

'French Revolution.' "I think," he said, one day, "that M. Thiers, who is at bottom a thorough monarchist, would write a still better history of the Empire; but I fear he will never get the time to do it." The time to begin the work, at any rate, was got for him by his dismissal from Louis Philippe's Government in 1840. Nearly all his leisure, during the next five-and-twenty years or more, was diligently employed in collecting and elaborating the materials for this stupendous undertaking, and the first volume being published in 1845, it was continued at intervals until the twentieth appeared in 1863, the twenty-first, which was published in 1869, being a rather disjointed supplement to it. As regards literary style and workmanship, it is hardly necessary to say that this is a most masterly production. For clear, compact, and incisive diction, for vigorous portraiture and dignified narrative, it is superior to the 'French Revolution,' and to nearly every other book that has ever been written in this department of literature. Dealing largely in military events, its brilliant descriptions of battles and all the operations of war are hardly to be rivalled, and its unravellings of political complications and expositions of political problems and the principles underlying them, have all the appearance of wisdom. There is no reason to suppose, moreover, that Thiers was not as honest in his intentions as he was evidently painstaking in the execution of his task. In the Preface to his twelfth volume, apologizing for the slowness of the work, he set forth the conditions of historic writing which he had prescribed for himself:—"One might proceed more rapidly, I acknowledge; but I entertain such respect for the mission of history that the fear of alleging what is inexact fills me with confusion. I have no peace until I can find proof for the object of my doubts; I search for it everywhere; I do not stop till I have reached it or till I have acquired a certainty that it does not exist. In this case, compelled to pronounce as a judge, I speak according to my intimate belief, but always with an extreme fear of being in error, because I hold that there is nothing more to be condemned, when one assumes spontaneously the mission to speak truth to men on the great events of history, than to gloss it over by cowardice, to distort it by passion, to forge it by indolence, and, knowingly or not, to misstate anything to one's own ages, and to ages to come." And yet this great 'History of the Consulate and the Empire' is biased in every part, incorrect in its facts, unwarranted in its inferences, and pernicious in its conclusions, a huge political pamphlet, in comparison with which even Macaulay's 'History of England' is as much its superior in tone as in brevity. That Thiers, being a Frenchman, should have set himself to glorify France at the expense of other nations, neglecting sources of information that might have put him right, and giving a false colouring to facts that were before him, is not perhaps to be wondered at, and this is a venial offence, seeing how history is still generally written. The grand fault of his book is in the dangerous principles which are enforced in it with a consistent recklessness and an unblushing boldness that are appalling. He read the history of his country by the light of a whole constellation of false theories, and he wrote it in such a way as to present those theories in the guise of incontrovertible truths and absolute rules for healthy national development. Heedless of the disasters that had befallen France through centuries of misgovernment, he made it his business to glorify misgovernment. Blind to the misery spread throughout Europe during the time of his own youth by military autocracy at home and military usurpation abroad, he painted them in seductive hues, and exhibited to his own generation as the highest virtues all the dominant vices of the past. To say no more, he lived to see the fruits of his work in the prolonged existence of the Second Empire, in the Franco-German war, and in the Paris Commune.

To his credit it must always be remembered that Thiers sought no advantage to himself from

the outcome of his teachings. In practical politics he was generally honest enough to place himself in opposition to Napoleon the Third, and to Napoleon the Third's exemplification of his own maxims. Happily it is not incumbent on us here to attempt a solution of that or many minor riddles of his political life; still less of its culminating riddle—the exhibition by him, after he had passed the allotted space of three score and ten years, of statesmanlike abilities which were altogether lacking during his prime, and of such strange adaptability to the altered temperament of the country, that he proved himself at once the most thorough exponent and the chief controller of its humours. If he helped by his mischievous authorship to bring about the degradation of France under the Second Empire, it was some compensation that his successful statesmanship mainly enabled France to recover itself as soon as the Second Empire was got rid of. During his terms of office as Chief of the Executive Power and President of the Republic he possessed, and, for the most part, wisely exercised, such authority as neither of the Napoleons ever really enjoyed; in all but the name he was, in contradiction of his own adage, a king who governed as well as reigned, and, after surrendering the semblance of power with admirable dignity and rare patriotism, he retained not a little of the substance.

Besides his more famous works and some minor ones, Thiers published in 1848 a very characteristic treatise, 'De la Propriété,' which reveals his whole social theory and his life-long opposition to the national tendencies which he regarded as supremely dangerous, and the unhealthy outburst of which at the time of the Paris Commune he had the opportunity of ruthlessly crushing. He is reported to have left behind him a long and elaborate fragment on philology, showing that his views thereon had undergone no great change since 1821, when, as a young literary adventurer, he came up to Paris "with a complete system of philology in his head."

THE OGHAM INSCRIPTION.

In continuation of my last notes upon the alphabet "El-Mushajjar," as applied to the Ogham or Ogam, I venture to suggest that those interested in Irish epigraphy should print, photograph, or lithograph all known forms, the common and the "ladder" or "stepped" (e.g., †, †, †, &c.), and send copies to the archaeological societies of the Continent before the appearance of Dr. S. Ferguson's promised 'Corpus Inscriptionum.' The antiquaries of Italy may, it would appear, add considerably to our knowledge of these *barbara Rhœna*.

My attention has been drawn to this point by the fine folio, 'Intorno agli Scavi Archeologici' (in the Arnaldi property, near Bologna), lately published by Count Senator G. Gozzadini (Bologna, Fava e Garagnani). P. 32 offers a most interesting table of *sigle* (potter's marks), divided into four heads: 1, those scratched (*graffiti*) on the base of the articles after baking; 2, the marks on other parts of the pottery; 3, the basal *graffiti* before baking; and 4, those inscribed upon bronze articles.

In the first category, numbering thirty-nine, I find seven, not including the crosses, which may mean anything, more or less directly connected in shape with the alphabet El-Mushajjar. The † (b), the † (common h), and the † (guttural h = c), are perfect; and No. 2 letter has in this table three variants, the †, the †, and the †. The imperfect are the †, the †, the †, and the seven-branched †. Table II. (p. 23) shows four, viz., the †, the †, with its variant †; the †, and the †. In Table III. (7) there are four: the †, the †, the †, and the †; whilst, finally,

Table IV. (also 7) gives one, the †, with its variant, the †.

I venture to believe that these are letters, and not marks. In Table I. you will find the Phœnician † (a), and the same occurs eight (nine?) times in the *sigle* which are printed in p. 236 of 'Etruscan Bologna,' by RICHARD F. BURTON.

THE DIEZ MEMORIAL.

FOR some time a movement has been in progress on the Continent for establishing a memorial of the late Prof. Diez, the founder of Romanic philology, in the shape of scholarships or prizes for the promotion of the studies to which his life was devoted. The movement was inaugurated at Berlin by a committee of eminent German philologists; it has been warmly taken up in Austria and Italy, where similar committees have been formed, and has since been joined by France. It is intended that the final disposal of the fund, which will to a great extent depend on its amount, shall be determined by consultation among the committees after the closing of the subscription lists at the end of this year.

Diez's work interests in England a wider circle than that of the students of language, who look up to him as a master and a founder. Owing to the Norman Conquest, it is impossible for Englishmen to investigate, sometimes, indeed, to properly understand, much of the history of their language or their literature, and even of their constitution, without being acquainted with the early language and literature of France; and without Diez, our knowledge of these would be far more imperfect than it is. The English Committee, therefore, appeal not only to philologists, but to the reading public generally, for subscriptions to the Diez Memorial Fund; believing that England will not show herself unable to appreciate, or unwilling to recognize, labours with which she is so intimately concerned. The Committee consists of Prince L. L. Bonaparte, A. J. Ellis, Esq., Prof. Max Müller, Prof. Sayce, Rev. W. W. Skeat, H. Sweet, Esq., Pres. Phil. Soc., and some others, and has for its honorary secretary Mr. Henry Nicol.

THE VOCAL MEMNON.

THE following extract from the magnificent collection of Mr. Robert Hay's Egyptian drawings and notes, in the British Museum, will be read with interest in relation to Lady Wilkinson's communication, published by us (*Athen.*, 2600). British Museum, Additional MS. 29831, folio 21.—"This morning I visited the two statues in the plain, but was not so fortunate as the ancients to hear the northernmost one speak, though it was but sunrise, and I remained in their company for three full hours. However, an hour before sunset, while I was taking my coffee under the shade of the southern one, I heard a noise like a stone shifting its place a little and falling against another. This the Arab with me remarked, without my making any observation to him, at the same time saying that not a soul was near the statue but ourselves. This statue is of one stone, though very much shattered in all parts—again I have heard the same noise! The stone is a pudding-stone, but varies much in different parts of it," &c.

NOTES FROM NAPLES.

Naples, August 29, 1877.

THE publication is announced of a new 'History of the Events of 1799 in Naples.' "Hitherto," says a reviewer, "that period has been imperfectly studied, as the most important documents connected with it were burnt by order of Ferdinand the Fourth. Prof. Palumbo, of this city, has now given to the public many inedited documents which regard especially Maria Carolina, the infamous Queen of Naples, and Lady Hamilton." "In the great Library of the British Museum,—richer than all the others of the world in historical memorials," says the author,—"I endeavoured to discover the most accredited writers, to investigate the