TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

THE SCIENCE OF HISTORY.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

By GUSTAVUS GEORGE ZERFFI, Esq., Ph.D., F.R.S.L.,
CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL.

Read 13th November, 1879.

SIX years ago I had the pleasure of reading a paper "On the Possibility of a strictly Scientific Treatment of Universal History," and that which was at that time a mere suggestion, has since become a firm conviction, based on indefatigable study, and the collection of innumerable facts.

When called upon at the first meeting of the Council of the Royal Historical Society this session, to read an inaugural paper before the Fellows, I thought I could not do better than bring this conviction before you, so as, if possible, to make it your own.

I have had the satisfaction of lecturing during the last six years to, at least, 45,576 persons, and this proves that there is an increasing demand for the supply of historical knowledge. Six years ago there were 303 Fellows on the rolls of this Society; we have since increased more than a hundred per cent. and more than doubled our income; all this shows, if statistical facts are of any value, that the first Royal Historical Society of England has made some progress. I am, however,

sorry to say that a deplorable neglect of the study of General History is still only too evident. Not one of our large influential and wealthy seats of learning includes "General History" in its "curriculum," as a subject in which candidates for University honours ought to be examined.

The "British Association" sternly and obstinately refuses to give "General History" a special section, denying history a scientific status. Whilst Japanese scholars in the farthest East feel the necessity of the study of history, we, the first and most powerful nation, are still afraid of it, or treat it as the fanciful crotchet of some whimsical dreamer. We allow papers to be read at our great annual gatherings, "for the promotion of science," on bees, ants, and dogs, on their ways and manners; their high artistic powers; their intellectual faculties and social organization; their moral sense of duty, and deep feeling of gratitude; but man—the crowning product of Creation—the maker of his own destiny, is considered unworthy of a strictly scientific treatment.

In Germany, Austro-Hungary, Italy, France and America, HISTORY is at all the Colleges and Universities the most important subject, and with us, it is the most neglected. And yet history is the mighty record of God's True Revelation, for His spirit manifests itself as law in the religious, social, political, and artistic deeds of man, the active or passive agent of the histories of all countries, races and nations.

Man consists of *matter*, forming the constituent particles of his body; and of *mind*, the cause of his perceptions, sensations and consciousness. If we are able to treat matter and mind in the unit-man scientifically, what can prevent us from treating the collective actions of any number of such units in a scientific way? If anatomy, physiology and psychology are sciences, why not history, which is but a systematized record of man's individual and collective development? If man in his isolation as savage or prehistoric man, in anthropology and archæology, may be treated scientifically, why not the whole of humanity in history? Do the laws of causation apply to everything in nature, except to man, so

soon as he leaves his savage state, and enters, in accordance with his very organization, into social bonds; no longer acting isolatedly but collectively as family, tribe, or nation? Action which we can trace in man, like in all other phenomena, must be the result of *force*; and wherever forces are at work, they must be subject to laws which may be more or less complicated but which we ought to be able to trace on the reliable basis of causation.

All our physical sciences are founded on an inquiry into the working of acting and counteracting forces. Can we deny man to be a physically constituted being, whose organization engenders mental action, the outgrowth of his vital force? Motion or action is the sign of life; life in man is the primary cause of all his thoughts, words and deeds. All phenomena in the universe are the results of either a static or dynamic force, or of a combination of both. The former manifests itself as the law of conservation of energy; the latter as the ever-varying force of moving activity. Applying these elements to humanity we find that *morals* correspond to the *static*, restraining, corrective force, which is in fact the *passive* element in our nature. Moral laws are generally given in the *negative* form; whilst mind with its intellectual and reasoning power is undoubtedly the *dynamic*, pushing, inquiring, thinking, arguing, inventing force—the *active* element; for all human efforts in arts, sciences, discoveries and inventions are of a *positive* nature. To trace the working of these two undoubtedly existing forces in the development of humanity must be the task of history, and we may thus scientifically reduce all the complicated phenomena of history to a *plus* or *minus* of their relative qualities and quantities.

As the universe strives to attain harmony, and as all its infinite particles work to this aim—so the historian finds that humanity endeavours unconsciously or consciously to reach one goal—civilization, which can only be the attainment of a perfect balance between the static and dynamic, or the moral and intellectual forces working in humanity.

The whole study of history, from a higher general and

scientific point of view, resolves itself into a correct tracing of the disturbances in the two forces. All the phenomena in the flowing and ebbing ocean of the past and present ; all religious, social, political, artistic and scientific events, may philosophically be referred to a conflict of morals with intellect, or of intellect with morals. Wars, revolutions, the downfall of empires, changes in dynasties, religious and scientific controversies, are simply endeavours to re-adjust and discover the equipoise between the static and dynamic forces, pervading not only the material universe, but also intellectual, self-conscious humanity.

In history, as throughout nature, there is a certain *oneness*, engendered by the law of causation to which the forces working in humanity are as subject as all other forces, but there is at the same time an eternal change and life—an expanding life, that is never to-day what it was yesterday ; that, in spite of thousands of survivals in savage prejudices, and inherited false notions, continually extends, drawing larger numbers into the vortex of a self-conscious life of higher moral and mental culture.

It is still thought extremely doubtful in certain quarters, whether Ethics and *Æsthetics* can be brought *à priori* under fixed rules and be reduced to first principles ; history as the “ Science of Sciences ” *à posteriori* gains in tracing these first principles in importance and power day by day. In fact everything in the development of humanity resolves itself into history. Not history that receives its garbled facts from narrow-minded Annalists, Chroniclers and Compilers ; who generally note down only what serves their purposes ; leave out what does not suit them ; colour incidents with the gloomy tints and views of their sectarian, national, political, or social prejudices ;—but history based on the eternal cosmical laws of man’s true and undefiled nature. For nature is truth which does not exclusively reveal itself to the inner consciousness of some chosen metaphysician, or the untutored thoughtlessness of the savage, but speaks audibly and intelligibly through the mighty voice of history, forcing man from the lofty height of

speculations to the firm ground of reality, showing eternal law in his gradual development. "The History of mankind is a continuation of the Natural History of the Universe, and must have discoverable laws," says Dr. Maudsley, one of the keenest thinkers of our times.

More than 2,000 years ago, Aristotle attempted to systematize the study of poetry and even that of art, by tracing laws in the products of playful imagination; but the study and composition of history is still left to mere *Chance*, whether clad in the garb of self-interest, religious prejudice or political expediency, and whether called Providence or Predestination. "Chance has been recognised alike in all ages and in all climes; by the peasant in his cottage, and by the king on his throne. Chance is apparently the mainspring of industry, of trade, of party politics, and of international diplomacy." But this assumption of chance, this radical *belief* in chance (Predestination or Providence), is virtual *unbelief* in universal order, producing self-deception, and a negation of all moral law, for it does away with the fundamental element of science, and a strict concatenation of cause and effect. History, studied or written from the providential chance point of view, is certainly nothing but an unconnected, and therefore dry register of detached facts which might have happened quite differently, if it had so pleased chance. But the most important duty of an Historian is to show to conviction that the facts could not have happened differently, and that, if the same causes were to be at work, they would inevitably again produce the same effects.

The palm of having attempted to place history on a higher scientific basis must be given to the German, SAMUEL PUFENDORF (1632—1690), who laid down the principles of European international law, illustrated by historical facts and statistical records, in his great work, "*Elementa Juris prudentiæ Universalis*," published 1660. Pufendorf's works are still considered of great importance, and though he intended to write for diplomatists only, starting from a strictly practical and political point of view, they must be

looked upon as the first after the Reformation in which the composition of history was attempted on new and scientific principles. Assisted by the generous Elector Palatine, Charles Louis, Pufendorf established the first special chair for the study of "National and Natural Law based on History" in the University of Heidelberg. This was 1661—218 years ago, and he must be put down as the founder of "Sociology," which science begins to be timidly mentioned now in our educational establishments.

Chronologically next to Pufendorf stands the Italian, GIOVANNI BATTISTA VICO (1660 or 1670—1744), who, 65 years after the publication of Pufendorf's great work, issued his "Principles of History" in 1725, under the title "*Principij di una scienza nuova d'interno alla comune natura delle nazioni.*" In this work he pleaded the necessity of a more philosophical method in the composition of history, and propounded the theory that there is an organic development in the different epochs which can only be understood through a correct knowledge of the social and political condition of any nation; the most important condition, the religious, he could not well touch upon under Papal authority. Yet in a broad spirit he endeavoured to trace evidences of a moral government all over the world, and assumed that there is an interdependence between cause and effect in the complex actions of man; that justice and progress are the results of ruling forces, and that our intellectual and political life is guided by a harmony of feelings which pervades the whole of humanity.

He was followed in England by Viscount BOLINGBROKE (1672—1751), who published ten years later, 1735, his "Letters on the Study and Use of History." How far Pufendorf and Bolingbroke's earlier works influenced Vico, or how far Pufendorf and Vico were instrumental in the composition of Bolingbroke's work on history, it would be equally difficult to decide. It is an historical fact that Bolingbroke was the forerunner of VOLTAIRE in France, and of LESSING and HERDER in Germany. Whatever the failings of his character may have been, they were the failings of his social position and education;

he saw and felt deeply that the minds of students were stored "with crude, unruminated facts and sentences," with meaningless dates and arbitrarily assumed incidents, obscuring, rather than clearing up past events. He deprived Scaliger, Bochart, Petavius, Usher, and even Marsham of their bright halo of authority; he mercilessly exposed the tricks of these "historical jugglers," and asserted boldly that they had joined disjointed passages, and used fantastical allegories as real facts, and similitudes of sounds, though utterly ignorant of philology, to prop up their preconceived historical systems. With a few words he unmasked the pompous dignitaries of learning, and had, of course, the whole herd of scholastics against him. They saw danger in the study of "General History," and up to our own days have succeeded in excluding it from our educational establishments.

What is the use of History? To disturb the mind of youth; to arouse a spirit of inquiry, and to undermine time-hallowed authorities. We cannot trade better, sleep, eat and drink more efficaciously with any amount of historical knowledge, and who is to master all the dates and facts of history? Bolingbroke endeavoured to answer these objections, in comparing two great captains in history, the courageous Lucullus, who was made great by the study of history, and the Duke of Marlborough, who probably never read Xenophon, or any other historian. The former became a military genius through historical training, and the latter, who triumphed over the veteran armies of France, was a born military genius. The Roman commander had on his side experience cultivated by study; whilst Marlborough had inborn genius united with skill, acquired by actual practice. Study does not lessen genius, but genius can do without study, is the conclusion to which the generality of mankind must come from these examples. "But such examples are very rare," says Bolingbroke, "and when they happen, it will still be true, that they could have had fewer blemishes, and would have come nearer to perfection of private and public virtue in all the arts of peace and achievements of war, if the views of such men had

been enlarged, and their sentiments ennobled, by acquiring that cast of thought and the temper of mind which will grow up and become habitual in every man who applies himself early to the study of history."

Whilst history, in spite of the brilliant part England has played in the world's commercial, political, and scientific development, and the great isolated historians, like Robertson, Hume, Gibbon, and Hallam, which she had produced, still remains neglected, because we have not yet altogether freed ourselves from those insular barriers which prevent us from extending our sympathies to all nations and races, to all creeds and denominations—the French have used history one-sidedly for national and political purposes.

MONTESQUIEU was constructive ; VOLTAIRE destructive ; and ROUSSEAU socialistic in the treatment of history ; they all three broke with the past ; they all three saw it superseded by a yet unknown future ; they felt the terribly disturbed state of the moral and intellectual forces in the French nation, and attempted to restore the balance, or through its more equitable readjustment to transform France ; but intolerant priests, bigoted aristocratic idlers, ignorant teachers of inherited falsehoods, quarrelling Jesuits, debating Jansenists, debauched official villains—all of them ignorant of history—prevented the restoration of the lost balance of forces, and they had to learn through torrents of blood, and the sacrifice of more than a million and a half of murdered human beings, what they had refused to learn from Greek and Roman History ; the long list of sanguinary deeds, recorded in Mediæval History ; the Thirty Years' War, &c.

Not the wild, ignorant, bloodthirsty rebels or the fanatical demagogues can be condemned by true and honest historians, but the blind aristocrats, bureaucrats, priests, monks, and bigot who neglected their education and drove them to despair and madness, and who, instead of studying history, and learning from the past lessons to guide the destinies of the people, abused, vilified and cursed those who recognised the disturbed state of the balance of forces in the French people, and tried

to readjust it. They ought to have known the causes which, more than a century before, had produced the Grand Remonstrance in England, with all its deplorable but wholesome consequences. Those also who wished to cure the political evils in France, ignorant of history, allowed themselves to be carried away by the excitable and impatient character of the masses. In a truly French spirit all was exaggerated. Martyrs were looked down upon as individuals that *expected* death; whilst fanatical "sans-culottes" were glorified because they *rushed* into death. A feverish longing for a speedy change in religion, political and social relations, burst asunder all the ties of society. The religiously blind were suddenly to see, and the politically deaf and dumb to hear and to speak. A normal historical development in an atmosphere of passion, ignorance, and superstition is impossible when national pride and wild fanaticism rule supreme. When nations sing hymns, whether pious or revolutionary, Klio, the sober muse of history, retires and awaits a less emotional moment to make her voice heard.

The French in general have not yet learnt to write history. They always treat facts from a one-sided national point of view; just as the English, from a one-sided sectarian, political, party, or merely municipal point of view.

THIERS wrote an analysis of the Republic to prove the necessity of the Empire which followed, and to teach the French that the only possible government was that at the head of which he at last found himself as President, namely, a republic, which began its career with the slaughter of more than a million of human beings. His masterly histories of "the Consulate" and "the Empire," describing the glorious victories, the waste of national treasure, self-sacrificing enthusiasm, and human life, all ending in the melancholy captivity and exile of the originator and instigator of, and principal actor in this anachronistic Imperial Roman tragedy, ought to have opened the eyes of all the vain-glorious, politically attitudinizing French comedians—if they had studied history scientifically. But the leaders, or rather mis-leaders,

of France started with the false notion that they might use powder and shot to play at Roman Emperors, Consuls, and Prætors, conquering half the world. Had they carefully read the records of the past, they would have prevented the last spurious and still more anachronistic performance of the second Franco-Roman Empire. So long as the French do not study, write, read, and teach history from an *objective*, and purely scientific point of view, they will have no stability, and no settled social and political organization. Like the Romans who would not understand that there could be nations who did not deem it an honour to be Romans, the French cannot see that there are countries beside their own, and human beings that have the inherited natural right to defend themselves victoriously, especially if wantonly attacked.

Another example of French historical one-sidedness is found in GUIZOT, who was literally raised from the historical lecture hall to the highest State dignities in France, showing how amply talent, study, and industry on the field of literature are rewarded in a country that is always alive to the charms of intellect, wit, and rhetorical power, if used to flatter national prejudices and vanity. In all his writings Guizot was always the exclusive Frenchman, and could never understand the mighty cosmopolitan spirit of the Teutonic nations. In his "History of the English Revolution," however, he attained the position of an impartial judge, and is even more trustworthy than many an English writer, for he stands high above party spirit and theological bias, taking neither the views of a High or Low churchman, nor of a dissenting Puritan. Guizot, to a certain degree, was a philosophical historian, and considered civilization the aim of nations in particular, and of humanity in general; but, unhappily, the most complete of all civilizations in his eyes was that of France, though he never tells us clearly what he means by the word civilization. He finds fault with the English because they are genial, but unsystematic, like their language. He considers everything in England practical, but bigoted and narrow-minded, and asserts that the English people have contributed nothing

towards an extension of the horizon of human intellect. He must have forgotten Francis Lord Bacon, Sir Isaac Newton, Hooker, Chillingworth, Shakespeare, Milton, Locke, Hume, and the long list of deistic writers of England, the fathers of modern freethought and free inquiry. "The English," he says, "are great as a nation, but not as individuals." In this one epigrammatic sentence we may recognise the distorted Franco-Roman spirit, swaying French logicians and historians, who look upon the State abstraction as an entity without ever taking the individual citizens and their interests into consideration. Guizot speaks of the grandeur of a nation, and at the same time denies the existence of grandeur in the individuals who compose the nation. Because the English have learnt, in spite of their insisting upon individual freedom, to act in common whenever required, Guizot blames them, and extols his compatriots who have not yet freed themselves of a very primitive tribal egotism, and abhor to act in common when their vanity does not serve as the mainspring of their combined action. Dialectical sophistry in the annals of history has done more harm than correct reasoners can readily make good. If the whole be iron or steel, the particles must be iron or steel also. The Roman spirit, mode of thinking and rhetoric have gradually pervaded modern French thought through an undue admiration and mimicry of ancient Rome, and a culpable neglect of the study of history. The refined discernment and the quick emotional instinct of the spirited French have thus been directed into a false groove of historical reasoning; so long as the French do not divest themselves of their exclusively French mode of thinking, we must look upon their historical works and historians as national curiosities and peculiarities; but we shall seek in vain for true scientific historians amongst them.

The activity of the French on the field of history was surpassed by the Germans, who have gained the palm of excellence in every branch of historiography. Like the ancient Greeks, the Germans were forced through their geographical position to devote themselves to the culture of intellect, for

they were politically checked in the exercise of all broader social and commercial activity. The historical development of Germany was slow, but sure. It was not so brilliant as that of England, but profounder; it was not so spirited as that of France, but more systematic. At a time when the English and French possessed unsurpassed classical writers in their vernaculars, the Germans were still struggling for a common language. The learned spoke and wrote Latin; the upper classes conversed in French; whilst the lower prattled in innumerable unintelligible dialects. The Reformation wrought extraordinary changes, not only in a religious but also in a lingual direction. To oppose Romanism and its Latinizing influences, enthusiastic divines composed popular hymns, homilies, tales, fables, and sermons in the language of the people; they continued what LUTHER had begun, to model and remodel the German language, and brought it into a more harmonious and settled grammatical form. From the time of the Reformation history became the most important study of the German nation. The old formulæ and most of the dogmas of the Romish church had been based on prophecy, revelation, tradition, and history. The apostolic succession was either true or a fiction; Isidor's Decrees were either a fact or an historical forgery; the whole theologico-dogmatic fabric; the whole social and political organization of all the Christian nations in general, and of the German people in particular, was therefore built on history, either true or false. If true, the Reformation had no basis; if false, the Reformation had to disperse the historical mist, the dark clouds and gloomy night obscuring truth, and to endeavour to ascertain real facts upon which to reconstruct Christianity.

These circumstances forced theologians above all to criticise, to inquire into, and to study the past from a more correct historical point of view. Whilst in England the Anglican establishment was a continuation of the Roman Catholic Church, and only involved a formal change of some dogmatic details and ceremonials; the Reformation in Germany was a

direct cataclysm that swept away an ancient, spiritual, religious, and educational world, built up for more than 1500 years on a basis, the correctness of which was not only to be doubted, but the hollowness of which was to be demonstrated on historical grounds.

When in England king, lords, and commons once had agreed to be Anglicans, Anglicanism became an accomplished political fact, protected by endless parliamentary bills, and the Church, thus strengthened, required no support either from learned inquiry or history. The continuity was neither interrupted nor broken, and was therefore not to be sought for and reconstructed on a firm historical foundation. This was quite different in Germany. Protestantism had to work its way into the hearts and brains of the people by means of persuasion, deep learning, and, above all, by a higher moral and intellectual force which was stimulated to continuous activity by an equally learned body of antagonists—the Romish priests—who were not silenced by *penal laws*, but appeared in the arena of learning as Jesuits, Benedictines, and a number of other monastic associations, and continued to teach, to argue, and to engage in historical, classical, and philosophical controversies. The struggle of the modern intellectual progress in Germany was a free and genuine war, no longer on sanguinary battle-fields with guns and cannons, but in lecture halls, pulpits, and ponderous learned books, where no human blood, but printer's ink was shed in incredible quantities, to foster peace and a higher spiritual life in the people.

HISTORY was the great weapon on both sides; written or unwritten, sacred or profane. Facts had to be newly studied and investigated, and their causes and effects in the past had to be traced on different principles. This led to a deeper inquiry into historical authorities, and aroused an unparalleled enthusiasm for history in the middle classes and religious sects. In Germany kings, princes, and dukes took only a moderate interest in the gigantic movement, to arrest the progress of which they were powerless. The smallness of their dominions made it easy for any learned critic or historian

whose sceptical ideas were considered objectionable in one state, to find refuge, and often the very highest honours in another.

When the celebrated philosopher, Christian Wolf, delivered a lecture at Halle: "*De Philosophia Sinensium Morali*" (on the moral philosophy of the Chinese), in which he asserted that Christian ethics and Chinese morals were the same, though Confucius lived nearly five centuries before Christ, Professor Wolf was ordered in 1723—156 years ago—to quit the dominions of the first King of Prussia on peril to be hanged if found twenty-four hours after the issue of the order within the frontiers of the Prussian kingdom. He went over to Cassel, where he was appointed Professor of Philosophy at the University of Marburg.

The spirit of critical inquiry in the Germans was not to be checked or tired out. It has just been shown that the greater historical activity in general originated in theological and scholastic requirements, and was kept in continual motion by a wholesome controversial energy which engaged the whole thinking and reasoning powers of the German nation.

As the geographical position is a most important factor in the development of the character of a nation, I will now refer more particularly to those territorial causes which necessitated a broader and more correct study of history in Germany. Encircled by Russians, Slavons, Poles, Magyars, Servians, Croatians, Italians, French, Belgians, Dutch, Swedes, Danes, Norwegians, Livonians, and Courlanders, the Germans were forced to know something of the customs and manners, mode of living and thinking, reasoning and acting of these different peoples, all of whom were often seen as unwelcome guests, sword in hand, on the banks of the Spree, the Elbe, the Weser, the Rhine, the Danube, or in the plains of central Germany in villages and towns, plundering and murdering; though the Germans could neither understand their languages, nor discover why they came to disturb the peace of the fatherland. Thus they were practically forced to study the history, origin, and languages of at least the most important of

these invading nations. This was a further cause of the universality of learning prevailing in Germany. There is *not a single* historical work of any importance, written in any European or Asiatic language, that is not translated into German. I wish I could say the same of the English literature. All the classical and more prominent historical works of the Chinese and Japanese, Persians, Indians, and Arabs are commented upon and brought into systematic order. All that had been written worth reading and studying on Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, and the Jews by French, Italian, English, and native authors exists in German, augmented by a vast amount of original research, carefully arranged. Philological, mythical, religious, and historical similarities or differences are pointed out, analogies and comparisons are drawn with courageous impartiality. No historical phenomenon—and nations are mere embodiments of the phenomena of history—has been treated by the Germans as insignificant. Through a classical and philosophical training they acquired a deeper insight into the astounding sameness of human nature. In spiritual contact with all the religious sects and nationalities of the world, they could not help seeing that each nation, each religious sect had good and bad, wise and foolish, learned and ignorant members; but that in all of them the virtuous and the generous prevailed, and this sentiment pre-eminently qualified the Germans for writing history. They broke through the artificial barriers of tribal exclusiveness and national egotism. Only such a people can boast of true historians, who above all require broad minds and large hearts.

In this spirit wrote the genial Gotthold Ephraim LESSING (1729-1781), who boldly attacked antiquated traditions, prejudices, and fallacies. He proclaimed the grand doctrine of *tolerance*, not as a mere emotional element, but as the only possible foundation of the higher culture of humanity. To put an end to sham learning and historical falsifications was the great aim of Lessing.

He was supported by the poetical Johann Gottfried HERDER (1744-1803), who in his writings was always refined and above

all *humane*. He was the founder of humanism no longer in the scholastic, but in the true sense of the word. He was the first to point out the importance of physical geography in connection with history. He drew the attention of students to the configuration of the different countries, inhabited by different nations; to the influence of plants and vegetable products; of animals and animal food on the formation of the character of tribes and races, and to man in his bodily and mental organization. He assumed man to be created for immortality and hope, for virtue and truth. He must be further considered the founder of ethnology, in a higher scientific sense, for he discourses on the various organizations of the people inhabiting the highlands or plains of Asia; of the Africans; the islanders in the tropics, and the American aborigines. He was anxious to discard chance; and attempted to treat history with an universal grasp, never before attained by any other writer.

Johann Gottlieb FICHTE (1762-1814) worked out Herder's principles, and asserted history to be the safest and the most impressive, the truest and only reliable teacher of humanity. He was, however, in every branch of speculative and practical science far surpassed by Immanuel KANT (1724-1804), who in his plan of a "general history from a cosmopolitan point of view" (*Idee zu einer Allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht*, 1784) laid down with masterly clearness the distinction between opinions, faith, and knowledge. History in France is a matter of opinion, biassed by national pride; in England a matter of faith, fostered by inherited prejudices or coloured by party-spirit; and in Germany a matter of knowledge based on fearless research, and a correct understanding of the causes producing the different historical phenomena.

Kant's method of treating physical, moral, and historical subjects brought about a total revolution in the system of our studies. On his principles Schelling, Stahl, Hegel, William von Humboldt, Schlegel, and Gervinus attempted, with more or less success, to solve the great problem of a scientific treatment of history.

To consider general history as the best means to promote the highest culture of our mind, to arouse our true moral nature, to prevent all stagnation in science and politics, and to make us worthy of the position which we occupy as self-conscious human beings, is the earnest endeavour of all those who have made humanity, and not minerals, chemical substances, plants and animals, cats and dogs, or ants and caterpillars, their exclusive study. Let *specialists* believe in the importance of their particular pursuits, but let them not undervalue the glorious efforts of philosophical *generalizers*, who bring into order and system their detached researches, promoting real civilization.

It will interest you to hear that more than 336 independent, original, historical *standard* works have been published in Germany during this century, and altogether about 6,288 works, making, on an average, 82 historical publications per annum. Amongst the writers are the names of Moser, J. v. Müller, Eichhorn, Heeren, Bohlen, Pölitx, Rotteck, Schlosser, Arndt, Weber, Becker, Gesenius, Neander, Tuch, Dahlman, Niebuhr, Curtius, Lepsius, Mommsen, Ranke, Görres, Hormayer, Pfister, Sybel, Lassen, Uhlmann, Spiegel, Max Müller, &c. ; each of them a host of learning and free inquiry in himself.

I think every one who tells us of our shortcomings, though we may not like it, does us a real service. We shall never be able to remedy evils, if we are not made acquainted with them. It is of no use to boast *we are making history*; let the Germans study it, but let us ponder over the possibility, how much better we would make history, if we had the same historical training as the Germans. It is only a very short time ago, since 1851, when the genius of the lamented Prince Consort destroyed for ever our insular and mere tribal position, that we began to realize the fact that we are, after all, but completing particles of a whole—Humanity. In opening to the inspection of all nations the artistic and industrial products of the world, the word “international” dawned upon us, for the first time, in all its glorious meaning. Timidly we

began to quit our oystershells of national pride and prejudices ; reluctantly we discarded our narrow and sectarian pretensions, and our doleful contempt for everything intellectual beyond our island. We were suddenly enabled to discriminate between true national greatness, and mere national presumption. We saw ourselves far behind others. We instituted Schools of Art, and, only nine years ago, forced the youth of England into Board Schools, and established, about the same time, the first Royal Historical Society.

Any one who has studied the historical productions of the last fifteen or twenty years, must have observed the remarkable change that has come over the spirit of historical inquiry in England. The Essayists and Reviewers, Macaulay, Bishop Colenso, Dean Stanley, Carlyle, Principals Tulloch and Caird, Buckle, Lecky, J. R. Green, &c., have infused new life into history, and ventured fearlessly on new paths of independent research.

In politics, commerce, industry, use of inventions, and a progressive social development, England, and England alone, is the country in which morals and intellect, stability and progress, monarchy and democracy, conservatism and liberalism, are, if not perfectly, at all events, best balanced by means of our love of freedom and our practical realism. It is, therefore, our peremptory duty consistently to strive to make England stand at the head of all nations in independent historical inquiry and research ; for the more nations study history, the more they become acquainted with the causes of the commotions and volcanic throes in other countries, the more surely will they be able to master and altogether to avoid them. "War and its horrors will gradually disappear, private and national rights will be better understood, tyranny and oppression on the one hand, and popular revolutions and violence on the other, will be rendered powerless, and there will be established the incontrovertible truth that historical knowledge is real power." Historians have, unhappily, their defilers and opponents. Frederick SCHILLER, one of the greatest poets, when appointed (1789) Professor of General

History at the University of Jena, proved, in a masterly introductory lecture, not only the usefulness of history, but at the same time also pointed out the opposition which its study had to encounter. Metaphysicians and scientific pedants are its greatest enemies. They both hate reforms, they despise inquiry, and have a horror of comparisons and analogies. There is no more implacable enemy to progress, no more envious opponent of research, than the narrow-minded scholastic fanatic, the learned "ignoramus," who knows only too well that free inquiry must scatter his cherished assumptions to the winds as so many empty illusions. Trembling for their daily bread, dependent on antiquated, long-exploded chronological and historical fallacies, the bigoted everywhere obstruct the path of history. But the dynamic (intellectual) force of progress is continually and irresistibly at work, and drives us to seek for law in solar systems, in stars and nebulae, crystallizations and chemical combinations; in plants and vegetables, the rays of the sun, the formation of the earth's crust, the very origin of the different species of animals. Everywhere we are indefatigable in tracing law and order. We find it in our statistical tables of births, marriages, and deaths; in the rise and fall of our stocks, bonds, railway and other shares. We have systematized "supply and demand" in trade and commerce. Only the variegated stages of man's moral and intellectual activity, as they present themselves in the different epochs of history, in different countries and nations under different circumstances—man, in fact, "with all his sublime yearnings, measuring suns and planets, speaking, by means of electricity, at distances of thousands of miles, reducing *space* in its dimensions; travelling, by means of fire and water, at an unheard-of speed, reducing *time* in its duration; man, in his slow and gradual historical development, is to be the least important of our studies, and no object of our scientific consideration."

The universe is ruled by gravitation, manifesting itself as attraction and repulsion. Harmony in the universe can only exist through a perfect balance of these two forces. Humanity

is ruled by consciousness, manifesting itself in morals and intellect, evolving, by a process of progressive continuity, a perfect balance between the two forces, in order to promote the happiness of the greatest possible number of human beings, driven by their very nature to form one common, loving brotherhood, enacting history, and striving to fulfil the true destiny of mankind, individually and collectively — to HUMANIZE HUMANITY.