

given) Sir Henry Roscoe, Mr. R. H. Hutton, Sir James Paget, Mr. W. H. Mallock, Mr. F. W. H. Myers, and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Below these there are some hundreds of names, including everybody who has made any sort of mark in literature, science, or art, but none of them has received as many as fifty votes.

"VOX POPULI, VOX DEL."

The result of the competition thus set forth is interesting for many reasons, and amongst others for the illustration it gives of the value of the plébiscite as a method of election even in literary matters. In no other way have you the same security for eliminating personal fads and prejudices, and arriving at a sound and just judgment. The number of voters in this instance has been very large, and they have included persons, as we have said, in all classes and stations of life. The list of the first Forty which has resulted from the aggregate of their opinions will, we think, commend itself at once as eminently fair, comprehensive, and sensible. It is not the list of any single competitor—indeed, as we stated yesterday in awarding the prizes, no competitor named more than thirty-two out of the forty men elected; it is the combined list of them all. So true is it that the wisdom of the many is often greater than that either of the few or of the one. The list is not, indeed, perfect. Most people will probably agree with us, for instance, that the literary claims of Dean Church and Bishop Lightfoot are at least as great as those of Archdeacon Farrar, and the *academical* claims of Sir Theodore Martin, Mr. Henry Irving, Cardinal Manning, and even Sir Frederick Leighton, cannot be said to be obviously greater than those of Sir Henry Maine, Sir George Trevelyan, Mr. J. A. Symonds, and Professor Palgrave. Still, on the whole, the list drawn up by plébiscite is, we think, better than would have been arrived at in other ways. The thing can be brought to the test by means of a comparative table. A few years ago the *Journal of Education* propounded a similar competition to its pundits: there was the oligarchic system of election. Then the other day Mr. G. A. Sala drew up a list of the kind in the *Illustrated London News*. There are few more catholic critics of letters than Mr. Sala: here then was the monarchic system. Our plébiscite illustrates the democratic method, and most competent judges will, we fancy, admit that our list is the best of the three. Here they all are for comparison—the ten names which are common to all three lists being eliminated:—namely, Matthew Arnold, Robert Browning, J. A. Froude, E. A. Freeman, Professor Huxley, Professor Max Müller, Cardinal Newman, John Ruskin, Herbert Spencer, and Lord Tennyson. Two of the *Journal of Education's* immortals have, we should explain, since died—namely, Charles Reade and Sir Henry Taylor; we have filled their places with Dr. Martineau and Mr. Besant, who *proxime accesserunt* on that occasion.

"P.M.G."
Duke of Argyll
Walter Besant
William Black
R. D. Blackmore
John Bright
Wilkie Collins
Archdeacon Farrar
W. E. Gladstone
Frederic Harrison
Henry Irving
B. Jowett
Sir John Lubbock
W. E. H. Lecky
Andrew Lang
Canon Liddon
Sir F. Leighton
Sir T. Martin
Justin McCarthy
Cardinal Manning
George Meredith
John Morley
William Morris
G. A. Sala
J. R. Seeley
Lord Salisbury
A. C. Swinburne
Leslie Stephen
Bishop Stubbs
R. L. Stevenson
Professor Tyndall

G. A. SALA.
Edwin Arnold
Alfred Austin
Professor Blackie
Lord Carnarvon
Edward Dicey
A. Gallenga
Sir W. Harcourt
General Hamley
Lord Lytton
George Macdonald
Lewis Morris
Sir John Lubbock
Professor H. Morley
Andrew Lang
David Masson
St. George Mivart
Sir T. Martin
Sir R. Owen
Dr. B. W. Richardson
James Payn
Henry Reeve
Lord Roebury
W. H. Russell
Prof. A. H. Sayce
Lord Salisbury
Dr. W. Smith (*Quarterly*)
G. Saintsbury
Professor Skeat
Sir George Trevelyan
Lord Wolseley

"JOURNAL OF EDUCATION."
A. W. Kinglake
Walter Besant
William Black
R. D. Blackmore
Bishop Lightfoot
Wilkie Collins
Archdeacon Farrar
W. E. Gladstone
Prof. H. Morley
Sir H. Maine
B. Jowett
George Macdonald
W. E. H. Lecky
Dr. J. Martineau
Lewis Morris
J. H. Shorthouse
Samuel Smiles
Justin McCarthy
J. A. Symonds
George Meredith
John Morley
William Morris
Sir G. Trevelyan
J. R. Seeley
Archbishop Trench
A. C. Swinburne
Leslie Stephen
Bishop Stubbs
Canon Westcott
Professor Tyndall

OXFORD V. CAMBRIDGE.

Reverting now to the English Academy of Letters as drawn up by plébiscite, we may notice as an interesting point the large proportion of Oxford men in the list. It used to be said that Oxford was the home of movements, and Cambridge of men; but the contrast scarcely seems to hold good in the field of contemporary letters. We only notice five Cambridge men in the list—namely, Lord Tennyson, Archdeacon Farrar, Mr. Walter Besant, Mr. Leslie Stephen, and Professor Seeley. Oxford on the other hand can claim the following seventeen—Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Froude, Mr. Morley, Professor Freeman, Mr. Swinburne, Mr. W. Morris, Cardinal Newman, Mr. Jowett, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Lord Salisbury, Canon Liddon, Mr. R. D. Blackmore, Mr. Andrew Lang, Bishop Stubbs, and Cardinal Manning. The balance is not redressed by including the second Forty; there Oxford could point out twelve *alumni* against nine we think, of Cambridge. But one should remember that the *Académie Française* is only one of five learned bodies which compose the *Institut*

de France. If an English Academy of Sciences were to be drawn up also, then we suppose Cambridge would have her revenge.

FRANCE V. ENGLAND.

Meanwhile a comparison of the imaginary English Academy with the actual French Academy suggests many interesting points of remark. We give below a list of the latter body as at present constituted in the order of seniority of their admission. In the parallel column are the imaginary English Academicians, placed in some cases over against their nearest French equivalents, though even in these cases the difference is more remarkable than the resemblance:—

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| J. M. N. D. Nisard | B. Jowett |
| E. W. G. J. Legouvé | Herbert Spencer |
| Emile Augier | John Ruskin |
| Duc de Broglie | Duke of Argyll |
| Octave Feuillet | R. L. Stevenson |
| Camille Doucet | Professor Tyndall |
| A. A. Cuvillier-Fleury | Archdeacon Farrar |
| Emile Ollivier | Marquis of Salisbury |
| Xavier Marmier | Professor Max Müller |
| Duc d'Aumale | W. E. Gladstone |
| Camille Rousset | Sir John Lubbock |
| Baron de Viel-Castel | W. Morris |
| A. J. F. Mézières | Cardinal Newman |
| Alexandre Dumas | W. Besant |
| E. M. Caro | W. E. H. Lecky |
| John Lemoine | G. A. Sala |
| Jules Simon | J. Morley |
| M. L. A. G. Boissier | A. Lang |
| Victorien Sardou | Wilkie Collins |
| Ernest Renan | Matthew Arnold |
| H. A. Taine | J. A. Froude |
| Duc d'Audiffret-Pasquier | J. Bright |
| E. M. Labiche | Frederic Harrison |
| Maxime Du Camp | Leslie Stephen |
| A. J. E. Rousse | W. Black |
| R. F. A. Sully-Prudhomme | Lord Tennyson |
| Louis Pasteur | Professor Huxley |
| Victor Cherbuliez | J. McCarthy |
| The Bishop of Autun (Perraud) | Cardinal Manning |
| Edouard Pailleron | Sir Th. Martin |
| L. C. J. R. de Mazade-Percin | H. Irving |
| François Coppée | Robert Browning |
| Ferdinand de Lesseps | George Meredith |
| Victor Duruy | E. A. Freeman |
| Joseph Bertrand | Canon Liddon |
| Ludovic Halévy | R. D. Blackmore |
| Léon Say | Sir F. Leighton |
| Charles Lecomte de Lisle | A. C. Swinburne |
| A. M. E. Hervé | Bishop Stubbs |
| V. C. O. Gréard | Professor J. R. Seeley |

"THE LEADER IS FAIREST, BUT BOTH ARE"—IMMORTAL.

Which of the two lists is the more distinguished? The first thought of English readers will, no doubt, be conceived in the spirit of that sentence by Lord Macaulay which Mr. Matthew Arnold gibbets in his essay on the French Academy. The literature produced by our English forty is of far greater value, they will say, than that produced by the forty Frenchmen, many of whose names we have never so much as heard. It is quite true that not more than half the French Immortals at most are generally known in this country: but then it would probably be a painful surprise to learn how few of ours are known at all in France. Besides, the French have this great advantage to start with, that a French writer speaks to so much larger an audience of the best judges than an English writer. If quality be put out of court, the Englishman, it is true, has the advantage. But the French audience, if fewer, is far more fit. English is the language of the New World, but French is the language of the Old. Colonization speaks English, but culture speaks French. The author who writes in Paris has the Continent of Europe, and especially Belgium, Switzerland, Russia, and Italy for his sounding-board, but the author who writes in London must speak with a very clear and classic utterance for his voice not to be drowned in the English Channel. But how stands the comparison if the extent of influence be disregarded and the intrinsic merits of the things said be alone considered? Eliminate the less distinguished men on either side and pass over those whose distinction is not literary at all, and see what remains. In science is Professor Huxley fairly matched against M. Pasteur? Probably not, but then is M. Pasteur as great a master of French style as Professor Huxley is of English? Among the critics which is the greater, M. Renan or Mr. Matthew Arnold? Let us hope for the sake of the game the former, for it cannot surely be only insular prejudice that ranks the poetical—we use the word, in its application to M. Renan, *Gossesquely*—record of Mr. Arnold above that of the author of the "Abbesse de Jouarre." There are statesmen with literary tastes in both lists; and Mr. Gladstone, Lord Salisbury, and the Duke of Argyll need not, we think, fear comparison with the Reactionary Dukes and M. Ollivier. We have left out M. Jules Simon and M. Léon Say; but Mr. John Bright is a greater orator than either, and Mr. John Morley has his books on the French Revolution to commend him. In the field of history, comparison is impossible, for the two sides would never agree we suppose on the preliminary question whether the history of France or of England was the better worth writing. M. Taine is a host in himself; but Mr. Froude is a master of style, too. Freeman and Stubbs and Seeley are at least as great historians, surely, as Rousset and Rousseau and Viel-Castel. In the department of classical scholarship the comparison is not so favourable to us as it might be owing to the popular vote having excluded all our best classical scholars; but even as it is, Mr. Jowett and Mr. Andrew Lang will, we think, beat