Maqāṣid of Al-Ghazālī (also fol. 2r is superscribed كتاب مقاصد الفلاسفة للغزالى), and at the end a reference to the same author's *Tahāfut* is to be found. Yet the work is not the same as the one mentioned above (see Professor Rieu's Catalogue, p. 494). If this one were authentic we should have two works of Al-Ghazālī composed later than the *Tahāfut*, in order, as Dr. Malter points out (p. x), "to give a decided expression to his final philosophical views." The investigations on this point are, as we see, anything but exhausted, and Dr. Malter will have an opportunity of entering into the same when preparing his promised edition of the *Maqāṣid*, of which a specimen has already been published by Dr. Beer.

As to the work itself, it consists of queries and replies, a form much affected by Arabic scholastics, though not original. A survey of the contents is given by Steinschneider, l.c., p. 339. Dr. Malter has added to the first part of his edition a German translation and copious notes, which bear testimony not only to the enthusiasm with which he undertook his work, but also to his close acquaintance with the literature concerned. His treatment of the text of the version, as well as the Arabic excerpts of the *Maqāṣid*, prove how well he is qualified to undertake the publication of the portions of that work not yet printed. The glossary appended to Part II does not contain much that is new. For "mugtihadûn," p. xiv, rem. 5 (twice), read *muǧtahidûn*.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

BRITISH INDIA. By R. W. FRAZER, LL.B., I.C.S. (retired). "Story of the Nations." 8vo. (London: Unwin, 1896.)

Considering the space at his command and the other necessary limitations imposed upon him in a book of this sort, Mr. Frazer's "British India" must be pronounced a most satisfactory piece of work, a credit to the series in which it appears. To bring within less than four hundred not too closely printed pages, the connection of the West

with the East, from the time of Alexander the Great to the present day, is in itself no light or easy task; while every page shows that the author is no mere haphazard compiler, but one who had already studied for his own pleasure much of the overwhelming mass of material pertaining to his subject. The distribution of the matter seems to be in due proportion to the relative importance of the subjects treated; and the result is a compact and fairly complete narrative, bright and lively enough not to repel even the most superficial of general readers, and sufficiently full and accurate to supply the student with a handy compendium for ordinary reference.

The only criticism that suggests itself in regard to the apportionment of space has reference to the necessity or otherwise of the introductory chapters (pp. 1–77). It cannot be said that they are absolutely out of place. Nay, they give us a rapid, well-written, and interesting summary of the intercourse between Europe and India from the earliest ages up to the eighteenth century; and there can be no doubt that this portico gives to the whole edifice a balance and proportion which it would otherwise lack. But *British* India being the theme, these introductory chapters might have disappeared, for the sake of a fuller development here and there of the especial subject. In reading the book one feels vaguely a sense of over-compression in some of the earlier chapters which treat of the commencements of our empire; and in the last chapter the effect would have been increased rather than diminished by somewhat fuller details and statistics of our existing system of administration.

For the reason just assigned, or perhaps because Mr. Frazer feels himself more at home in the modern period, the second half of the book has considerably more dash and vigour than what precedes. The story of the two Sikh campaigns of 1845–6 and 1848–9 is told in excellent style, carrying the reader on without pause or hesitation. Again, the events of the Mutiny are narrated with great spirit and conciseness; in fact, it would be

impossible to find anywhere, in the same number of pages, an equally comprehensive and lucid history of the dangers encountered and the spirit-stirring deeds then done by our countrymen. The bird's-eye view on p. 261, which Mr. Frazer has unearthed from an old number of the *Illustrated London News*, is most useful: it enables us to realize graphically, what we all more or less forget, that the Mutiny, however extensive and serious, was strictly limited to Northern India, and in it did not pass beyond the central portion. To the east, in Bengal, and to the west, in the Panjab, the disturbances were few and of comparatively little importance.

Much as there is to engage our earnest and absorbed attention in present-day India, that "weary Titan . . . staggering on to her goal," to a future fate which we can only dimly surmise, it is the earlier half of British Indian history which exercises the greatest fascination upon most readers. It is only natural that this should be so. Besides the romantic aspect of the events themselves, our interest is further excited by the tremendous political and parliamentary struggles to which those events gave rise; and the glittering rhetoric of a great writer of this century has surrounded them with an added glamour.

Accordingly we find that Mr. Frazer, with sure judgment, has allotted nearly one-fifth of his space to the forty years (1748–1785) covered by the public careers of Robert Clive and Warren Hastings. In dealing with those years, he has still further shown a true appreciation of the facts by throwing what he has to say into the form of biographies of these two exceptional men. England then, as ever, relied on the vigour and genius of her sons to build up the fabric of her great empire; then, as now, the men she wanted rarely failed her.

Disguise it to ourselves as we may, our rule in India began in military superiority, and on that base it will rest so long as we are able to retain hold of the country. Military weakness, the causes of which were many and various, brought the Moghul empire to its doom; and

Europeans were not very long in discovering the tremendous engine that they possessed in a disciplined infantry (p. 73). The rest was easy. From the time that Dupleix first showed the way, Europeans have never met with any decisive or long-continued check from any native force that ever took the field against them. Mr. Frazer is far too wise to give in his adhesion to Seeley's heresy that general causes suffice to account for our conquest of India. According to Professor Seeley, it was no quality of the Englishman that gave the country to him instead of to the Frenchman; and the heroism attaching to the conquest, if any, was displayed by the Indians themselves, who formed the bulk of our armies and conquered their own country for us. But anyone reading the contemporary records cannot fail to see that our success was not due merely to persistent but undeserved good fortune. If the Frenchman was as good as the Englishman at this particular work, why did he fail when we succeeded? If the Indians were the real conquerors, why did they succumb whenever pitted against us and prevail whenever we led them? Assuredly the difference lay in the quality of the men and in nothing else.

In dealing with the career of Warren Hastings, the man who did more than any other to acquire India for us, Mr. Frazer adopts the more favourable judgment which has lately prevailed, and is, indeed, the only one that can be come to after an unbiassed examination of the original authorities. In reading them one is struck with the remarkable fulness and accuracy of Hastings' information on the origin and recent history of all the Indian States. His agents had served him well, and if Macaulay would only have accepted Hastings' facts, he would have been saved from many of his extraordinary misapprehensions. Burke may be more easily excused; he stood in the thick of the fight, and lived too near the events to easily distinguish the true from the false. Macaulay, on the contrary, had ample leisure to sift the abundant evidence upon the record. A convincing proof of his misleading

methods may be derived from a passage quoted by Sir John Strachey in his "Hastings and the Rohilla War." Read the paragraph with all the adjectives as they stand, and every statement is false: strike out all the adjectives, and every statement will become literally true.

No doubt, Warren Hastings adopted, consciously or unconsciously, the rules of Oriental statecraft; and judged by that standard, his conduct was that of an extremely upright and honourable man. That defence would cover absolutely everything in his acts to which objection has been made. Even if the European code of morals be substituted, it must be remembered that many things were condemned from ignorance of local conditions and precedents. For instance, the demand for aid in men and money from a subordinate ruler like Chait Singh of Benares, and that Rajah's subsequent deposition for default, were entirely consonant with Indian public-law of that period. The attempt to elevate Chait Singh into a sovereign ruler—an attempt renewed not many years ago—was rightly brushed aside by Hastings as pure absurdity. The Rajah of Benares was the subordinate of a subordinate, and would have been swept away long before by his overlord, the Nawab of Audh, had not Hastings interposed to preserve him.

In their natural revolt against past injustice some recent inquirers have failed to allow any shadows to appear in their portraits of Hastings' character. This is just as much a mistake in the opposite direction. For it is impossible to deny that in public life Hastings was very unforgiving. Whenever he had been slighted or thwarted, he concealed under the mildest and quietest of manners an implacable resolve to be revenged. The case of Chait Singh just referred to would show the truth of this assertion, were there space to state the facts or sum up the evidence.

Nor can all his plans be held as irreproachably wise. No one has yet touched, so far as I know, on what seems a cardinal error in the external policy adopted by Hastings, an error much more deep-seated, and more likely

to bring disaster, than Rohilla Wars, Benares insurrections, or Begam despoilings. Justly enough, as we must acknowledge now, he held the Mahrattas to be our most dangerous foe. In his mode of trying to avert the chance of being overwhelmed by them lay his only error. He bent all his energies to the task of forming a "buffer" state out of the Nawab Wazīr's dominions: an excellent device, if only his instrument could have been depended upon. But Shujā-ud-daulah was not merely untrustworthy; he was, we are convinced, absolutely hostile. In native estimation he was greater and more powerful at his death than he had been before the battle of Baksar. They did not look on him, nor did he in the least consider himself, as a crushed and helpless cipher in the hands of Hastings and the newly-risen British power. He had gained largely in territory in the Dūāb and Rohilkhand; and neither he nor other Indians shared our belief that we had been the donors of these accessions. Shujā-ud-daulah, from 1765 to 1774, was busy, with the aid of French officers, in raising a force of infantry disciplined in the European fashion. He evidently meant to try conclusions with us once more. Then, by a tremendous stroke of luck, we were saved from a fierce struggle for our supremacy by his unexpected death in January, 1775,[1] when he was only forty-eight years of age, and had before him, to all appearance, many years in which to make ready before he struck the blow. Instead of supporting the Nawab to the best of his power, Hastings ought to have weakened, so far as he could, a man who hardly concealed his intention of making another trial of his strength.

A few remarks in passing may be made as to such errors as we have noticed, due either to the author's oversight or the printer's carelessness. For example, on p. 125, line 12, "north-*east*" should be "north-*west*." Dupleix's rank (p. 76) was 7000 not 700, see Tibulle Hamont, "Dupleix," 143; and there is some discrepancy as to Hastings' first

[1] The exact date is the 26th January, 1775: see "Forrest," i, p. 208. The 6th February on p. 131 is wrong.

stay in India (p. 121), which was of fourteen, not ten years, see Lawson, 35, and Gleig, i, 33, 132; he landed October 8, 1750, and sailed November, 1764. "Mahandwāra" (p. 178) should be "Mukand-darah." On p. 206, R. M. Bird is given an honour he could not claim; if any one person did so, it was a still greater man, the late Right Hon. Holt Mackenzie, author of *Aīn haftam*, who "inaugurated" the modern system of revenue. But collection from "village communities" was a legacy from native times, and no invention of ours. Nor could Lord Macaulay (p. 214) consider whether official correspondence should be carried on in English or in the Indian tongues; that matter had settled itself long before he was born, and from the first days Englishmen had written to each other in English, and to Indian subordinates in an Indian language, as they do to this day. On p. 262 the year 1803 must be wrong: should it not be 1834? On p. 295, line 3 from foot, ought not *China* to read *Persia*? and on p. 311, line 4 from foot, is not *length* a slip of the pen for *height*?

Some further revision on such points as the above should be kept in view, in case the book is reprinted. For my own part, I should like a few more dates, without which history is as shapeless as a human body would be without any bones. For instance, the date of the very important battle of Pānīpat (p. 121) might be inserted. As usual, the old difficulty of the transliteration of Indian names crops up, and Mr. Frazer, rightly enough for his purpose, accepts the so-called Hunterian method. But, having got so far, it is a pity to propagate actual error in such forms as *Nasīr* for ناصِر *Nāsir*, *Daulā* for دولہ *Daulah*, and *Kārim* for کریم *Karīm*. If I mistake not, the *Kunwār* of p. 288 is identical with the *Koer* of p. 310; and there ought to be no accent on the last vowel. The name is कुँवर *Kunwar*, not कुँवार *Kunwār*.

A word or two, to the address of the publisher, may also be added on the subject of the illustrations. In a cheap book it is perhaps unfair to ask for very much, so nothing

need be said about the feeble, blurred look of most of them. But two or three are positively execrable. Akbar (p. 59) appears to have suffered from a cancerous sore, which has eaten away the whole face between the nose and the lower lip. Clive (p. 79) and Hastings (p. 137) seem to have recently recovered from a bad attack of small-pox, the effects of which are only too visible. Hastings' portrait I have compared with an impression in the original work (1786), and the reproduction quite distorts the original engraving. Hastings, at his best, was slightly-built and sloping-shouldered; but in the picture his right side looks positively deformed. This defect is caused by the blurring over of the detail in the original. In addition, the expression of the mouth and of the whole face is entirely altered. Again, the portrait of Clive chosen for insertion seems to me too sweet-looking about the mouth, and not half gross-featured enough to represent faithfully the essentially earthy nature of the man.

A word of praise at parting must be accorded to Mr. Frazer's last chapter on the material and moral progress of British India during the last forty years. Let us hope that the information therein conveyed may help to dispel some of the vast ignorance of things Indian, which is so prevalent among the "great British Public," who generally know as little of the marvellous work we are doing in India, as they do of how we have won our way to the foremost place in that wonderful land, the cradle of many a reputation, the grave of many an unfulfilled renown.

March 18, 1897. W. IRVINE.

WITH THE DUTCH IN THE EAST. By Captain W. COOL, Dutch Engineers. Translated from the Dutch by G. J. TAYLOR. 8vo, pp. 365. (London: Luzac, 1897.)

This work is a sketch of the Dutch military operations in Lombok, in the year 1894. And it gives incidentally in a long and interesting chapter (pp. 46–165) a fairly full