

SOME NEW BOOKS.

Slavery and the Status of Women.

What will generally be acknowledged to be the most important contribution to our knowledge of ethical development since the publication of Herbert Spencer's "Descriptive Sociology" and the "Data of Ethics" will be found comprised in two volumes collectively containing nearly 700 pages, and entitled "Slavery and the Status of Women," by L. T. HOBBHOUSE, formerly fellow of Merton College, Oxford, and lately fellow and assistant tutor of Corpus Christi College in the same university (Henry Holt & Co.). This is not by any means the author's first book. Some time ago Mr. Hobbhouse published his "Mind in Evolution" and Methuen & Co. have brought out his "Theory of Knowledge," which was a contribution to some problems of logic and metaphysics. The purpose of the work before us is to approach the theory of ethical evolution through a comparative study of rules of conduct and ideals of life. In the author's method of handling the subject no hypothetical assumptions as to the cause of evolution is required. Even the hypothesis of evolution itself is not strictly necessary. The object is to distinguish and classify different forms of ethical ideas; to present, in short, a morphology of ethics comparable to the physical morphology of animals and plants. The results of such a comparative study, if firmly based on recorded facts, would undoubtedly, as Mr. Hobbhouse submits, remain standing, even if any given theory of evolution were shattered. At the same time the results of classification, when viewed in the light of evolutionary theory, acquire a wholly new significance and importance. They furnish us with a conception of the trend of human development, based not on any assumption as to the underlying causes at work, but on a comparison of the achievements reached at different stages of the process.

We can best exemplify the range of the author's researches and the illuminating value of his comments by marking what he has to say about two divisions of his subject, slavery and the status of women. Although incomparably more concise, his account of the institution of slavery in primitive and modern times is even more sensitive than that set forth in Señor Saco's "Historia de la Esclavitud," which years ago was reviewed at considerable length in these columns. The survey, too, of the many changes which the status of women has undergone from primitive conditions up to our own day has no reason to dread comparison with the best previous book upon the theme, Letourneau's "The Rights of the Female Sex in the Diverse Races and Civilizations," which was published rather more than three years ago.

We begin with the author's brief but comprehensive study of slavery. Mr. Hobbhouse points out that the primitive community is, as a rule, small, but compact and homogeneous. There was always the distinction between its own members and outsiders; there was also a greater or less distinction in the rights enjoyed by the two sexes.

Two conditions sufficed to assure the growth of slavery, or of a servile caste in the savage world. The first condition was a certain development of industrialism. In a hunter tribe which lived from hand to mouth there was little occasion for the services of a slave. The harder and less interesting work could be put upon the women, and the chief occupation of the men was to fight. This state of things eventually brought about a servile condition, when the acquisition of warlike booty gave to a tribe the means of supplying slaves from its captives. Not only, however, must a tribe that was to obtain captives slaves conquer; it must also refrain from putting its captives to death. In an earlier part of this volume the author has shown how the difficulty of exercising such restraint militated against a rise of slavery in savage society. In the second condition, though the idea of slavery was widely diffused in the uncivilized world, the institution grew more important, step by step, with the development of civilization. We find, indeed, many civilized peoples among whom slavery has attained a luxuriant growth retaining a tradition of a time at which there were no slaves: in Mr. Hobbhouse's opinion, the traditions may well preserve a historical truth. The enslavement of the conquered, however, is not the only alternative open to a conquering people. Instead of apportioning captives to individuals as their personal booty, they may reduce the conquered tribe collectively to a servile position. In that case we should get from the first a system of public serfdom. Our author notes that in other cases, possibly illustrations originally of this practice—the conquest of northern India by Arya invaders may be taken as an example—the distinction between conqueror and conquered would harden into a distinction of caste sanctioned by religion. Ultimately the development of military organization and the consequent rise of the power of the chiefs might become responsible for that form of "rightlessness" in which all members of the tribe become slaves of the king, as was actually the case of the inhabitants of modern Persia were presented with the alternative of bringing forward a multitude of instances of slavery in the uncivilized world the author arrives at the conclusion that, while avoiding undue generalization, we may fairly say, first, that in the rudest tribes there are no class distinctions, the harder and more menial work falling often, though not always, upon the women; secondly, that as a tribe grows in culture, and especially in military strength, the first result is, as a rule, that the conquered peoples are sacrificed, eaten, tortured, or in any case, put to death. But, thirdly, with a certain softening of manners, or at any rate with a cooler conception of permanent advantage, prisoners are spared and enslaved. This mercy was first reserved for women and children, but was afterwards extended to male captives. A

class was thus formed that was within the jurisdiction of the conquering tribe but from the point of view of law and morals remained outside of it. Either in the form of a class of slaves or of a degraded quasi-servile lower caste the presence of such an element in the population was a common feature in a society which had emerged from the lower savagery and the rawest military. On the strict principle of group morality this class was destitute of rights, and only too often the principle was consistently carried out. The typical slave could neither marry nor hold property except on sufferance. His very life was in his master's hands. He might be flogged, maimed, sold, pawned, given away, exchanged or put to death.

In many slave systems, however, the primitive "rightlessness" was qualified in many ways. To see how this qualification arises it is needful to take a complete view of the sources from which slaves were drawn. The first slaves, doubtless, were captives in war, but this was not only modified by which the servile class was enriched. Of other methods the first, and greatest was inheritance—for, normally, a slave's child was also a slave. Secondly, in most barbaric and semi-civilized societies the numbers of the slave class were swollen by other causes, principally by debt, crime and the slave trade. "What! Shall I starve as long as my sister has children whom she can sell?" was the remark of an Indian in Burton's "India in the fourth century B. C." that the Greek travelers of Alexander's time denied that the institution of slavery existed there. In China a tradition is preserved of an epoch in which there was no slavery, but there is decisive evidence that slavery did exist under the Chow or Tau dynasty, which came to an end in the third century B. C. The institution of slavery is far less important than it is in some other countries. Debt slavery is no longer obtains, and war has ceased to be a source of supply; but the slave trade is general, and the sale of daughters by their parents and of wives by their husbands, particularly in times of famine, is a rich source of recruitment of the slave class. Slaves are usually treated well, and in China there is the same equality between master and slave which is found commonly in the East. The protection of the slave, however, is very inadequate. If he strikes his master he is liable to death by beheading, whereas the master, if he kills a slave, is only punished with beating by the bamboo. Moreover, if death is caused by a canonical or legitimate punishment the master is held guiltless.

It is well known that slavery, like polygamy, was firmly established among the Arabs at the time of the introduction of Islam, but what he was not strong enough to abolish Mohammed strove to mitigate. He declared that in a war with Moslems prisoners were not to be enslaved, and if a non-Moslem announced himself a convert to Islam on the battlefield he might not be killed, but according to the traditions ought even to be set free. The holding of Moslem slaves, however, as such was prohibited, but that emancipation was regarded as an act of special merit. The Prophet enjoined upon Moslems to show kindness to slaves and made the prostitution of slave girls a religious offense. If a slave girl should have a child by her master she became free at his death, and if the child were acknowledged by her master she became free forthwith. The master was ordered to feed his slave with such food as he ate himself, and to clothe him with such clothing as he himself wore and "not to command him to do what he was unable to perform." Wrongful punishment was held by Mohammed to be a moral ground for having twisted his Mameluke's ear, made the for manumission. The Caliph Omar forbade the separation of mother and child, and the cause of separation of mother and child by selling and giving. God will separate him from his friends on the day of Resurrection." On the whole, the Prophet's rules of good treatment have been observed by Mohammedans. To sell a slave of long standing is considered disgraceful, and female slaves are seldom emancipated without being provided for in life. In the later Babylonian Empire, as in the case of the slave girl who was sold to the master of a man, and indeed if he totally neglected her it was held that she would in time become a malevolent being with demonic powers, against whom magical conjurations would have to be pronounced. It would seem, in fine, that in Babylonia there were different classes of slaves, distinguished in practice and custom if not in law, although the conception of chattel slavery, though by no means disappeared.

In ancient Egypt, also, though our information with regard to it is less precise than it is for Babylonia, the main source of recruitment of slaves, as distinguished from serfs, was capture and the slave trade. An idea of the number of slaves in Egypt during the period known as that of the New Kingdom may be formed from the fact that in the course of thirty years Ramses III. presented 118,437 to the temples alone. Such slaves, however, apparently intermarried frequently with natives and had families and descendants, who at the end of two or three generations passed into the condition of serfdom, in which the mass of the Egyptian population appears ultimately to have lived. In the Early Empire there seems to have been some "middle class" which helped to bring Egyptian art and handicraft to their pitch of perfection, but in the New Kingdom the peasant serfs were strictly part of the property of the Crown or of the temple to which the lands belonged. In ancient Egypt, however, even the slave, properly so called, was not wholly, or at any rate not at all times, destitute of rights. In the New Kingdom, according to Diodorus, his murder was punished with death. But at that period the freeman himself had no rights under the Egyptian Constitution, for the king was theoretically master of the whole land of Egypt, owner of all property and lord of all men who dwell therein.

The history of slavery among the Hebrews is interesting, between for the strong distinction marked between Jew and Gentile and for progress traceable in law and custom affecting the position of the Hebrew slave. In the earliest code, set forth in Exodus, the period of service for a male Hebrew was limited to six years. Moreover, "if a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod and he die under his hand he shall surely be punished, but if the injured slave continued to live for a day or two as our author points out, was chattel slavery partially abolished of itself. The Exodus code further provided that a male or female slave should obtain freedom for the loss of an eye or a tooth at the master's hands. If an outsider killed a slave he had to pay the master thirty shekels of silver. The code of Deuteronomy breathes a more humane spirit, providing that when the Hebrew slave was released in the

seventh year, he should not go away empty but should be furnished forth liberally out of his master's flock. The priestly code set forth in Leviticus seems at first sight reactionary, providing that the slave should be released not in the seventh year but in the year of Jubilee. In other respects, however, the priestly code was considerate to the Hebrew slave and even denied that he ought to be a bondman at all. In Ecclesiasticus the master is enjoined to treat a good servant well and not to defraud him of release. On the whole the development of Hebrew law and custom in relation to slavery affords an example not only of the amelioration of the slave's position by humanitarian sentiment but also of the persistence of a deep distinction between the domestic slave and the foreign, due to the dominance of an exclusive national religion.

In India, though slavery was already known in the Vedic age and persisted into the Brahmanic period, it has been of very secondary importance as compared with caste. Our author discusses at great length into a full discussion of the origin and nature of caste in India, which was a matter of some perplexity to moralists even in the Brahmanic age. Already in the Mahabharata is propounded an ethical doctrine of equality or of distinction by merit alone, which was strictly in line with the subsequent teachings of Gautama Buddha, in whose Order there was no thought of caste, and for whom the true Brahman was the lives of a perfectly good life. There were few slaves in India in the fourth century B. C. that the Greek travelers of Alexander's time denied that the institution of slavery existed there. In China a tradition is preserved of an epoch in which there was no slavery, but there is decisive evidence that slavery did exist under the Chow or Tau dynasty, which came to an end in the third century B. C. The institution of slavery is far less important than it is in some other countries. Debt slavery is no longer obtains, and war has ceased to be a source of supply; but the slave trade is general, and the sale of daughters by their parents and of wives by their husbands, particularly in times of famine, is a rich source of recruitment of the slave class. Slaves are usually treated well, and in China there is the same equality between master and slave which is found commonly in the East. The protection of the slave, however, is very inadequate. If he strikes his master he is liable to death by beheading, whereas the master, if he kills a slave, is only punished with beating by the bamboo. Moreover, if death is caused by a canonical or legitimate punishment the master is held guiltless.

growth of Roman dominion, however, and the rise of great estates, together with the increasing facility of obtaining slaves by capture in war and by traffic with pirates gave Roman slavery toward the close of the republic a new and dark character. It is Mommsen's opinion that, by comparison with the sufferings of the slave gangs that tilled the soil, all that was endured by negro slaves was insignificant. Some relief came, however, from the humane ideas of advancing civilization fostered by contact with Greek culture. The Stoic philosophy, in particular, was the champion of the slave. In the second century A. D. the Roman jurists laid down distinctly the principle that was to be reproduced by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, that by natural law all men are equal. "So far as pertains to natural law, all men are equal," wrote Ulpian.

There is no doubt that the Stoic teaching had a profound effect upon the legal sale of children was prohibited. An edict of Diocletian forbade a freeman to sell himself. Man sellers were punished with death. The insolvent debtor was no longer made a slave. The right of bequest, receiving and making, was granted to slaves, and some approach was made to a recognition of their marriage, even while in slavery. Under Hadrian the power of Roman Empire had been taken from the master and under Antoninus Plus the master who killed his own slave without good cause was punished as a homicide. Under Plus the slave who was cruelly treated could claim to be sold, and by a special enactment it was held cruel to employ an educated slave in degrading or manual work. While, however, the legal position of the slave was being improved by imperial legislation, a new form of servitude, equivalent to serfdom, was growing up under the name of the colonate. Some of the coloni were probably foreign captives and immigrants settled upon the soil, while others were originally free tenants who lapsed into a semi-servile condition through the insecurity of the times, and largely through self-compulsion. A powerful landowner, under an edict issued by Constantine in A. D. 332 the colonus could not quit his holding or marry off the property of his lord. On the other hand, he could not be disturbed or subjected arbitrarily to increased charges, and, as the status was hereditary, he represented a fully developed pre-land serfdom, with fixed but limited rights for the serf. Rural slaves were assimilated to the coloni in 377, and in the seventh century they were merged in the colonate.

As early as the close of the fourth century, A. D., the institution of slavery in the Roman Empire had been subjected to fresh influences, that of the barbarian conquests and that of the medieval Church. Thus the Middle Ages began with two fairly distinct classes of the unfree: on the one hand, the slaves proper, whose position had been ameliorated in Roman law, but remained that of pure chattels by the law of the barbarian conquerors; on the other hand, a class of serfs in various degrees of unfreedom, which had already grown up in the later stages of the Roman Empire in the West, and was reinforced by the corresponding class of liti, or dependent land owners, which existed among the Teutonic invaders. The moral influence of the Stoic philosophy, which had inspired the imperial legislation for the benefit of the slaves, was now replaced by that of the Church. The latter, however, was less universalist in character than the former. For the Stoic, all men were brothers; for the Church, all men ought to be brothers, but as many men were unfortunately unbelievers, the brotherhood of men was for many purposes limited to Christians. From an early medieval period the custom of enslaving prisoners of war began under ecclesiastical influence to be abandoned, at any rate as between Christians, while the serf set itself also to combat the traffic in slaves.

The custom of treating the slave as a fixture on the estate, which in the Empire had been eventually made matter of legal enactment, was first adopted among the barbarians by the West Franks and gradually spread from them to other peoples. As, however, the papal prohibition to enslave captives did not apply to pagans, it left the way open to the practice of converting the heathen into Christians, and not converted until near the close of the tenth century—as the one source open to the western European countries for the acquisition of fresh slaves, whether by capture or traffic. The interval before their conversion lasted long enough—it lasted centuries—and during that time this source of slaves was sufficiently important after European name for a prehistoric epoch in which there were no slaves, but in Homeric times we find slavery in full swing. Apart from legitimate warfare, piracy was a frequent source of slavery. In the rural districts of Greece, however, slavery remained rare. In the more developed States, on the other hand, the growth of wealth meant, as always in the ancient world, increase in the number of slaves and the rise of the ruinous belief that manual labor was not compatible with the dignity of a free man. Slavery remained a recognized fate for prisoners of war as an alternative to massacre, and through the institution of debt-slavery the poorer classes in each State—in Athens up to near the close of the sixth century B. C.—were frequently menaced with falling into enslavement. Solon's prohibition of debt slavery and of pledging of the person was a step toward the introduction of democracy, although it was a democracy of freemen only, the position of the slave was indirectly improved. The master had the right of corporal punishment and of branding, but could not put a slave to death without a judicial decision. If maltreated by his master a slave could take refuge in the Theseum or some other asylum and demand to be sold, a demand which was investigated either by the priests or by a judicial process. On the other hand the slave was not directly recognized as a personality by the law. Except in murder cases he could only give evidence under torture, and he could only give evidence against his master on a charge of treason. At the same time he was often allowed to hold property and found a mistress, while he might buy his freedom by a sum of money, and in the Dorian States his earnings were more prevalent than slavery, though the two institutions existed sometimes side by side. In Laocœdemon the period were personally free, but had no political rights; the helots, on the other hand, were serfs, bound to the soil, who could not be sold or set free except by the State. The penesæ of Thessaly, though occupying a position closely analogous to that of the helots, were better off in that they could only be put to death by judicial process. In most of the Greek States it is a mark of ethical superiority that the logical consequences of slavery were mitigated by humanitarian legislation.

In Rome during the earlier period the slave, though in law a chattel, was as a rule fairly well treated. Though legally he could hold no property, and his stock was made to the lord on the possession of a Bishop. Then, again, although the French law in the sixteenth century recognized that no slaves could exist on French soil, the maxim seems to have been applicable only to those who entered France after being baptized. The smoldering embers of slavery were destined to burst out into flame. The Portuguese began importing negro slaves in 1482, and obtained a bull sanctioning the practice from Pope Nicholas V. twelve years later, the reason given being the hope that the slaves would be converted to the Catholic faith. When Columbus, how-

ever, shipped 500 Indian prisoners to Spain to be sold as slaves the law of the case was investigated by Isabella, and theologians differing in their views, she ordered the Indians to be sent back to their homes. Meanwhile, in the New World, the Spaniards were making slaves freely of Indians and treating them with great cruelty. Las Casas, impressed with the horrors which he saw, was struck with the idea that negroes would endure bondage without sinking into idleness, and with the most benevolent intentions gave the advice that residents in Hispaniola should be allowed to import negro slaves. Regular traffic in blacks accordingly began, notwithstanding successive efforts made by the Pope, when they grasped the situation, to suppress it. All the great commercial nations of western Europe joined in the slave trade. In England, indeed, in the case of the negro colonies in 1773 the courts held that English soil emancipated him, but in France this doctrine, which had been good law in 1571, was suspended in 1716 and again in 1788. Slaves were sold in Paris down to 1762, while from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century the Pope themselves had Turkish galley slaves, and Louis XIV., besides these, had Jewish slaves and Russian captives.

Not until 1807 was the slave trade abolished in Great Britain and her colonies. It had been abolished by Denmark in 1792. At the Congress of Vienna British influence was active in obtaining the consent of other nations for the suppression of the slave trade, and France acquiesced in treaties of 1814 and 1817. The importation of slaves was prohibited by the United States in 1807. The institution of slavery was abolished in the British colonies in 1833, in a French colony in 1848 (it had been abolished in them in 1794, but restored by Napoleon eight years later). It was abolished by Portugal in 1825, by the Dutch in 1863, by Brazil in 1888, and emancipation was proclaimed in the United States in 1863.

We have left ourselves but very little space in which to condense the purpose of the hundred pages allotted to the status of women of the various stages of civilization. The gist of two chapters, however, may be summarized in a few paragraphs. In the lowest stages of society the life of women is less differentiated from that of men than it afterward becomes, but there is a tendency for the heavier drudgery to fall on them, while the men do the hunting or fighting. At a higher stage the restricted of woman becomes more clearly restricted only when compelled thereto by poverty, and the idea grows that she should be protected by her menfolk and as far as possible sheltered from the world. Thus she tends to become a different being, romantically conceived as of finer, more ethereal texture than the male, but as yet practically no will or character of her own conceded to her. At a still further stage the ethical conception of personality comes into play. To be the ideal being that man would have her it is recognized that woman must be a responsible agent, and it is seen that her special talents and qualities must have all the scope which freedom gives to come to the fullness of their development, while it is only through free development that the extent of her differentiation in its character. Thus in the German Empire the progress of emancipation which had been going forward until the thirteenth century was arrested in the fifteenth and a reaction took place. Serfdom lingered on, but in 1819-20 was abolished on the Crown lands of Prussia by Frederick William I. Frederick the Great aimed at a general emancipation, but achieved little except in Prussian Poland. The survival of the serf in Germany was to be indirectly from the French Revolution. In 1807 an edict was published by the King whereby the whole population of Prussia was made free with a stroke of the pen. Serfdom survived in a great part of the Austrian Empire down to 1848. In Russia the peasant, a hitherto free, was transformed into a serf by the Czar Boris in the closing years of the sixteenth century, and serfdom was not abolished until 1861, a great time that may be regarded as the final termination of the enslavement by law, whether complete or partial, of white men.

In France the direct manumission of serfs in the later Middle Ages was perhaps more frequent than it was in England. Emancipations in block were common. In 1315 Louis X. invited all the serfs on the Crown lands to purchase their liberty, but the price asked was too high. A general abolition of peasant serfdom was demanded by the Third Estate at Blois in 1576, and again at Paris in 1614. This was not granted, but, as we have said, the institution was quite unknown in many provinces in the seventeenth century. It remained in France, Comte, Bourgogne, Alsace-Lorraine, Trois Evêchés, Champagne, Bourbonnais, La Marche, Nivernois and Berry; but the burden was relatively light, and when in 1711 the serfs in the latter provinces proposed a money commutation for their serfdom, the serfs themselves who were to benefit by the proposal raised objections. The question was raised by Voltaire, and by an edict of 1789 Louis XVI. enfranchised the serfs of the royal domain and encouraged general abolition. Serfdom was finally extinguished in France without compensation to the lords on August 4, 1789, along with other incidents of feudal tenures. At the same time fell the whole system of privileges which had been apart from the mass of the people the estates of the nobles and the clergy.

Mr. Hobbhouse would describe the abolition of slavery and serfdom in Europe as a process whereby the obligations of group morality were extended so as to cover all Christians, or at any rate all white Christians. Obviously the result was not the same as would have followed the strictly universalist morality of the Stoics. As long, however, as the Christian communities lived in isolation and did not come into touch as conquerors with weaker races the matter was not one of very practical moment. But when, with the discovery of a new world and the circumnavigation of Africa, a fresh economic position arose, making slave labor industrially indispensable, while at the same time a vast black population was put at the disposal of the far stronger white man, slavery grew up again in a new and more debased form. Our author directs attention to the fact that the old Roman slavery had never entirely disappeared. As late as the twelfth century slaves were sold at fairs in Champagne, and Saracen slaves were found in the South of France in the possession of a Bishop. Then, again, although the French law in the sixteenth century recognized that no slaves could exist on French soil, the maxim seems to have been applicable only to those who entered France after being baptized. The smoldering embers of slavery were destined to burst out into flame. The Portuguese began importing negro slaves in 1482, and obtained a bull sanctioning the practice from Pope Nicholas V. twelve years later, the reason given being the hope that the slaves would be converted to the Catholic faith. When Columbus, how-

ever, shipped 500 Indian prisoners to Spain to be sold as slaves the law of the case was investigated by Isabella, and theologians differing in their views, she ordered the Indians to be sent back to their homes. Meanwhile, in the New World, the Spaniards were making slaves freely of Indians and treating them with great cruelty. Las Casas, impressed with the horrors which he saw, was struck with the idea that negroes would endure bondage without sinking into idleness, and with the most benevolent intentions gave the advice that residents in Hispaniola should be allowed to import negro slaves. Regular traffic in blacks accordingly began, notwithstanding successive efforts made by the Pope, when they grasped the situation, to suppress it. All the great commercial nations of western Europe joined in the slave trade. In England, indeed, in the case of the negro colonies in 1773 the courts held that English soil emancipated him, but in France this doctrine, which had been good law in 1571, was suspended in 1716 and again in 1788. Slaves were sold in Paris down to 1762, while from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century the Pope themselves had Turkish galley slaves, and Louis XIV., besides these, had Jewish slaves and Russian captives.

Not until 1807 was the slave trade abolished in Great Britain and her colonies. It had been abolished by Denmark in 1792. At the Congress of Vienna British influence was active in obtaining the consent of other nations for the suppression of the slave trade, and France acquiesced in treaties of 1814 and 1817. The importation of slaves was prohibited by the United States in 1807. The institution of slavery was abolished in the British colonies in 1833, in a French colony in 1848 (it had been abolished in them in 1794, but restored by Napoleon eight years later). It was abolished by Portugal in 1825, by the Dutch in 1863, by Brazil in 1888, and emancipation was proclaimed in the United States in 1863.

Not until 1807 was the slave trade abolished in Great Britain and her colonies. It had been abolished by Denmark in 1792. At the Congress of Vienna British influence was active in obtaining the consent of other nations for the suppression of the slave trade, and France acquiesced in treaties of 1814 and 1817. The importation of slaves was prohibited by the United States in 1807. The institution of slavery was abolished in the British colonies in 1833, in a French colony in 1848 (it had been abolished in them in 1794, but restored by Napoleon eight years later). It was abolished by Portugal in 1825, by the Dutch in 1863, by Brazil in 1888, and emancipation was proclaimed in the United States in 1863.

We have left ourselves but very little space in which to condense the purpose of the hundred pages allotted to the status of women of the various stages of civilization. The gist of two chapters, however, may be summarized in a few paragraphs. In the lowest stages of society the life of women is less differentiated from that of men than it afterward becomes, but there is a tendency for the heavier drudgery to fall on them, while the men do the hunting or fighting. At a higher stage the restricted of woman becomes more clearly restricted only when compelled thereto by poverty, and the idea grows that she should be protected by her menfolk and as far as possible sheltered from the world. Thus she tends to become a different being, romantically conceived as of finer, more ethereal texture than the male, but as yet practically no will or character of her own conceded to her. At a still further stage the ethical conception of personality comes into play. To be the ideal being that man would have her it is recognized that woman must be a responsible agent, and it is seen that her special talents and qualities must have all the scope which freedom gives to come to the fullness of their development, while it is only through free development that the extent of her differentiation in its character. Thus in the German Empire the progress of emancipation which had been going forward until the thirteenth century was arrested in the fifteenth and a reaction took place. Serfdom lingered on, but in 1819-20 was abolished on the Crown lands of Prussia by Frederick William I. Frederick the Great aimed at a general emancipation, but achieved little except in Prussian Poland. The survival of the serf in Germany was to be indirectly from the French Revolution. In 1807 an edict was published by the King whereby the whole population of Prussia was made free with a stroke of the pen. Serfdom survived in a great part of the Austrian Empire down to 1848. In Russia the peasant, a hitherto free, was transformed into a serf by the Czar Boris in the closing years of the sixteenth century, and serfdom was not abolished until 1861, a great time that may be regarded as the final termination of the enslavement by law, whether complete or partial, of white men.

In France the direct manumission of serfs in the later Middle Ages was perhaps more frequent than it was in England. Emancipations in block were common. In 1315 Louis X. invited all the serfs on the Crown lands to purchase their liberty, but the price asked was too high. A general abolition of peasant serfdom was demanded by the Third Estate at Blois in 1576, and again at Paris in 1614. This was not granted, but, as we have said, the institution was quite unknown in many provinces in the seventeenth century. It remained in France, Comte, Bourgogne, Alsace-Lorraine, Trois Evêchés, Champagne, Bourbonnais, La Marche, Nivernois and Berry; but the burden was relatively light, and when in 1711 the serfs in the latter provinces proposed a money commutation for their serfdom, the serfs themselves who were to benefit by the proposal raised objections. The question was raised by Voltaire, and by an edict of 1789 Louis XVI. enfranchised the serfs of the royal domain and encouraged general abolition. Serfdom was finally extinguished in France without compensation to the lords on August 4, 1789, along with other incidents of feudal tenures. At the same time fell the whole system of privileges which had been apart from the mass of the people the estates of the nobles and the clergy.

Mr. Hobbhouse would describe the abolition of slavery and serfdom in Europe as a process whereby the obligations of group morality were extended so as to cover all Christians, or at any rate all white Christians. Obviously the result was not the same as would have followed the strictly universalist morality of the Stoics. As long, however, as the Christian communities lived in isolation and did not come into touch as conquerors with weaker races the matter was not one of very practical moment. But when, with the discovery of a new world and the circumnavigation of Africa, a fresh economic position arose, making slave labor industrially indispensable, while at the same time a vast black population was put at the disposal of the far stronger white man, slavery grew up again in a new and more debased form. Our author directs attention to the fact that the old Roman slavery had never entirely disappeared. As late as the twelfth century slaves were sold at fairs in Champagne, and Saracen slaves were found in the South of France in the possession of a Bishop. Then, again, although the French law in the sixteenth century recognized that no slaves could exist on French soil, the maxim seems to have been applicable only to those who entered France after being baptized. The smoldering embers of slavery were destined to burst out into flame. The Portuguese began importing negro slaves in 1482, and obtained a bull sanctioning the practice from Pope Nicholas V. twelve years later, the reason given being the hope that the slaves would be converted to the Catholic faith. When Columbus, how-

ever, shipped 500 Indian prisoners to Spain to be sold as slaves the law of the case was investigated by Isabella, and theologians differing in their views, she ordered the Indians to be sent back to their homes. Meanwhile, in the New World, the Spaniards were making slaves freely of Indians and treating them with great cruelty. Las Casas, impressed with the horrors which he saw, was struck with the idea that negroes would endure bondage without sinking into idleness, and with the most benevolent intentions gave the advice that residents in Hispaniola should be allowed to import negro slaves. Regular traffic in blacks accordingly began, notwithstanding successive efforts made by the Pope, when they grasped the situation, to suppress it. All the great commercial nations of western Europe joined in the slave trade. In England, indeed, in the case of the negro colonies in 1773 the courts held that English soil emancipated him, but in France this doctrine, which had been good law in 1571, was suspended in 1716 and again in 1788. Slaves were sold in Paris down to 1762, while from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century the Pope themselves had Turkish galley slaves, and Louis XIV., besides these, had Jewish slaves and Russian captives.

Not until 1807 was the slave trade abolished in Great Britain and her colonies. It had been abolished by Denmark in 1792. At the Congress of Vienna British influence was active in obtaining the consent of other nations for the suppression of the slave trade, and France acquiesced in treaties of 1814 and 1817. The importation of slaves was prohibited by the United States in 1807. The institution of slavery was abolished in the British colonies in 1833, in a French colony in 1848 (it had been abolished in them in 1794, but restored by Napoleon eight years later). It was abolished by Portugal in 1825, by the Dutch in 1863, by Brazil in 1888, and emancipation was proclaimed in the United States in 1863.

To that end Carolina, which was a frontier province, was, like Chester, Lancaster and Durham in the old country, made a "County Palatine." The powers of the proprietors of Carolina were modelled on those of the feudal potentate, the Lord Bishop of Durham, who of the three English Palatinates alone survived in the reign of Charles II. Locke undertook to establish a nobility, but preferred not to give the nobles English titles. The nobility, however, was to be little more than a plutocracy, depending upon the amount of land which might be bought by a man, without regard to his birth or breeding or service to the State. The titles, moreover, were to pass by purchase as well as by descent. When land could be held at a penny an acre it did not require a large fortune to become a "baron," with 12,000 acres, a "casique," with 24,000, or even a landgrave, with 48,000. The estates were called "baronies," and there were many which long kept the name, as, for example, the "Colleton" and the "Fairlawne" barony, but no one was addressed as "baron" or "casique," and the landgraves simply prefixed the title to their surnames. Morton and Artell, who led 500 Dissenters to the colonies in the reign of James II., were made landgraves for their services.

The most valuable feature of the book—we know of no counterpart in any other publication—is the light thrown in the eighth, nineteenth and twentieth chapters on the structure and development of Charleston society during the period which elapsed between the ordinance of nullification, passed in 1822, and the ordinance of secession, passed in December, 1860. The author is peculiarly qualified to depict the ante-bellum times, because she is the inheritor of many social traditions and unpublished records relating to that epoch. Mr. Henry Adams has told us, in his history of Jefferson's administration, that nowhere in the United States during the closing years of the eighteenth century could be found such luxury as existed among the little oligarchy of rice, indigo and cotton planters who ruled Charleston, only on their behalf, gold plate to be seen, and nowhere else on this side of the Atlantic was so much attention given to horse breeding and horse racing. Mr. Adams testifies that the planters were travellers, readers and scholars, the elder men having been educated abroad and having transmitted to the younger a taste for culture. An average planter's household in those days was qualified to keep a carriage, a few slaves, and as many nursery maids as there were children in the family. Each lady had her maid, who was always a seamstress and a clearstarcher. If the cook was a woman, she had a cook and a boy scullion to help her, and there were as many landresses as the size of the family required. There were a butler and one or more footmen. A gentleman usually had a body servant, and the coachman, under him as many groom and stable boys as the horses kept demanded. A household of this sort which had gone undisturbed for two or three generations was "a little world in itself."

Mrs. Ravenel tells us, in the light of after events, it is hard to believe how calm and confident were the thirty years that followed the repeal of the nullification ordinance. Never since the years immediately preceding the Revolution had Charleston so prospered, so cheerful, so progressive. So far as the little world which we call society was concerned, those were the days of small and easy parties, meeting about 8 o'clock for tea, after which there would be talk, music, games, perhaps a little dance, ice cream and cake, a glass of wine for the men, lemonade for the ladies, and by 12 every one at home again. These were the days, too, when the St. Cecilia Society was in its youth—originally a musical club or amateur concert association, as its name suggests, but ultimately a purely social organization. The St. Cecilia still exists and is the only surviving counterpart of the Philadelphia Assembly. The society elects its members; names must be offered at the annual meeting in a letter presented by a member. If a man's father or grandfather or any of his immediate kindred have belonged before him, there is little doubt that he will be chosen. When a man is elected the names of the ladies of his household are at once put upon "the list" and remain there forever. Only death or removal from the city erases them; change of fortune affects them not at all. To be dropped from the St. Cecilia is now, as it has always been in the eyes of Charleston society, an awful possibility which is sometimes averted, but which, if it occurs, passes. Three balls are given in the season, and members are entitled to ask for invitations for visiting strangers, but they are expected not to use this privilege for business purposes. We add that the St. Cecilia Society differs from the Philadelphia Assembly in that the former owns or owned its plate, damask, china and glass and a good stock of wine. Readers of the life-like pictures of contemporary Charleston in "The Baltimore World" will wonder how much the survival of the St. Cecilia means to the young representatives of old but impoverished families. It is the last stronghold of a moribund aristocracy.

MANY USES FOR TEA.

In Circulation as Money in Central Asia—Fuel and Fodder. From the Scientific American. In China tea leaves are used in sweeping floors, but this does not end their utilitarian purposes. In the mountainous regions of the refuse leaves are pressed into bricks, dried and used in the same manner as blocks of peat. This fuel is particularly prized for pork curing—and the tea cured or tea smoked meat is in regions where there is a scarce supply of sugar cured bacon and ham are so. The ashes from the fuel are used as a fertilizer. But even before its use as fuel the refuse tea serves another purpose. The leaves are rigorous, and the moment they are steeped in cold water, in order to recover the tannic acid which they contain (about 12 per cent.). This is used in tanning leather and in dyeing tannin gives a fine, permanent but brown color, rarely so moment and is unaffected by sunlight, bleaching or washing. Sometimes the refuse tea leaves are used as fodder for farm stock—at least providing it is not much nutrition. Again, they may be dried, mixed with the low grade, factitious scented tea of commerce, and are then known as "tea tea." The decoction resulting from such tea cannot be far superior to one made by the common hay with which we are all acquainted.

The queerest use to which brick tea has ever been put in the Orient is in the capacity of money. It is still in circulation as a medium of exchange in the island Chinese States and central Asia, and has been traced southward to the Pamirs and Tibet and northward across Mongolia to the Siberian frontier. Between the Mongolian town of Urga and the Siberian town of Kiova there is a small town, as much as half a million tons of this money in circulation. At the latter place it ceases to be used as currency, and enters into the regular brick tea trade of Siberia and Russia. As brick tea is largely used in the Russian army, by covering engineers, touring the sportsmen and tourists in general, and Lord Rosebery's Definition of Memory. From the Youth's Companion. Somebody of a psychological turn of mind asked Lord Rosebery, "What is memory?" "Memory," Rosebery replied, promptly, "is the power of remembering what you have seen, but it is the power of remembering what you have seen."

Lord Rosebery's Definition of Memory. From the Youth's Companion. Somebody of a psychological turn of mind asked Lord Rosebery, "What is memory?" "Memory," Rosebery replied, promptly, "is the power of remembering what you have seen, but it is the power of remembering what you have seen."