. When he left Scotland, he was undoubtedly a believer in Christianity, although attached more to the 'moderate' than to the 'evangelical' school. His attitude to religion, during the years of the *Literary Journal*, we have already seen; he might then be on the way to scepticism, but he had not reached the goal. His mental history from 1806

* Count Woronzow, the Russian Ambassador in England, frequently complained to General Miranda of the vagueness and uncertainty of Mr. Pitt's communications. He said that, after a three hours' conversation, expressly carried on for the purpose of ascertaining the most important points, he had found himself totally at a loss to write to his Court to say what had been the result of the conversation.

to 1808 cannot be indicated. That his acquaintance with Bentham would have hastened his course towards infidelity, it is impossible to doubt. Bentham never in so many words publicly avowed himself an atheist, but he was so in substance. His destructive criticisms of religious doctrine, in the *Church of England Catechism reviewed*, and still more his anonymous book on Natural Religion, left no residue that could be of any value. As a legislator, he had to allow a place for Religion, but he made use of the Deity, as Napoleon wished to make use of the Pope, for sanctioning whatever he himself chose, in the name of Utility, to prescribe. John Austin followed on the same tack; but the course was too disingenuous to suit either of the Mills. It is quite certain, however, that the whole tone of conversation in Bentham's more select circle was atheistic. In Mill's own family, there is a vague tradition that his breaking with the church and religion followed his introduction to Bentham. Strange to say, the most authentic fact that I have been able to procure, is that the instrument of his final transformation was General Miranda. Unfortunately, we have nothing but the bare fact; it was stated by himself to Walter Coulson, one of his intimate friends of later years, but the circumstances have been withheld. Neither Bentham nor Miranda, nor any one else, would have made him a sceptic, except by the force of reason; but they may have set his mind to work to sift the question more completely than he had ever done before. Miranda's biography gives us no assistance on this point; his patriotic struggles are described, but his phases of faith are not touched upon except in the incident of his ignominious burial by the Spanish priests. We can fall back upon the observation, often made, and repeated by Mill himself in his notes on Villers, that when a man threw off Catholicism, he had no available standing ground between that and atheism. Hence, the free-thinkers in Catholic countries have usually been atheists. Mill says, "the two most celebrated infidels we have had in this country, Hume and Gibbon, had spent a great part of their youth in France, and were intoxicated with the vanity of imitating Frenchmen".

If we knew less of the facts, we might easily suppose that a mind of Mill's cast, finding in the Edinburgh book-shops Hume's *Dialogues on Natural Religion*, would have been carried away by the style of reasoning there employed, and have taken in the seeds of his ultimate scepticism. But Mill, like his countrymen generally, was proof against Hume; and possibly had not read the book, or if he did, it would be for giving a refutation in his Latin discourse before the Presbytery.

John Mill tells us that his father's greatest difficulty in regard to Religion was the moral one; but he partly admits, and should have been still more express on the point, that, in the end, the whole question becomes intellectual. If there be a difficulty felt in reconciling the moral character of the Deity with human misery, ways of meeting it are pointed out; and, the process at last consists in weighing and balancing opposites, which is eminently an intellectual function.

For some time after his marriage, Mill himself went to church; and the children were all baptised there. The minister that baptised the eldest was Dr. Grant, probably rector of the parish, who used to dine at the house, and meet General Miranda. John as a little boy went to church; his maiden aunt remembered taking him, and hearing him say in his enthusiastic way that "that the two greatest books were Homer and the Bible". As regards father and son, the church-going did not last; but the other members of the family continued the practice.

Negation, pure and simple, *sans phrases*, as Mill held it, was a rare thing in the cultivated society of the time in England. It was more frequent a few years earlier; but the beginning of the century, says Godwin, witnessed a change of feeling on religion. Mill's doctrinal views were very strong meat even to the most liberal of the young men that became his disciples. I knew one distinguished man, who had been well accustomed to deism, but was considerably distressed on hearing Mill declare that we could know nothing whatever of the origin of the world.

On the subject of Christianity, Mill used in conversation to say that the history of the first centuries needed to be wholly rewritten: and I am not sure that he did not at one time think of doing this himself.

I must now advert to another connection that Mill kept up during the years that follow 1808. In the *Life of Macaulay*, Mr. Trevelyan adverts to the great services rendered to this country and to mankind by the Clapham brotherhood, which comprised Wilberforce, Zachary Macaulay, Babington, Thornton, and others. He remarks, that in their mode of carrying out their anti-slavery and other philanthropic enterprises, "they can be regarded as nothing short of the pioneers and fuglemen of that system of popular agitation which forms a leading feature in our external history during the past half-century". The services of these men are, indeed, great and undeniable. But justice demands an equal reference to another sect, and another set of names, who were in active co-operation with the Claphamites, and not inferior to them in self-sacrificing zeal—I mean the Society of Friends, whose foremost representative for a long time was

William Allen, the chemist of Plough Court. Rivalling Wilberforce in the intensity of his subjective piety, he was inferior to none in energy and devotion to every good work; and, besides being a philanthropist, he was very considerable as a man of science. Allen became acquainted with Mill, not later than 1810, and secured his active co-operation in a literary enterprise, a quarterly journal, called the *Philanthropist*, published for seven years at Allen's own risk. He also secured the advice and support of Mill in public gatherings for agitating his various schemes; and in fact, Mill was one of the philanthropic band of the time, and knew many of them intimately, and, among others, Zachary Macaulay. Allen was worthy of a biography; but the three volumes devoted to him, although bodying forth his piety, his energy, and his science, by the help of diaries and letters, are exceedingly out of proportion to the facts of his life. The *Philanthropist* was projected in the summer of 1810, and one page and a quarter are devoted to it. Again, in 1812, while it was going on, it receives mention in less than three lines; and in all the three volumes, I have not discovered another reference. Mill is mentioned only twice; once he and Ricardo accompany Allen (May 1811) to a meeting at the Freemason's Tavern, for a subscription to Lancaster; and, again (November 1813) he and Fox are taken to a Finance Committee on the Lancastrian School business. Now, although the *Philanthropist* was only an instrument of propagandism for the numerous schemes that Allen worked at, it occupied a very large share of his attention for seven years; and while he had many contributors, Mill and himself were the mainstay of the work: they were in constant communication, and many of his letters to Mill are preserved. The deep-seated divergence of their opinions on religion never interfered with their mutual esteem. Robert Owen's infidelity was a grief to Allen, and he made some vain attempts to combat it; but Mill's views were never obtruded in an unsuitable place. Different was the impression he made on Wilberforce, who, according to Sir James Stephen, was the most charitable of judges. (*Life of W.*, Vol. V., p. 315)

Another intimacy of Mill's may be touched upon in advance, namely, with Brougham. That the two were acquainted in Edinburgh is highly probable; and from 1808, to the end of Mill's life, the intimacy was kept up. A number of Brougham's hasty notes to Mill happen to be preserved; pressing invitations to dine or to meet somewhere about some public matter, whether in parliament or in the schemes of the day. The younger Mill, from a very early date, conceived a repugnance to Brougham; and used to say that his father was carried away by Brougham's fascination of manner, in spite of

the numerous defects of his character. On one occasion, however, when Brougham, in his Chancellor days, gave public utterance to a panegyric upon the Christian religion, declaring that he had examined its evidences, and found them satisfactory, Mill vented his astonishment and indignation in two pages of foolscap. He says nothing of his private means of judging of Brougham's opinions, or want of opinions, but places him in a series of alternative positions:—either he had examined the evidences, or he had not; if he had, and was satisfied, his judgment in regard to evidences was so worthless, that no weight could be given to any opinion he might hold upon any subject, &c., &c.

In the *Philanthropist*, Mill was not only the leading contributor, but in part editor; yet though the letters show that Allen accounted to him at the rate of sixteen pounds a sheet for articles, I do not discover any traces of his being paid for editorial trouble.

Of his various writings from 1808 to 1819, over and above the *History of India*, our knowledge is limited to the *Edinburgh Review*, the *Philanthropist*, and the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, to which last, however, his contributions did not begin till 1815. As regards the *Edinburgh*, we have a good many of Jeffrey's letters, and can see from them that he was a steady contributor, and always on the outlook for subjects that might prove acceptable.

After these preparatory surveys, I will now give, in the form of annals, the known facts of the eleven years.

For 1808, we have nothing special to record but the publication of an article in the *Edinburgh Review* (October) on Money and Exchange. The author reviewed is Thomas Smith, Mill following up his pamphlet on Spence of the year before, and evidently full of the subject, which was a pressing one at the time. He laments the prevailing ignorance of the doctrines of political economy, and quotes as evidence thereof—"the late Orders in Council, respecting the trade of neutrals; the popularity of Mr. Spence's doctrine in regard to commerce; our laws concerning the corn trade; a great part of our laws, in fact, respecting trade in general; the speeches which are commonly delivered, the books which are often published, and the conversations which are constantly held". The last third of the article is on the Bank of England question, and controverts Henry Thornton's doctrines, then much in vogue.

1809. In the January number of the *Edinburgh*, appeared a very full article on the Emancipation of Spanish America (35 pages). It recounts the entire public career of General Mir-

anda, and was no doubt inspired by him. A second article on the same subject is contained in the July number, where Miranda's 'coaching' is still more apparent; Mill could not of himself quote authorities in the Spanish language. The situation of Spanish South America was one of no little complication; it was in revolt against Spain, while we were assisting Spain at home. The fate of the mother country had first to be decided, either for independence or for subjection to Bonaparte. Under the first supposition, Mill enumerates five alternatives, under the second, three; the one most advantageous to this country, would be for us, having secured the independence of Spain, to secure next the independence of the colonies.

For this year, there is a great deal of interesting incident in the Memoirs of Bentham. First is a letter (July 25) on what was an anxious subject in the small Bentham circle, the publication of Bentham's *Elements of Packing*. Romilly had declared that a prosecution of both author and printer would be inevitable. Mill is anxious for publication, and urges Baldwin to undertake it; it was printed, but not sold for many years.

In the October number of the Review appeared one of Mill's important articles, a review of Bexon's *Code de la Législation Pénale*. The work itself he disposes of, as vague, confused, and vacillating, and substitutes a short abstract of his own doctrines instead; but does not go far into detail. A considerable stir followed the publication of the article, and the irritant was a sentence on Bentham, as being "the only author who has attempted this most difficult and most important analysis; and imperfect as his success has necessarily been, we have no hesitation in saying he has done more to elucidate the true grounds of legislative interference than all the jurists who had gone before him". On the Review coming out, Mill writes to Bentham—"Bexon sadly mangled. The mention of you struck out in all but one place, and there my words, every one of them, removed, and those of Jeffrey put in their place". Another long letter follows (X. p. 453), showing how entirely different had been his original; and saying, that he had fully in his eye Jeffrey's aversion to praise, especially of Bentham, and had, he thought, kept within limits, and so on. Brougham writes to Mill, calling "the praise of Bentham (as it remained) excessive, though perhaps less extravagant than in a passage in your first South America Article". This was the clue to the South American articles. The reference to Bentham is in the first, and is slightly stronger than the present one. This "Bexon" article is, so far as I know, the first of Mill's writings on Benthamic subjects; others are soon to follow.

1810. The year of Mill's abortive attempt to live in Milton's

house, and his migration to Newington Green. By this time, he had been at least three years engaged on India, and he would naturally endeavour to turn his researches to immediate account in the *Edinburgh*, Jeffrey permitting.

An article in April, 1810, is a slaying attack upon the Company's government, under the two heads—Commercial Monopoly, and Government. He first refutes all the pretences for granting the Company a monopoly of the trade; and next reviews in minute detail the vices of the Company's Government. The remedy for the mis-government is curious, and is only given as a hint:—"Instead of sending out a Governor-General, to be recalled in a few years, why should we not constitute one of our Royal Family, Emperor of Hindostan, with hereditary succession?"

There is an article in the August number on a Disturbance and Mutiny in the Madras Army, of which the style and the apportioning of merit and blame to those concerned are very much in his manner.

The August number contains an article on Religious Toleration, based on an anonymous French work bearing on the state of religious liberty in France. The article displays the author's usual energy on this question, and takes a wide scope, embracing among other things the Catholic disabilities.

In the November number, he has a paper of twenty-six pages, on the part of the Code Napoléon referring to Criminal Procedure. There is a full abstract given, and then a series of criticisms from the more advanced position attained through Bentham. The faults found with the Code are pretty numerous, and there is a sweeping remark as to the French way of doing things: "if an end can be attained by an easy but humble process, and by an operose but showy one, they are sure to prefer the latter."

In December, we find him corresponding with Brougham, on matters connected with the Admiralty. Brougham had been pressing the subject in Parliament, and Bentham is very much interested in it.

1811. There are two letters from Jeffrey, in January. The first expects an article, and wishes it before the 7th Feb.; it also encloses a bill for £100, a balance being still due. I do not know Jeffrey's scale of payment at this time, nor how many articles of the previous year (amounting to 95 pages, so far as I know them) it would cover; it is plain, however, that Mill did not press for his money. The second letter follows in two days; approves of a subject proposed by Mill, but urges him to be gentle, and something else that in Jeffrey's handwriting I cannot decipher. The two articles traceable for this year, are in

February and May. The February article is twenty pages in review of a French pamphlet *Sur la Souveraineté*, by M. J. Chas. The pamphlet is considered to be a manifesto authorised by Napoleon, as an apology for his despotism; and is handled accordingly. The pamphleteer carries the war into the enemy's country and attacks the British Constitution itself, the better to strengthen his case. This only exposes him the more to Mill's batteries.

There is a letter from Jeffrey in March, declining a proposal to write on the Nepaul Embassy; the subject already bespoken by some one that he could not refuse, albeit not auguring well of the execution. The letter then refers to a coming article on the Liberty of the Press, and gives advice—to make allowance for difference of times, to take a candid view of the dangers of calumny, &c., &c. The article is in the May number, twenty-five pages. Its strongest point is the exposure of the utter uncertainty of our law as to what is allowed, or what forbidden; it criticises very severely a saying of Burke's, "that the law would crush liberty, but juries save it". Mill follows Jeffrey's advice so far as to speak of the abuses of liberty; but the way of doing it is his own. "With regard to political subjects, the liberty of the press may be abused in two ways:—the one is, when good public measures, and good public men, are blamed; tho other is, when bad public measures, and bad public men, are praised. Of these two, *we should consider the last as infinitely the worst.*" Jeffrey referred him to the French Revolution. On this he says:—"It was not the abuse of a *free* press which was witnessed during the French Revolution; it was the abuse of an *enslaved* press."

It was in this year that the *Philanthropist* began. Allen is represented as planning it in the previous summer. The title is—"The Philanthropist; or Repository for hints and suggestions calculated to promote the Comfort and Happiness of man".

From the first volume, we have a sufficient idea of the drift of the work. There is an introduction by Allen, on the Duty and Pleasure of cultivating Benevolent Dispositions. The articles that follow are—On the most rational means of promoting Civilisation in Barbarous States; Some successful attempts to civilise the Hottentots; Account of a Society to promote the Civilisation of Africa, in connection with the Abolition of the Slave Trade. Two articles are decisively Mill's;—The Penal Law of England with respect to Capital Punishment, and as connected with the Transportation and Penitentiary Systems. A short article on Penitentiary Houses for Convicted Criminals, giving an account of Bentham's plan, is

also probably his ; he was a thorough convert to the Benthamic "Panopticon". An article on the General Education of the Poor soon launches out into Lancaster's system, not exactly in Mill's manner, and gives notice that the subject would be followed up, which indeed it is. The writing on this matter soon waxes to a furnace heat. It was far more than a contest between the merits of two educational theorists—Bell and Lancaster. The remaining articles of the volume are—Penny Clubs for clothing Poor Children ; Employment of Poor Women in winter ; Refuge for the Destitute ; Considerations on War ; Sunday Schools.

A letter from Allen, on the 3rd of June, indicates the fervour on the Lancaster question. "We are much pleased with thy reply to the Bellites, it places the merits of the case upon strong grounds. We are now entrenched to the ears and shall fight with advantage—not with cannon balls, but with something far more powerful, when directed to those whose intellect has been cultivated : in such a warfare *even Quakers* will fight, and fight stoutly." I do not find anything in the numbers then published that answers to this outburst, although the matter in dispute had come up in several articles. What Allen must have been reading was part of the MS. of an article of fifty pages that appeared in January following.

For 1812, there are two short articles, in the *Edinburgh*, on Indian subjects, known through Jeffrey's letters that have been saved. One, in July, reviews Malcolm's *Sketch of the Political History of India*, and is chiefly on the constitutional question, as to the best form of government for India ; no very distinct solution being advanced. The other, in November, attacks the Commercial Monopoly ; and urges farther inquiry, by a Committee of Parliament, into the whole system of Indian policy. Jeffrey apologises for having made some retrenchments on this article.

In the *Philanthropist*, Vol. II., is the long article above mentioned on the Lancasterian dispute. The Church of England organs had been denouncing Lancaster : "it has even been broadly and unblushingly asserted, in a high church quarter,* that Mr. Lancaster, as being a Quaker, is *no Christian*". The cry "The Church is in danger!" had been raised. "Unfortunately," the article says, "the name of the Church has been converted into an engine of war against us. In the use which is thus made of it, we are in self-defence constrained to resist it." "While bishops and archbishops, and deans and rectors, and lords and gentlemen, looked on in apathy, this individual

* *Antijacobin Review*, Vol. XXIX. (Jan.-Apr., 1808), p. 292.

(Lancaster) performed two things: he first proved that the education of the poor might be rendered incredibly cheap; he next conceived the truly great and magnanimous idea of rousing by his own exertions a sufficient number of individuals in the nation to contribute the expense which the education of the whole body of the people would require.

While the Dr. Bells and the Dr. Marshes, the Bishop A's and the Bishop B's enjoyed their tranquillity and their ease, without an effort for the education of the poor, without a single school to which their exertions gave birth, Mr. Lancaster proved, &c., &c." Two main accusations had been brought against the system, and are dealt with in the article. First, "the teaching of the poor to read, and habituating them to read the Bible, without inculcating any particular creed, is the way to make them renounce Christianity". In reply, Mill at once puts his finger on the sore, pointing out with remorseless plainness that "the *not inculcating some religious creed* is the mainspring of this objection"; and he meets opponents with an argument that he justly regards "as perfectly conclusive and unanswerable". The second accusation is "that teaching children to read and write, without teaching them the Church of England creed, is the way to make them renounce the Church of England". No sooner has Mill stated this position of his enemies than he declares vigorously: "We believe that no sentence more condemnatory of the Church of England ever was pronounced, or can be pronounced, by her most declared enemies, than is thus pronounced by her professing votaries." He then proceeds to discuss the charge at considerable length, being careful to meet numerous minor arguments more or less closely connected with this principal accusation. Thus the larger part of the article deals with general objections; the remainder in specific replies. Dr. Herbert Marsh, afterwards Bishop Marsh, well known for his criticism of the Gospels, had just published a sermon attacking the Lancaster plans, and to this Mill replies with crushing effect. He then overhauls the *Quarterly* for "an elaborate and designing article against the Lancasterians".

Besides making this grand effort to fight the Church, Mill appears plainly, in the same volume, in two considerable Toleration articles, in which he had always the warmest sympathy from Allen.

A note from Brougham in July introduces a great friend of Indian questions, Mr. Bennet, son of Lord Tankerville, as having promised Mill the loan of his valuable journals and reports on India. In Bentham's Memoirs, there is a letter from Mill to Bentham, not specially important, and an account of his

unsuccessful endeavours to induce some publisher to bring out the *Rationale of Evidence*; the fear of prosecution for libel standing in the way. Mill called their hesitation "weakness"; but with no effect.

The only remaining scrap for this year is a letter from a warm friend of Mill's, the Rev. Dr. James Lindsay, an English Presbyterian minister, whose chapel was in Monkwell Street, in the east end of London.* He was a friend of Mill's next-door neighbour, old Mr. Taylor, and may thus have been introduced to Mill. They had many points of sympathy. The letter is of Dec. 4, and Lindsay is very excited over a trial just to come off, which we discover to be the trial of the Hunts for the libel on the Prince Regent. He has not been able to get accurate information about the names (of the jurymen?); but it grieves him to say that there is not a man among those in the eastern district that can be depended upon. Hunt has no chance except in the absence of special jurymen. The letter then passes to some point as to the signature of the Confession of Faith, which could not have arisen out of any part of the case between Leigh Hunt and the Prince Regent. Mill, apparently having forgotten the circumstances of his own signing the Confession, had desired information from Lindsay. Lindsay, however, had never signed it and could not tell what were the words, but he thought his friend Mr. Taylor might have a copy of the Confession.

1813. A note from Jeffrey, 5th Jan., declines a proposal for another Indian article; one was expected from Mackintosh, and it was well to change hands on so great a subject. An article on Lancaster is accepted, with the caution to adopt a conciliatory tone to the sceptical and misguided part of his opponents. The words "I shall be very glad to have your South Sea Speculators," indicates the opening of a new vein. The note is followed in

* All that I can trace of Dr. Lindsay is that he was minister of the Monkwell Street chapel from 1783 to 1821. He was a man of great liberality of mind both in politics and in religion. His only publication is a selection of his sermons, which the Evangelical critics of the day declared to be tinged with Arianism. Several single sermons of his on special occasions were also published. His death was very sudden; to happen while he was at a meeting of the Ministers of the Three Denominations held for the purpose of opposing Brougham's Education Bill. Although he was a well known man, I do not find any obituary notice of him that gives detailed particulars of his life, and cannot tell where he came from. The *Congregational Magazine*, in a review of his sermons, speaks of him as accustomed for half a century to subjects admitting of mathematical demonstration; which made him suspicious and slow in his theological deductions. Bentham, in writing to Richard Carlile while in prison, quoted Lindsay as an instance of a theologian that strongly condemned such prosecutions as Carlile had suffered from.

two days with another. After apologising for retrenching the Indian article, Jeffrey asks "to hear for what other articles I am in your debt; for I have formed a magnanimous resolution to get fairly out of debt". He considers that this last number beats the *Quarterly* this time; and thanks Mill for remarks on the number, and invites his free criticism at all times. He then returns to the South Sea article, which "Brougham mentioned to me some time ago as engaging a share of your attention". He thinks that a very interesting article might be made, by bringing together all that has been made known of the South Sea Islands since Captain Cook. The letter finally hopes that Mill's health has been restored—probably from one of his periodic fits of gout, which frequently come up in the letters.

I cannot find that he ever wrote the South Sea article. In February appeared the account of the Lancasterian System of Education. The conciliatory tone is not very apparent. It is chiefly an attack upon the English Church for thwarting the education of the poor, with allusions to the progress effected by the Lancasterian schools: in fact very much a repetition of the great *Philanthropist* article. In July there is a short review of Malcolm's *Sketch of the Sikhs*. It is attested by a note from Jeffrey, but the handling of the religious creed of the Sikhs would be attestation enough; he is utterly impatient of calling any of the barbaric creeds "pure deism".

Strange to say, this is the last *Edinburgh Review* article that can be traced to Mill's hand.

In the volume of the *Philanthropist* (III.) for this year, there is an elaborate paper on the Formation of Character with a view to the improvement of mankind; which savours of his hand, but at present Psychology as a subject was in abeyance. A review of Owen's Schemes is probably his. An article on War is certainly not by an honest quaker. A long review of his friend Dr. Thomson's *Travels in Sweden* is sure to be his; and is continued into the next volume. Clarkson's *Memoirs of Penn* is reviewed in the first of three articles; Penn's views of toleration are quoted with strong approbation, and farther enforced by the writer.

A few interesting scraps for this year are presented. In autumn he is at Barrow Green. There is a pressing note from Allen, in September, about the Lancasterian Committee, for which he has secured the zeal of the two Royal Dukes—Kent and Sussex. In the end of October, Mill attends a meeting at Kensington, where the Dukes of Kent, Sussex, and Bedford were present.

On the 14th October, while still at Barrow Green with Bentham, Sir Samuel Romilly sends through Lady Romilly an

invitation to Bentham to visit him at Tanhurst, and to bring Mill, whom Romilly "has long wished to become acquainted with".

In December there is a letter from Dr. Lindsay replying to a solicitation on the part of Mill to use his influence with some East Indian proprietors in favour of Joseph Hume, then aspiring to become a Director. This seems to have been Hume's first object of ambition, on his return from India; and Mill would do everything to help his friend. Lindsay would like to see Hume appointed, but is reluctant to canvass. The letter also indicates that Lindsay had been got to work on the Lancaster Committee.

1814. The year of removal to Queen's Square. The fifth child, James, was born in his grandmother's house at Hackney, where the family stayed while the Queen's Square house was getting ready. This was the first year in Ford Abbey; the experiment of the long domestication with Bentham being, however, on the brink of failure. Bentham himself supplies a full account of Ford Abbey and its amusements (X. 479).

In the *Philanthropist*, Mill must have done a good deal. The second article on Penn is a long discussion of the evils of Unwritten Law. A review of Gilpin's *Lives of the Reformers* is Mill's without a doubt; the argument for toleration is in his strain. So is this sentence:—"All men are governed by motives, and motives arise out of interests; interests are the source from which all inferences from the actions of men of former times to the actions of those of the present may safely be drawn." An Appeal to the Allies and the English Nation, in behalf of Poland, has for its text the good of mankind as the purpose of government; "to behold a union of governments seriously concerning themselves with the happiness of the millions of human beings would be a new scene in the world!" The review of the Life of Penn is concluded in the strain of the previous articles. "How just and admirable are the ideas thus distinctly expressed—nothing in the acts of government, or in the acts of one man towards another, should have any regard to anything in religious opinions except their morality." A short article dictated by the conclusion of peace, is probably Mill's; it expounds the connection of war with barbaric passions, and urges the need of restraint upon the powers of a monarch. An article on Schools for All, opens up the theory of education as a preface to the report of a great meeting in Freemason's Hall. A Comparison of the Sixteenth Century with the Nineteenth, in regard to the Intellectual and Moral state of the public mind, is a review of the Memoirs of Sir James Melvil, and is shown to be Mill's by the terse and spirited remarks on human improvement.

1815. The volume of the *Philanthropist* for this year is wanting in the only copy that I have been able to procure access to, the one in the British Museum. Fortunately one of Allen's letters, the best of the set, reveals some interesting facts. A fragment of a letter from Allen, docketed March, contains the address "Ford Abbey," which shows a very early migration. The important letter of the year is also addressed to the country, date 18th September. The first allusion is to a terrific castigation by Mill of the mismanagement of the King's Bench Prison; the next, to the exhibition (not said who by) of the state of the colony at Sierra Leone. This article had "stirred up so much gall, that it would be delightful to some persons, if the authors could be made to pass through the gates of a prison". But, indeed, a year before, Brougham told Allen that he had been applied to, to say whether the magazine did not furnish grounds for a prosecution. Next Allen lays down very adroitly the maxim of prudence as to dealing with great abuses—to state the facts fully, and leave the reader to boil up of his own accord, and so forth. He then goes into the pecuniary position of the *Philanthropist*, and, with a view to making the magazine known, asks Mill to prepare a short and pithy advertisement, indicating what might be put in by way of detail. For the July number, the Sierra Leone article was to be specified. For the next number in October, the bill of fare to be—the Prisons article, an article on a flourishing religious community in America, called Harmony; an article on Wordsworth, forwarded by Clarkson from a Cambridge man (Wordsworth he thinks favourable to morality and virtue, though rather too sentimental); a notice of an attempt to civilise the North American Indians. Next is a request to know the state of the accounts between Mill and himself. Then follows an acknowledgement of a present of Bentham's new book (I suppose the *Chrestomathia*, the project of which he was now busy upon). Allen was on friendly intimacy with Bentham; but spoke of him with reservation:—"Before I can commit myself neck and crop in the concern, I must be assured that it contains nothing at variance with my religious feelings, and prejudices (if you please); but I feel with my dear friend the immense importance of imbuing the rising generation with right notions upon points in which the interest and happiness of every community is deeply concerned." Gratifying letters, also, had come respecting their schools in Paris (France now open). With all this budget, he has not got through half that he wished. Another scrap is full of anxiety for Mill's return to town for the Borough Road Committee; Allen has a new scheme of penny subscriptions among the poor themselves to assist their schools, and enable them to beat the "National with its £60,000".

A letter from Lindsay, on the 20th October, shows the party still at Ford Abbey (now nearly eight months). Lindsay has procured £200 for Brougham towards education. He rejoices that Brougham, whom he idolises, has taken up the law of libel, and the education of the poor. It would appear that Mill had informed him of their receiving at Ford Abbey the visit of a Bishop, on which Lindsay makes the appropriate jokes; wondering "whether you had the hardihood to put in a word occasionally for our guid auld kirk?"

To replace the (apparent) cessation of contributions to the *Edinburgh*, it was about this year that the well-known articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* may have begun. The publication of the edition extended from 1815 to 1824. Mill did his very best for these articles, and the seven entitled—Government, Jurisprudence, Liberty of the Press, Prisons and Prison Discipline, Colonies, Law of Nature, and Education—are classical and renowned. In addition, by assistance obtained in Messrs. Black's office, I have been enabled to identify four others—Banks for Saving, Beggar, Benefit Societies, and Economists. As it thus appears that he made a study of Savings Banks, we may attribute to him articles on the subject that came out in the *Philanthropist*. How far he was the contriver or chief promoter of this valuable institution, I am unable to say.

1816. On the 16th of "1st month," Allen writes anxiously, expecting Mill's return to London; he appears to have remained in Ford Abbey all the winter, which would be nearly a year on a stretch. Allen needs for his next number an article of a sheet on a pamphlet respecting the Registry of Slaves in the West Indies; the author is "Stephens," who gave up his seat in parliament because this was not made a government measure. There occurs in the first number an article with that heading. Again Allen urges upon Mill the settlement of the accounts.

A letter, dated January, is from Ricardo, and still addressed to Ford Abbey. It is but an end-fragment, and opens—"fill 8 pages in the Appendix, will that be too much"? John Mill tells us that it was through his father's urgency and encouragement that Ricardo brought out his great work on Political Economy; and to that work we must refer this request. A long letter in February, from that voluminous correspondent, Major Cartwright, is occupied with Westminster electioneering, on which Mill had always to be consulted.

Allen again, on the 3d of March (a fragment); Mill now in town. He asks Mill to a meeting with Wilberforce, about St. Domingo, and forwards a bundle of papers from Hayti. In a scrap of letter, dated June, this year, an Irish gentleman, Mr. Ensor, greatly attached to Mill, who sees much of him

when in London, and writes often from Ireland, seems to respond to Mill's Savings Bank hobby, as proposed by him for Ireland; the tone of the reply is grim incredulity. On the 20th September, there is a letter of Mill's own from Ford Abbey, to his old friend Dr. Thomson, who was at present unattached to any office, and was now for more than a year occupying rooms in Mill's house, by arrangement. He had just been married, and Mill writes a warm letter of congratulation, like a man that attached great value to the married state. From this letter it appears that Mill was now paying for his house, in rent and taxes, about 100 guineas a-year; which was full value. The only other item of interest is that John, now ten, had read that summer "with vast ardour" Thomson's *System of Chemistry*.

Turning to the volume of the *Philanthropist*, I find Savings Banks again; also the Registry of Slaves and St. Domingo—the response to Allen's bundle of papers. But for the indications of these subjects, I could not trace his hand in a marked way in this volume.

1817. This year, the *History of India* goes through the press. The *Philanthropist* is stopped, after the publication of two numbers. The first number is remarkable for a review of Dumont's edition of Bentham's *Treatise on Rewards and Punishments*. The article expounds and defends Bentham at some length, and is to be continued; but never was. In March, Allen sends notes of the Prison at Ghent, to be worked up by Mill into an article, which accordingly appears. In April, Allen writes to urge the publication of a paper on the Establishments for the Poor at Mannheim, and will "be glad to know how thou gets on with the Amsterdam article"; this also appears, headed Charitable Institutions at Amsterdam. The concluding article of the last number is on the Report of a Committee of the House of Commons on the Police of the Metropolis.

Thus, for six years and a half, Allen and Mill carried on a most energetic agitation in favour of a wide range of works of philanthropy and usefulness. They were at the same time, Allen especially, on all the Committees for putting their numerous schemes into operation. The extent of Mill's contributions may be judged from the fact, that at one settlement, Allen accounted to him for 8½ sheets.

The commencement of the printing of the *History* is marked by a letter, July 22, from the Secretary to the Post Office, Freeling, to Lord Auckland, conferring upon Mill the privilege of sending his proof-sheets through the Post Office free. I was not aware that such a privilege had ever been accorded. The letter shows that such applications were not always successful. Mill was at Ford Abbey the whole time of the printing.

Two letters to Dr. Thomson (Sept. 13 and Oct. 5) refer to his being appointed Professor of Chemistry in Glasgow. There are congratulations, and also regrets, at the breaking up of the Queen's Square connection, which seems to have been very harmonious; all the children lamented the departure. Both Mrs. Thomson and a maiden sister, Miss Colquhoun, were popular; and John had fulfilled a promise to write to Miss Colquhoun. No wonder, when his father styles her "dear Miss Colquhoun".

The letter intimates that the printing of the History would be finished in November. In point of fact, it was published about the new year. The family left Ford Abbey for the last time, in January. The correspondence shows that the residence there was as much as ten months in the third and fourth of the four years.

1818. Notwithstanding the cessation of the *Philanthropist*, Friend Allen is the first to salute the year. Opens (16th of 2d month) with a lament—"I have not heard a single line from thee since my return to England." Always doing business: Prison Discipline pressing now. *Inter alia*, "Owen has made a fool of himself". Hopes that the poor *Philanthropist* may be soon revived. To his great relief, Mill writes, and forthwith is pressed to dine at Plough Court—"a great deal to communicate".

A letter from Mill to Dr. Thomson on the 22d February, revives a forgotten episode of his life. In Hunt's *History of the Fourth Estate*, there is an anecdote to the effect, that Mill, from his singleness of devotion to the Philosophy of Mind, would have resigned his lucrative post in the India House, for the Moral Philosophy chair in Edinburgh; but was advised by his friends there that he had no chance. This anecdote is not discredited by the circumstance that his family knew nothing of the transaction; and it has a certain air of plausibility. The chair was vacated in 1820, when Mill had got his foot into the first step of the ladder of the India House (£800 a year, with the certainty of promotion). It was just possible, I should hardly say probable, that he would have surrendered his future for the chair. The present letter tells us the facts. His ever watchful friend, now the professor of chemistry in Glasgow, warned him of a vacancy in the Greek chair of that University, and set forth the temptations of the chair. Mill weighs the proposal on every side; is tempted by the emoluments and the rank; doubts his chances in a body made up of Tories, not that he is the servant of either aristocratic faction, but that, if Glasgow is like Edinburgh, both would conspire against him. As to influence, he could count upon his old friend Sir John Stuart, and Sir John's son-in-law, Sir W. Forbes. (The electors were the professors, but always under pressure from the gentry.) But now he

discloses to Thomson a secret, as yet to be kept very close. His History had not been out many weeks, and already some friends of his among the Indian Directors had views of getting him into the India Office. One thing more on the Glasgow chair: he fears he must sign the Confession of Faith—a thing he could not do, if signing meant a belief in the book.

The *History of India* was a great and speedy success. The appointment to the India House did not happen till next year. Nevertheless, his struggles may be considered as ended. It does not appear that he was entering on any new projects of work; the only thing on his table, so far as I know, was the series for the *Britannica*. From his tone in alluding to the *Edinburgh Review*, I should think he had given it up on principle. Probably, until the decision of the Indian appointment, he would not conceive any new literary plans.

It is now quite evident that John Mill overstated his father's exertions, wonderful as they were, in saying that he maintained his family by Review and Magazine writing, while himself their sole teacher, all the time of writing the History. I was very much staggered by this assertion, when I first heard it, many years ago, from John Mill in conversation. Two difficulties occurred to me at once, although I did not venture to press them. The one was the enormous quantity of his very compact writing that would be required to realise what was absolutely necessary. The still greater difficulty was to point to the articles. Ten or twelve considerable review articles a year for eleven years would be the least that would suffice; about three or four a year is, however, the utmost we can trace. Mill may have realised about £150 a year, but certainly not more, from his literary work, during those years: so that he must have had other ways of meeting his wants. The four years' residence at Ford Abbey, although more of Bentham's seeking than of his, must have been a great assistance. It appears, too, that his fast friend Sir John Stuart, who was always cognisant of Mill's circumstances, sent a silver cup to his god-son, with a present of £500 (according to family tradition). The cup has no date, but bears an inscription in terms of great respect for both father and son. It is said in the family that the money present was avowedly to send John to Cambridge, but the father set aside this proposal by the reply that John already knew more than he would get at Cambridge (somewhat of an *ignoratio elenchi*). I am fain to believe that the gift had in view Mill's own needs during the composition of the History. The sending of John to Cambridge was pressed upon his father some time after Sir John Stuart's death; and there may be a mixing up of different traditions in the story of

the cup. However this may be, I have heard from very good authority that Francis Place, who took charge of Mill's money affairs, made him advances while he was writing the History; these, of course, were all repaid; but Place would have cheerfully allowed the loan to lapse into a gift, had that been necessary.

It appears from two notes that have been preserved, that John Murray sought and obtained, through Ricardo, Mill's assistance in connection with some of his publications. The notes are civil and deferential in the extreme, and might have led to closer relations, had Mill been so disposed.

So rapid was the sale of the History, that in the beginning of 1819, "we are busy preparing for a second edition". It was in the early months of this year, that the canvass for the India House appointment was going on. There is luckily a letter to Thomson explaining the situation in the beginning of April. The letter touches first upon the History. Thomson had told him about the Edinburgh Reviewer, and he replies that he knows something of the spirit which reigns in that quarter. However, "the reputation of the book is higher than I had expected it to be for several years". He also accepts in good part some observations by Thomson as to his style. Then as to the India Office affair. There has occurred a vacancy in the Examiner's Office. He has been encouraged to apply, and his application is now before the Court of Directors. Several of them are his declared friends; and a good deal of influence of considerable weight has been made with others. The reputation of the History is even a strong recommendation. "You could do a great deal with Thornhill, and I could wish you to write both to him and to Col. Bosanquet, in as strong terms as your conscience will allow." Thornhill is a man to influence other votes. His friends in the Direction say to him—"Accept of anything, however small in the first instance; if once in, we shall be able to push you on".

Mill's friends spared no pains to secure this appointment; Hume and Ricardo made great exertions in the city. Mr. Grote remembered being asked by Ricardo (who had then recently introduced him to Mill) to use his influence with India proprietors. Both the Chairman (Pattison) and the Deputy Chairman were in his favour, solely on the ground of his ability and knowledge of India. There was of course a considerable mass of Tory opposition to be got over. I have heard that Canning, who was President of the India Board, took some part in the affair. One version of the story is that he was forward in urging the appointment; the other version is that he declared his approbation of it, on being appealed to by the Tory party in the Direction to oppose it.

It was on the 12th of May, 1819, that he was appointed "an Assistant to the Examiner of India Correspondence," salary £800. I give his subsequent steps of promotion. On the 10th April, 1821, he was appointed second Assistant to the Examiner, Edward Strachey being first Assistant; salary £1000. He was now fourth in the office. On the 9th April, 1823, he was put ahead of Strachey, and appointed Assistant Examiner, at £1200 he was now second. This rise made the vacancy that led to John's being taken in as a junior clerk. On the 1st Dec, 1830, he became Examiner, salary £1900. He was now chief. On the 17th Feb., 1836, his salary was fixed at £2000. This he enjoyed only four months.*

From the time of his entering the India House, till he became chief Examiner, in 1830, his occupation was the Revenue Department; which was, therefore, the only branch where he exercised direct control. It was his duty to draft all the despatches relating to that department. When he became Examiner, he superintended all the departments; he did not necessarily draft despatches in any one, but read those that were prepared by the Assistants.

John Mill speaks in general terms of the improvements introduced by his father into the Indian Administration, but unfortunately does not specify any precise heads. No one is now left that can speak of the details of his official career. There is no clue in the office to any of his despatches, except the presumption that from 1819 to 1830, he drafted those in the Revenue Department. One would like to have a specimen of his official style; this could have been easily supplied by his son, whose own despatches can all be identified.

Mill's immediate senior in the office, whose retirement placed him at the top, was William McCulloch, a Scotchman also, with whom Mill was on a very friendly footing. McCulloch's reputation as an administrator, is very high; his despatches

* John Stuart Mill was appointed junior clerk in the Examiner's Office, 21st May, 1823. The clerks in those days had no salary, but only a gratuity. For three years, Mill had £30 a year; at the end of that time, he received a salary of £100, with an annual rise of £10. It was, however, in 1828, that he was put over the heads of all the clerks, and made an Assistant, at £600 a year; being sixth in rank. In 1830, he stood fifth, his father being at the top. Early in 1836, he received a step, and, on his father's death, the same year, another; he was then third, but David Hill was made second over his head; Beacock was chief. His salary was now £1200 a year; to which in 1854, a special and personal addition was made of £200 a year. On 28th March, 1858, Peacock and Hill retiring together, he was made Examiner, salary £2000 a year. At Christmas, 1858, on the transfer of the Company's government to the crown, he retired on a pension of £1500 a year.

were regarded as perfect models, and by some held to be superior to Mill's.

One thing is certain, that Mill acquired a very great amount of influence and authority with the Court of Directors. It is doubted whether any one before or since obtained the same share of their confidence. It has been said that, Mill being dead when the Macaulay Commission brought over their new Code for India, the Directors could not trust their judgment so far as to put it in force.

In the Bentham Memoirs, there are scattered allusions as to what Mill might induce the Indian Government to do, in the way of Judicial Reforms; the subject was often mooted between Mill and Bentham. The wide influence that John Mill alludes to must have been apart from the routine of his office.

For the remaining seventeen years of Mill's life, the *Autobiography* is tolerably full, and is sure to be correct. The narrative of the connection with the *Westminster Review* is probably exhaustive. From a few remaining letters and indications, something may be added to bring out the lineaments of the picture.

For the year 1820, I have no traces except some notes from the irrepressible Brougham, then in the excitement of the Queen's trial. They only show his urgency in getting conversations with Mill, with or without special business.

In 1821, Allen writes, and wishes an interview, with a view to a new issue of the *Philanthropist*.

For June and July of this year, there are several letters from the Rev. William Mills, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Professor of Moral Philosophy, urging Mill to visit him at Oxford, in Commemoration week. Engagements prevented, but better things are hoped for next year. John had now come back from France, and was also pressingly invited.

In the end of the same year, there are two letters from Zachary Macaulay, with whom Mill had long been acquainted. The first of the two solicits his influence in some pending election, more especially with Townsend of Trinity, Cambridge, and Bickersteth. The other has a variety of topics. It first asks Mill to procure for him in the India House a document by the Court of Directors on the sugar trade of India. The next point is a desire for help for a friend to an intelligent Scotchman; and the conclusion is a warm eulogium on the *History of India*, with an exception to some economical doctrine. Mill pencils at the end of the letter, the name 'Mr. Mudie,' educated at Aberdeen, co-conductor of the *Dundee Advertiser*, &c.

It was in 1821 that he brought out the *Elements of Political Economy*.

The *Autobiography* tells us that 1822 was the year that Mill began to compose his *Analysis of the Human Mind*. He had taken a summer house at Dorking, where the family stayed six months in the year, he going down from Friday till Monday, and during his six weeks' holiday remaining there throughout. To the end of his life he kept up this arrangement, but for the last years his house was in the small rural village of Mickleham, on the Dorking road, not far from Leatherhead and Epsom. The *Analysis* cost him six of these holidays, being published in 1829.

For 1823, passing over Brougham's invitations as a thing of course, I come to two very interesting scraps from Professor Townsend of Cambridge, who had cultivated Mill's acquaintance with great assiduity, and is now bent upon procuring his consent to enter John at Trinity College. There is also an invitation to visit Cambridge, and see his theological library; it appears that Mill was then consulting certain theological works; Townsend had sent him *Michaelis*. I believe this was one of Mill's lasting friendships; his influence with Townsend has just been before us. The second letter (27th May) was too late for its purpose. On the 22nd, Mill had written to Thomson, intimating his promotion to be second in the office, next to McCulloch, at £1200 a year; and also that John had been appointed to the Examiner's Office: "He will be in the receipt of a larger income at an early age, than he would be in any profession, and as he still can keep his terms as a student of law, his way to the legal profession is not barred, if he should afterwards prefer it."

There is a letter of the 26th May from the indefatigable Major Cartwright, on the exciting topic of the Westminster electioneering, in which Mill was always one of the Radical leaders. They seemed to be at sea for a candidate; Bentham had suggested Ricardo; the major urges Mill to try if Sir Francis Burdett would take a leading part.

From a letter of Mill's own to Dr. Thomson, in December, we find that the second edition of the *History* was nearly sold, and the *Political Economy* volume all sold.

This was the year of the commencement of the *Westminster Review*.

For 1824, I have nothing new. The following year was marked by the starting of the London University (afterwards transformed into University College), in which Mill took a lead. The project of an Institution for unsectarian education was a very bold one, and certainly but for Mill and

and the people that he worked upon would never have been carried through. Mr. Grote often remarked that it was Mill's personal ascendancy with persons of means, and the trust they placed in his judgment, that more than anything else enabled the requisite funds to be raised. Brougham threw himself into it, and there are notes from him about meetings to consult on the progress of the scheme. Here is one :—" I wish you could look in on your way to the city, as I have a talk to hold with you, on our liberal ministers' having refused a charter as not daring to face Oxford bigotry, &c."

In 1826, the arrangements were so far advanced, that they began to look out for professors ; and, in October, Mill wrote to Dr. Thomson to accept the chemistry chair, supposing it could be made worth his while.

The appointment that gave the Council most trouble was to the Philosophy chair. Mill and his allies put forward a man of ability and liberality of mind, but his orthodoxy being doubtful, the Evangelical Dissenters took a hostile stand, and he could not be carried ; Brougham slunk away at the final push. Another candidate, a dissenting clergyman, conciliated Mill's support by professing to follow Hartley, and Mill took him up as a *pis aller*, and got him elected ; not without the opposition of Mr. Grote, who then, as afterwards, held strongly the incompatibility of clerical vows with the *libertas philosophandi*.

We know that by 1825 the *Encyclopædia* articles were all published. These articles are the final elaboration of all the subjects that he had been writing upon for periodicals during a number of years. He complained, however, in a letter to Constable, that they were hurriedly done at first ; and he revised them for the next edition. As short treatises on the several subjects, they were unmatched. The greatest notoriety came to attach to the one on government, from the Macaulay articles in the *Edinburgh Review*. In the *Autobiography*, John Mill enters into the merits of this controversy, and tells us that it was a turning point in his own views on Logic.

It is commonly represented that Macaulay owed his seat in Parliament to the attack on Mill. It appears from a passage in his *Life* that Lord Lansdowne " had been much struck by the articles ". It is added, however, that Macaulay's " high moral and private character " had determined Lord Lansdowne to offer him the seat. Viewed from one side, the promotion has been regarded as a Whig tribute to his having vanquished obnoxious Radicalism. Notwithstanding, Lord Houghton, in the *Academy*, (April 29, 1876), gives another side of the affair. " His College intimacy with Charles Austin may not improbably have had something to do with this important change in his

destiny, for with Charles and John Austin, and Sarah the beautiful and accomplished translator of Ranke's *History*, Lord Lansdowne long held the most friendly relations". This brings the wheel completely round, for the Austins (including Sarah) were the closest of Mill's own friends.

That Mill warmly supported, with the Court of Directors, the appointment of Macaulay to India, and that Macaulay made handsome amends for his tone towards Mill, are facts that will always be quoted to their honour. Nevertheless, any one that reads the articles now will feel that there was a gain, rather than a loss, to Macaulay's reputation, in withholding them from his collected essays. The want of body in the political thinking leaves the mannerism of the style empty like buckram; and the personalities would tend, by lapse of time, to become more and more distasteful.

We have seen that Mill was a friend of Zachary Macaulay, and although the families did not come together, Mill's relationships were well known to the household. (*Life*, Vol. I., p. 186, 1st ed.) In the interval between the appointment to India and his setting out, Macaulay saw Mill at his house. John Mill remembered his father earnestly counselling him to keep to the line of an "honest politician".

The year 1830 was the culmination of Mill's prosperity. He is at the head of his office. He leaves the Queen Square house for a large villa in Church Street, Kensington, looking at that time across to the gardens. Here, in opulence and fame, he spends his last six years, varied by his summer retreat at Mickleham. His nine children were all about him, John, the eldest, being 24, and George, the youngest, 6. For twenty years the house had been a school, and it continued so while he lived. He was thoroughly habituated to the state of things, and lesson-hearing was a part of his daily work. True, he devolved upon John and the elder children the teaching of the younger, but he always took some part, and never lost interest in the work. After John, the next elder children seem to have disappointed him, and he never looked upon them with any complacency. James, the second son, was destined for the India Service abroad; he was an assiduous student, and appears to have given his father tolerable satisfaction; but there was nothing in his career to show that he had much intellectual gift. The next brother, Henry, was everybody's favourite; I have heard Mrs. Grote describe him as a "heavenly boy". Personal beauty and charms, great faculty not merely for study but for anything that he had to do, unselfishness in the extreme, were the traits that made his popularity. He died of consumption, in his 20th

year; aware that overstrain had crushed him. John watched his deathbed at Falmouth, and, in writing of the event, styled him "the noblest and worthiest of us all". The youngest son, George, I knew personally; he too possessed the family talent, but gave way to the same malady. It is apparent enough that while the father's fine quality of brain was not wanting in the children, John was single in possessing the physical endurance that was needed for maturing a first-class intellect.

The *Autobiography* expresses with sufficient frankness the defective side of Mill's demeanour to his children. Such a phrase as "the most impatient of men" speaks a volume, and we have only to turn the leaves to realise the particulars. He could exercise perfect self-control in his intercourse with the world, and his social and commanding qualities gained and kept friends, but at home he did not care to restrain the irritability of his temperament. In his advancing years, as often happens, he courted the affection of the younger children, but their love to him was never wholly unmingled with fear; for, even in his most amiable moods, he was not to be trifled with. His entering the room where the family was assembled, was observed by strangers to operate as an immediate damper. This was not the worst. The one really disagreeable trait in Mill's character, and the thing that has left the most painful memories, was the way that he allowed himself to speak and behave to his wife and children before visitors. When we read his letters to friends, we see him acting the family man with the utmost propriety, putting forward his wife and children into their due place; but he seemed unable to observe this part in daily intercourse.

I add a few remarks on his friends and associates during the later part of his life. Both at his house in Kensington, and at Mickleham in summer, he had a constant flow of select visitors. Hume, his schoolfellow, was never long absent. Brougham, even in his Chancellor days, would make a dash down to Mickleham on a Sunday. Neil Arnott was very congenial to him, and shared his confidence. Mr. and Mrs. Grote's society was always cherished. Cameron, who went to India as a colleague of Macaulay, was a visitor. He had as a neighbour at Mickleham, for some time, Sharp, well known as 'Conversation-Sharp'. Their walks and talks were frequent. John Mill, who had so many chances of hearing good conversation, considered himself as peculiarly favoured in accompanying his father and Sharp in their walks. Henry Bickersteth, who became Lord Langdale and Master of the Rolls, was attached to Mill in no ordinary degree. Besides being a frequent visitor, he used to take a

summer-house near Mickleham. The reader of the two volumes of his Biography, when informed of his being offered the Mastership of the Rolls, is startled to find that Mill, whose name had not occurred previously, is the man whose judgment he sought before he could bring himself to accept. On the other hand, Bickersteth was Mill's counsel in the composition and style of his last work, the *Fragment on Mackintosh*, and induced him to make many alterations in the way of softening its tone. Mr. Strutt (Lord Belper) and John Romilly were friends from a very early date, and were among the Mickleham visitors. Walter Coulson was his frequent Sunday companion in London. Mr. Roebuck was a very early friend both of father and son. Charles Buller and Molesworth used frequently to visit him together; Molesworth struck him greatly both for ability and for having the courage of his opinions. Mr. Charles Villiers was one of the band of youthful listeners. Of the Austins, and some others, ample mention is made by John Mill.

The Sunday walk was a regular institution of his life; his walks on other days were necessarily limited. He had cultivated the power of prolonged walking as necessary to his health, and John and the rest of the children were habituated in like manner. The Sunday excursions were often very long indeed; and some even of the younger men spoke afterwards of their fatigue as passing endurance.

From early years, Mill had been a sufferer from gout, and was subject to periodical fits. In advanced life, this turned to disease of the chest. For two or three years before his death, he had a winter cough; it was in the autumn of 1835 that he became seriously ill; all that winter he had to be at home, his strength steadily failing, but not his mind. His son James had gone to India, and he proposed to write him a monthly letter. The first was in March, 1836, and would be very interesting as a domestic picture if I had room for it. A month passed, and he wished to keep to his engagement. He wrote the following sentences, which may be given as being his last composition. "I would not let this opportunity pass without saying a word to you. But as the rest, I suppose, have told you all the incidents, and I am worn out writing to the Governor-General and Macaulay and Cameron, I shall reserve my contribution till the next time. My great complaint now is weakness, but that is extreme and most distressing. However, they say that needs but a little time and good weather, which has hitherto been wretched." This was the 4th of April. He sank gradually and died on the 23d of June, 1836. He is buried in Kensington church.

A. BAIN.