Federigo Borromeo, and the like warmly supported him. On the 5th of February, 1615, an unsigned denunciation of him was lodged with the Inquisition. Early in December he voluntarily set out for Rome. On the 19th of February the Qualifiers for the Holy Office were called upon for an opinion substantially as to the Copernican proposition. On the 24th they reported it to be heretical. On the 25th, Cardinal Bellarmine was directed "to summon before him the said Galileo and admonish him to abandon the said opinion; and in case of refusal the Commissary [*i. e.*, the most Rev. Michelangelo Seghizzi] is to intimate to him, before a notary and witnesses, a command altogether to abstain from teaching or defending the said opinion, and even from discussing it; and if he do not acquiesce therein, he is to be imprisoned." Note that if he consented to "abandon" the said opinion there was to be no such intimation; and if there was an intimation, it must be executed before a notary and witnesses to be of effect. But Galileo at once agreed to abandon the theory. On March 3 a decree of the Inquisition was published, of which the preamble states that "Galileo Galilei, mathematician, had, in terms of the order of the Holy Congregation, been admonished to abandon the opinion he has hitherto held, and had acquiesced therein." On May 26th Cardinal Bellarmine delivered to Galileo a formal written statement to the effect that "Signor Galileo Galilei has not abjured [but only promised to *abandon*] . . . any opinion or doctrine held by him, . . . but only the declaration made by the Holy Father . . . has been communicated to him . . . that the opinion attributed to Copernicus . . . is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and therefore cannot be defended or held." This obliged Galileo to abandon his researches and writings; and his health suffered seriously, although he was allowed to use the proposition as a "hypothesis."

Events led to his writing 'Il Saggiatore,' and in October, 1622, it was sent to a member of the Accademia dei Lincei, and was passed from hand to hand, and various corrections were suggested and accepted with a view to rendering it acceptable to the Inquisition. In February, 1623, the Papal imprimatur was attached to it, and later in the year it was published. Meantime, on August 8, Galileo's adherent and admirer, Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, had been elected Pope, taking the name of Urban VIII. In April, 1624, Galileo went to Rome and had six long interviews with this new Pope, endeavoring to have the prohibition of 1616 removed, but to no purpose. The Pope wrote officially to the Grand Duke and expressed his sense of what the world owed to Galileo's discoveries, as well as his great affection for him. Galileo returned to Florence, where he drew up a reply to an attack on the Copernican system. This was handed about in manuscript. The Pope, having been shown some passages, expressed his high commendation, and on another occasion remarked to a cardinal that the Copernican system had never been condemned as heretical, but only as rash. Such things convinced Galileo that he might find means to express himself; and in 1626, he began to write his famous 'Dialogo intorno ai due Massimi Sistemi del Mondo, Tolemaico e Copernicano,' which fully occupied him until May, 1630, when he repaired to Rome in order to find under what conditions it could be published. He had audience with the Pope, who assented to the publication under three conditions: first, the title must not be misleading (Galileo had proposed to call it 'Dialogues on the Tides'); secondly, the subject must be treated from a purely hypothetical standpoint; and thirdly, it must be wound up by the argument that since God is all-powerful, no facts can be a *necessary* proof of any independent facts. Certainly, no logician to-day can withhold his assent to that; and certain it is that this argument was absolutely vital to a good Catholic then, and so remains to this day.

There was nothing for Galileo to do but to make the required alterations of the title, the introduction, and the conclusion. The last was a most difficult task, for he held the Pope's opinion in supreme contempt, and yet it would not do so to treat him. He ought to have seen that this situation forced upon him, what good controversial rhetoric required, the genuine putting of himself in the Pope's attitude of mind, so as really to feel what the reasons were which weighed with the Pope. Otherwise, in attempting to restate that argument, he would give a travesty of it. If he found it impossible to conform to that condition, then the one course open to him was to betake himself to Venice, which republic was ready to receive him with open arms, and to protect him at the risk of an interdict, if necessary.

In the Dialogue, all the arguments (including the Pope's) against Copernicus are put into the mouth of a character called "Simplicius." There was a certain appropriateness in this, since the best arguments of the Aristotelians were drawn from the commentary on the 'De Cœlo' by the real Simplicius. Yet it was bad rhetoric. The manuscript was submitted to the papal censor, who, after causing it to be thoroughly revised by his assistant, all passages being altered that were at all objectionable (as Galileo had desired), finally very carefully examined it himself, and attached his imprimatur for its publication in Rome, with the understanding that an introductory and a concluding passage should be inserted by Galileo, such as the Pope had required. The affair having come to this stage late in June, Galileo returned to Florence.

The prevalence of the plague and a particular death hindered the publication in Rome, and in August Galileo decided to have the book printed in Florence. On communicating with the Roman censor, that dignitary said he must first see the complete book. But the plague had rendered the mails so uncertain that Galileo proposed to send instead only the new preface and conclusion, suggesting that some person in Florence be deputized to reëxamine the body of the work. This proposition was acceded to. The counsellor of the Inquisition in Florence went through the body of it with the minutest attention, and declared there was nothing in it that could give the slightest umbrage to anybody. The Roman censor neglected to attend to the introductory and concluding portions sent to him, until July, 1631, when the Pope personally ordered him to approve those parts at once, with permission to alter the wording in any way Galileo might desire, the substance remaining as it was. After another complete reëxamination in Florence, the final imprimatur was attached, and the book was published toward the end of February, 1632.

During the summer the Jesuits laid their plans deep to bring Galileo to ruin, and, in all that followed, the Pope (having, no doubt, come to believe that Galileo's statement of his argument was ironical and satirical) manifested an intense personal vindictiveness, which was never relaxed as long as Galileo lived, and whose effects were only a little mollified under such circumstances that not even his passion and the inherent littleness of his soul could hide from him the general contempt that he was in danger of bringing upon himself. In August, 1632, further sale of the Dialogue was forbidden, and a papal commission was appointed to examine the book. This commission reported during the next month, and in this report for the first time appears the statement that, in 1616, Galileo had been enjoined from ever holding, teaching, or defending the Copernican doctrine. It appears that the commission, upon looking at the records of the proceedings of 1616, came upon an unsigned *compte rendu* or protocol in the handwriting of the commissary-general of the Holy Office, who then acted as secretary, which failed to say that Galileo had submitted to the admonition of Cardinal Bellarmine; and which stated that the next step had been taken, namely, that said commissary had, before witnesses, enjoined Galileo, under pain of further proceedings, never to hold, teach, or defend the opinion. But nothing is said about a notary, nor are any other witnesses but Cardinal Bellarmine named. He had formally denied that any such thing took place, and was now dead. It has been supposed that this minute was a forgery. Favaro says that it cannot be so; but not being signed, it was without legal value. Nor does the minute, such as it is, represent the injunction to have been executed according to the form prescribed by the Holy Congregation; so that that injunction, if it had been so delivered, would be extra-legal. This document came as a complete surprise to all parties, and Galileo believed it to be a forgery. Pope Urban VIII. himself, who had taken part in the proceedings of 1616, had repeatedly discussed with Galileo the doctrine which that minute represented Galileo to have been forbidden to discuss. There is no doubt, therefore, that the proceedings of 1632 and 1633, basing themselves, as they did, on that minute, were contrary to the law of the Church.

On October 1, Galileo was summoned to appear during that month before the commissary-general of the Inquisition, in Rome. There were various delays, and he did not arrive at the Tuscan embassy in Rome until the 13th of February, where he begged leave to remain; and this was granted for the time being, under restrictions. On April 12 he appeared before the Inquisition. From that day until the end of the month he was held prisoner in the walls of the Inquisition, but was allowed his servant, and was well treated. Owing to the intense malignity displayed by the Pope, Galileo's friends, in fear for his life, advised him simply to admit everything, and to submit to everything. This he did at his second examination of April 28, and on his third appearance of May 10. On June 16 the Pope held a meeting of the Congregation, at which it was decided to make Galileo confess his evil intention under threat of torture, and if that failed, to proceed further—that is, to burn him alive; for that is what it undoubtedly would have come to. Catholics may take such comfort as they can that this did not happen. On June 21 Galileo appeared once more, and, being threatened with torture, replied, "I am here to obey," and acquiesced in everything. He was then imprisoned. On June 22 he was made publicly to confess, and recant upon his knees. On the 6th of July he was allowed to retire to Siena, to the house of Archbishop Piccolomini, where he arrived on the 9th. He remained, however, wherever he was, a prisoner of the Inquisition all the rest of his life.

The Story of a Soldier's Life. By Field Marshal Viscount Wolseley. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1903.

As far as the story goes, the reader will find this an interesting book. It describes a military experience which began in 1852 in the Burmese campaign of that year. Then follow the Crimean war of 1854-56, the Indian mutiny of 1857-59, the China war of 1860, the Red River expedition of 1870, and the Ashantee war of 1873-74; and if more be needed, there is promise of another volume to round out the author's career, and, presumably, to give an account of the fruitless expedition undertaken for the relief of Gordon in 1885. The pictures of military life under these widely differing climates and conditions are admirably drawn, the hair-breadth 'scapes are exciting enough, and it is only occasionally that the superabundance of detail becomes tedious. Apart from purely military events, moreover, we have an account of a shipwreck, of a visit to Japan in 1860, and of a residence of some years in Canada and the United States from 1862 to 1870.

Coming to matters of opinion, we are reminded of the student who endeavored to solve all the problems in mechanics which he could not understand by the action of the common pump, which he had completely mastered. Lord Wolseley's common pump is a belief that war is not what Sherman called it, but, on the contrary, a good and desirable thing in itself. This doctrine is reiterated in some form or other in almost every chapter; and from it flow, naturally enough, certain corollaries, to wit, that Wellington and Napoleon were the greatest men that ever lived; that no civilian should be appointed war minister, and that England should adopt compulsory military service and cultivate glory in order to avoid becoming "a jellyfish." Early in the first volume we meet the common pump: "Surely, war, with all its horrors, exercises a healthy influence on all classes of society. . . . . War is the greatest purifier to the race or nation that has reached the verge of overrefinement, of excessive civilization." A curious doctrine, certainly, but one that would appeal more strongly to the lay mind if Lord Wolseley had given a few instances of nations that have reached the verge of overrefinement and excessive civilization. And, to begin with, how does he define excessive civilization? Does any modern nation suffer from such a disease? Is there not, on the contrary, a wide discrepancy between the results actually achieved by civilization and the aspirations and ideals of the wiser and better members of all modern communities? Has it not always been so in the past also? And even if it were otherwise, and nations really suffered from this imaginary disease, can any one who has read history imagine that the situation would be improved by war?

The following quotation gives another frequently recurring outcrop of the main doctrine: "These men die that England should be great, and they die for her without a murmur, and yet it is their valor and their self-sacrifice that enable home tradesmen to make fortunes, live at ease, and to marry their sons and daughters into gentle families." This is, of course, ridiculous claptrap. As a matter of fact, men become soldiers partly from innate love of fighting and partly because they are incapable of success as "home tradesmen," or in any other calling. They die on the field of battle because that is one of the hazards of their business; but it would be safe to say that Tommy Atkins is more interested in beer and tobacco than in anything so abstract and intangible as the greatness of England.

Passing from the main doctrine to the corollaries, there is an interesting statement made about Wellington which acquires additional importance from recent discussions of the vexed question of Waterloo. There is said to be written evidence to show that, some years before his death, when there was danger of war between France and Prussia, the King of Prussia asked him to take command of his army, owing to the dearth of first-class military talent in Berlin. The Duke was willing, but the danger passed, and the war was deferred for a generation. Of Napoleon, Lord Wolseley writes, with curious inconsistency, that impartial men must put him by himself and in front of all human beings; and then adds that "his course of action was absolutely untrammelled by any fixed laws of right or wrong or any consideration for others."

The dreadful results of the unprepared condition in which England entered upon the Crimean war give Lord Wolseley a good opportunity to preach on the folly of allowing a civilian to direct military affairs. He also condemns, in strong language, the incapacity of the English officers of that period, who acquired their rank under the purchase system and by family influence, without adequate training. The only war minister for whom he has a good word to say is Mr. Cardwell, who abolished the purchase system in 1873, and to whose scheme of an army reserve he gives the credit for England's ability to put 200,000 men in the field during the Boer war. In 1862 Lord Wolseley paid a visit to the Confederacy, and here again he found a notable example of the disastrous results of civilian control. His theory is that if Lee had not been overruled by President Davis the issue of this conflict might have been different. Lord Wolseley's ideas about this country and its inhabitants have evidently undergone considerable change in the past forty years. During the war his sympathies were strongly in favor of the South, and he was much impressed by the feebleness of the Northern generals. Since those days many things have changed, and he has reached the conclusion that the American army, so far as its members go, is the finest in the world. He believes that the future of the world lies between the Chinese and the people of the United States, and in regard to the latter he is good enough to express the following noble sentiments: "Thank heaven they speak English [this is a specially gratifying admission], are governed by an English system of laws, and profess the same regard that we have for what both understand by fair play in all national as well as all private business."

Of wit and humor Lord Wolseley is not prodigal, but he tells a good story of Soyer, the celebrated French cook, who was sent out to the Crimea to give soldiers lessons in the culinary art. It seems that he had had an ill-tempered wife, and when she died he placed over her grave a stone with the simple but significant inscription: "Soyez tranquille." Another bon-mot is the message sent by Lord Clyde's A. D. C. after the relief of Lucknow. "Nunc fortunatus sum," presumably to be rendered, "I am in luck now."

On page 2, volume ii., we are told that Lord Clyde supported the candidature of Sir William Mansfield for command in the China campaign, but at page 5 it is stated that the question was left to Lord Clyde's decision and that he wisely made choice of Sir Hope Grant. We note, also, a few misprints: Guatma for Guatama; Staunton for Stanton; Westpoint for West Point.

Benjamin Disraeli: An Unconventional Biography. By Wilfrid Meynell. With forty illustrations, including two photogravure plates. D. Appleton & Co. 1903.

Mr. Meynell is right in calling his life of Disraeli unconventional. To accord with the conventions of biographical writing, it would need to be rearranged, if not rewritten. To say nothing of the author's style, Disraeli's "last days" come before his "early travels," and we have a hundred and fifty pages of "his talk from youth to old age" before we reach any narrative of his public life. This gives the whole volume a disorderly and disconnected effect, which is the greater pity because it really contains materials for an excellent picture of Disraeli. But Mr. Meynell is altogether too hurried as well as too extravagant and too partisan to do justice to his subject. He speaks of himself in a wild dedication as a "Dizzy-worshipper," and so he is. But worshippers are not necessarily good biographers. For one thing, they are apt to be deficient in a sense of humor, and to our mind no one can possibly write well about Disraeli who has not a very strong sense of the humorous. Nevertheless, Mr. Meynell has, we think, done Disraeli's memory a good turn, for he has given us pretty much everything that he could collect about him, and, now that party rancor is at an end, most that remains of Disraeli is entertaining and amusing, or at least curious.

With every new life of him it is the custom for hostile critics to endeavor to construct some plausible theory to account for his amazing political success in becoming the statesman of the latter-day English Tories, although he was an alien, a complete *novus homo*, an adventurer, and a Jew. Mr. Meynell's theory seems to be that he was really a man of profound political principles, and foresaw before even