the Gaulish invasion that Mr. Parry very properly stops. After that event we begin gradually to approach the limits of real history. Details are still utterly uncertain, but we get names of real men, and accounts of warfare and legislation the general results of which there is no reason to doubt. The Licinian Laws and the Samnite wars are doubtless real events. Though we have no contemporary history of them, yet that such laws were passed, and such wars were waged, rests upon quite sufficient evidence. The error lies in attempting to know every detail about them — to deal with them as we fairly may by the legislation of the Gracchi and the campaigns of the Scipios. Here, then, is a real distinction between the two periods; but it is one of which Livy had very little practical notion. He draws it, indeed, in form, at the beginning of his Sixth Book, but in his narrative he seems to know just as much about the former period as about the latter. These political details give a false appearance of truth to much that is as truly mythical as any story about Zeus or Apollo. The political character of the tales, in fact, goes back to the very beginning. The political history of Rome, if we like to believe it, begins with Romulus and Titus Tatius. That Romulus made a treaty with Tatius is in itself more credible than that he was suckled by a wolf, but there is no more historical evidence for the one story than for the other. The treaty must be set down as equally mythical with the wolf-suckling. The political character of the Roman legends, as we have them, arises from two causes: — One is the genius of the people, ever political and legislative, and which threw its very romance and legend into the form of the events in which it took most interest; the other is the lateness of the authors from whom we gain our knowledge of the old Roman stories. Except two or three notices of Polybius, we have nothing earlier than Livy and Dionysius. In Greece the case is quite different — we get our myths straight from Homer and the poets, and our half-mythical history from the prose poet Herodotus. But we see also the sort of thing into which Greek myths might easily be turned. The hero Theseus became a political personage, just like any of the heroes of Rome. He united the various towns of Attica into one city — sometimes he actually founded the Athenian democracy. Thucydides gives us his view — one quite practical and political — of the Trojan war. Euripides turns the heroes of Homer into the rhetors and sophists of his own day. Now in the case of Rome we have lost the tales in their earlier form — we have them only in the shape which they assumed when this process had been far more fully carried out upon them than it ever was upon the myths of Greece. We see them only as they stood after successive writers had, doubtless in perfect good faith, digested them into a consistent political history. Livy and Dionysius were but copyists of copyists. Livy, with his splendid powers of narrative, told his tale attractively — Dionysius told it stupidly. But for that very reason Dionysius is still more practical and political than Livy. With him the poetical or romantic element, which is still alive in Livy, vanishes as completely as in Thucydides' version of the Trojan war. But the narrative of Dionysius is not thereby rendered one whit more historical than the narrative of Livy. In fact, so far as there can be said to be any truth in the matter, Livy is the truer of the two. His tales have at least a sort of poetic truth — those of Dionysius have not even this.

Mr. Parry's little book seems well adapted for its purpose. His notes are simple and straightforward enough. But it is odd that he should twice — so it is no mere misprint — speak of Sextus Tarquinius as Sex*tius*, which is much as if one should call King John King Jones, or as when a Frenchman talks about Williams Pitt. Mr. Parry gets on rather dangerous ground when he says that the apparently Greek names in the early Roman stories "show that these tales are derived from a Pelasgian source." If Mr. Parry knows anything about the Pelasgians, he has greatly the advantage of us. Also, as Mr. Parry is writing English and not French, we cannot conceive why he should (p. 117) talk about Hippias practising a "*ruse*," or hope in his Preface to "diminish the *ennui* of master and boy." But these are small matters which may easily be improved in another edition. Mr. Parry has produced a very good and useful school-book, and we owe him our thanks for the line of thought into which his selections from Livy have led us.

MEMOIR OF PROFESSOR HENSLOW.*

THE characteristic portrait of Professor Henslow, photographed from his bust by Woolner, which is prefixed to the present memoir, will recall to several generations of Cambridge men the features of one of the most familiar and most honoured members of the University. None of those who ever joined the botanical professor in one of his field-days to Gamlingay, bringing back in triumph some live specimens of that rare toad, the natter-jack, will read without emotion the instructive memoir which his brother-in-law, Mr. Jenyns, has here given us of this single-minded and zealous naturalist. We will follow this interesting biographical record as succinctly as we can.

John Stevens Henslow was born at Rochester in 1796. His devotion to natural history was marked at a very early age. "He showed his ingenuity, as well as his fondness for natural objects, by making the model of a caterpillar." And while yet a child in a frock he dragged home from a considerable distance a fungus, *lycoperdon giganteum*, almost as big as himself. Having received Levaillant's *Travels in Africa* as a school-prize, the boy was seized with a strong desire to explore the mysterious interior of that continent, and the wish was not abandoned for many years. However, his parents and friends steadily refused their consent, and in 1814 Henslow was entered at St. John's College, Cambridge. He obtained high mathematical honours in 1818, having studied, during his undergraduate's course, mineralogy under Dr. Daniel Clarke and chemistry under Professor Cumming. After taking his degree, he devoted himself to geology in company with Professor Sedgwick, and had a great share in the establishment of the Cambridge Philosophical Society. The first professorship which he held was that of Mineralogy, but in 1825 he succeeded Mr. Martyn in the Chair of Botany. Mr. Jenyns, who is himself a distinguished naturalist, gives a detailed account of Professor Henslow's zealous efforts in his new position. The new Botanical Gardens at Cambridge are, perhaps, the most conspicuous monument of his energetic labours. His method of teaching and lecturing was always attractive and successful:—

> One great assistance he derived from his admirable skill in drawing. His illustrations and diagrams representing all the essential parts of plants characteristic of their structure and affinities, many of them highly coloured, were on such a scale that when stuck up they could be plainly seen from every part of the lecture-room. He used also to have "demonstrations" (as he called them) from living specimens. For this purpose he would provide the day before a large number of specimens of some of the more common plants, such as the primrose, and other species easily obtained and in flower at that season of the year, which the pupils, following their teacher during his explanation of the several parts, pulled to pieces for themselves. These living plants were placed in baskets on a side table in the lecture-room, with a number of wooden plates and other requisites for dissecting them after a rough fashion, each student providing himself with what he wanted before taking his seat.

The biographer proceeds to describe Professor Henslow's famous herborizing excursions round Cambridge, which became so popular that his party was often joined, not only by entomologists and students of other branches of natural science, but by many who went for the mere sake of exercise and amusement. After his marriage in 1823, Mr. Henslow took orders, and became curate of one of the Cambridge parishes. His residence in the University was thus prolonged for fifteen years, during which time he succeeded, by his personal efforts, in giving an impetus to the study of natural science which the recent changes in the academic course have failed to maintain. Among Henslow's pupils are reckoned some of the most eminent living naturalists, including Darwin, Berkeley, Lowe, Miller, and Babington — the last being his successor in his chair. Mr. Darwin contributes to this memoir a very interesting account of his recollections of his old teacher, both in his public and private life. It was Henslow's practice to hold a soirée once a week, to which everyone was welcomed who studied any branch of natural science. Of these parties, all who remember them speak with enthusiasm. The modesty, kindness, truthfulness, and playfulness of the host are the theme of universal praise. Mr. Darwin remarks, that towards the close of his life the only change observable in the Professor was that he "cared somewhat less about science and more for his parishioners." He concludes with a true but clumsily-expressed sentence: — "Reflecting over his character with gratitude and reverence, his moral attributes rise, as they should do in the highest character, in pre-eminence over his intellect."

During all these early years of his married life, Henslow's income was very straitened. The endowment of the Professorship was under 200*l.*; and the paltry stipend of a curate in addition did not enable him to dispense with the toilsome necessity of spending five or six hours a-day "in cramming men for their degrees." But in 1832, Lord Brougham, then Lord Chancellor, presented him to a living in Berkshire, which he was able to serve without ceasing to reside in the University. Here follows in his life a curious political episode. Having been a warm supporter of Lord Palmerston, so long as he was the Tory member for the University, Mr. Henslow followed his lordship in his change of politics on the accession of William IV. Nor was he content with a silent change of opinion. In 1835 he signalized himself by becoming the prosecutor in an action for bribery against Sir J. L. Knight Bruce, who had defeated Professor Pryme in a contested election for the borough. This step was much commented upon at the time as being unbecoming in a clergyman. His biographer does not excuse it, but urges that it was a proof of high moral courage. At any rate it had its reward; for two years afterwards Lord Melbourne — who had almost given him the bishopric of Norwich — promoted him to the well-endowed rectory of Hitcham, in Norfolk, which he continued to hold till his death.

Professor Henslow's removal from Cambridge to Hitcham had an injurious effect upon the study of natural science in the University. The Ray Club, an institution which still flourishes, was founded to supply in some measure the want of the soirées which have been already mentioned. But the Professor found to his deep regret, when he came up annually to deliver his lectures in the May Term, that his botanical class was considerably less than it used to be. His biography now takes a new phase, and for a time we see him face to face with the alienated population of a neglected and demoralized parish. He is said to have found the

* *Memoir of the Rev. John Stevens Henslow, M.A., F.L.S., late Rector of Hitcham, and Professor of Botany in the University of Cambridge.* By the Rev. Leonard Jenyns. London: Van Voorst. 1862.

people at Hitcham "sunk almost to the lowest depth of moral and physical debasement." The methods adopted by the new rector for reforming his parishioners were uncommon and highly characteristic of the man. "He wisely began with trying the expedient of winning them over by kindness and conciliation." Accordingly, he got up a cricket-club, and encouraged ploughing-matches, and all sorts of manly games. He gave every year an exhibition of fireworks on the rectory lawn; and he tried to interest the more intelligent of his people in his museum of natural and artificial curiosities. Of course he established a school, in which, almost from the first, he made botany one of the lessons in the regular course of instruction. The allotment system, which he succeeded in introducing in spite of the opposition of the farmers, was, however, perhaps the most beneficial of all his measures. In his attempts to raise the condition of the labourers he did not neglect the interests of their employers. He endeavoured to assist his farmers by his scientific knowledge in improving their methods of husbandry; and delivered admirable lectures to the Hadleigh Farmers' Club on such subjects as the fermentation of manures. These papers were afterwards collected and published, with a useful glossary of terms. We wish we had space for some extracts from these racy and humorous addresses. They met with a very favourable welcome, and contributed not a little to "the conversion," as he expressed it, "of the *art* of husbandry into the *science* of agriculture." Before long, Professor Henslow instituted Horticultural Shows, on which festive occasions there was always a museum of curiosities, with "lecturets" (as he called them), at short intervals, besides a distribution of prizes, games for the children, and tea for the visitors of all ages. In all this it is curious to observe that the place which music occupies now-a-days as a civilizing element in most well-worked rural parishes was supplied at Hitcham by botany. But botany, in Professor Henslow's hands, was anything but a dry study. It is, however, very difficult to believe that his parish children could learn — as we are here assured that they did — to spell properly, and to understand the technical terms of that science. There were three botanical classes; and admission to the very lowest was denied to any child who could not spell, among other words, the terms Angiospermous, Glumaceous, and Monocotyledons. Mr. Jenyns speaks of the "success that attended these botanical lessons as an educational measure;" and we are told that the method has been taken up by the Committee of Council on Education. The true moral, however, from this attempt is this, that in the hands of an energetic and single-minded clergyman any art or science may be made a useful instrument in raising the intellectual and even moral tone of his parishioners. In many respects Professor Henslow was before the age in organizing schemes which have since become not uncommon. For example, when he found that his parishioners had no holiday except a day at Whitsuntide, he substituted for his tithe-audit dinner a parochial excursion, sometimes to Ipswich, sometimes to Cambridge, Norwich, Felixstowe, and even to London. We are told that on these occasions the party numbered 200 souls. Mr. Jenyns apologizes more than is necessary for the secular character of these schemes, and takes needless pains to assure his readers that the spiritual interests of Hitcham were not neglected. More than enough has been said to show that Mr. Henslow, though not a partisan, held strong religious convictions, and was a man of deep personal piety. From this topic, which is delicately handled, and without any of the breaches of confidence too often found in religious biography, Mr. Jenyns goes on to describe Professor Henslow's connexion with the Ipswich Museum, the London University, and the establishment of the Natural Sciences Tripos at Cambridge. He also points out the especial characteristics of the Professor's method of scientific investigation, and the chief discoveries in natural history which are due to him. The end was now approaching. In 1861 a complication of diseases, the result, as it is thought, of a long overtasking both of mind and body, brought him to his death-bed. During his last illness, he was able to take the most lively interest in his own case, in a physiological point of view:—

> In the face of inevitably increasing sufferings he set himself to watch the successive symptoms of approaching dissolution, all of which he desired should be communicated to him by his medical attendants, with whom he discussed them as a philosopher, and without the most distant reference to himself as being the subject of them.

Yet Mr. Jenyns shows, in a very pathetic narrative of the words and thoughts of his brother-in-law's last illness, that he was not only a model of patience and resignation, but an example of ardent Christian faith and charity. Few things are more touching than the account of Professor Sedgwick's last visit to his old friend and colleague. We close this volume with hearty thanks to the biographer for the vivid and instructive picture which he has drawn of the life and death of a true Christian philosopher.