

the Alps themselves because he had reason to believe that the Gauls who dwelt beyond them would join him to a man. Neither were his communications with his immediate rear entirely broken, even after Hanno had been defeated; while the sea was always open to him, by means of which reinforcements and supplies could at any time reach him from Carthage. Hannibal and Wellington were equally deceived in their expectations. Both, after gaining great battles, were forced to withdraw: the one to defend Carthage, which he failed in doing; the other to save Portugal, and to gather strength for a third and more successful effort in Spain.

We might pursue this parallel further, by showing how closely these great men resembled each other in the moderation which they exhibited when carrying all before them, in their unflinching courage and determination, when to human appearance their cause was become desperate. Hannibal in Italy maintained among his troops the same strict discipline which Wellington maintained in the south of France; and both secured thereby the good-will of the people to whom they came as conquerors. The defeat of Asdrubal, terrible as it was, no more broke the courage of Hannibal than Wellington's resolution was shaken when tidings of the battle of Wagram reached him. Finally, both were the devoted servants of their country, and of its constitution, though both suffered from the inaptitude of the latter to a state of war. Marked differences the inquirer will doubtless find in the tempers of the men as well as in the careers of the generals. But these seem to be the results of the different circumstances under which they were placed. All that belonged, properly speaking, to themselves, their quickness to observe, their powers of calculation, their coolness, forethought, self-possession, justice, their fertility in resources, their exceeding strength of will, were essentially the same. Had Hannibal been thrown into Wellington's age and circumstances, he would have done, in all probability, much as Wellington did; had Wellington filled Hannibal's place in history, the name

would have been changed, but the exploits of the Carthaginian commander would have come down to us very little varied from what we now find them.

In estimating the character of the Duke of Wellington as a soldier, it has not been unusual, both in England and elsewhere, to draw between him and John Duke of Marlborough a parallel generally to the advantage of the latter. According to our view of the case, the materials for such a parallel are as scanty as the conclusion adverse to the Duke of Wellington is unjust. In this they doubtless resembled one another, that both understood how to handle troops; that both were careful of the health and general comforts of their men, and that both paid great attention to details. But so far they only fall into the groove along which great commanders have run since the world began; for no man can long command an army at all who is careless of the health and comforts of his men, and inattentive to matters of detail. When we look closer into the subject, however, it will be seen that there is not much similarity in the conditions under which Marlborough and Wellington respectively made war; and hence that the similitudes which are discoverable in the two careers affect particular operations rather than the genius of the men who directed them. The Duke of Marlborough, for example, assumed the command of an allied army in the Netherlands, after having studied his profession under Turenne and William III.; the latter an unsuccessful, but not therefore an incapable, officer. The Duke of Wellington's masters in the art of war were the Duke of York and Lord Harris, brave men both, but certainly not to be spoken of in the same breath with Turenne or William III. The Duke of Marlborough found himself at the head of Dutch, Austrian, and Sardinian troops,—all of them in as high a state of discipline as his own, and at least as well appointed. He had as his coadjutor Prince Eugene, a general scarcely inferior to himself in skill and capacity, and he carried on his operations against such officers as Tallard and Villars, the Duke of Burgundy, Villeroy, and Boufflers.

The Duke of Wellington was forced to construct for

himself a Portuguese contingent, and having raised it to the highest state of perfection of which it seems to have been capable, used to say, that when led by British officers it was equal to the Sepoys. As to the Spanish armies, they were sometimes rather an encumbrance to him than the reverse; they could never, to the end of the war, be entirely depended upon. With respect, again, to his own lieutenants, the most that can be said is, that several among them possessed a fair share of ability; whereas his opponents were, Soult, Massena, Marmont, Victor, and finally Napoleon. Again, Marlborough, when supplies were wanting, made his requisitions upon states which, being under the management of regular Governments, were always able, and generally willing, to furnish whatever might be required. Wellington, on the other hand, was driven to create his own resources, and to provide his own means both of collecting and paying for them. Marlborough, supported by the Queen, and backed by the undivided influence of the Revolution Government, had at his command the whole military resources of Great Britain. There were then no colonies in all parts of the world to protect; no India to guard, no Mediterranean fortresses to garrison. Wellington found it necessary to sustain the courage of a feeble Cabinet, which, in the face of popular clamour and a strong parliamentary opposition, was afraid to put forth the strength of the empire, even though in withholding it they exposed both their general and his army to destruction. No doubt the field deputies were a source of great annoyance to Marlborough, from which, however, he succeeded at last in delivering himself; but the Portuguese Regency, and the Juntas and Cortes of Spain, hung like a mill-stone round the neck of Wellington, from the opening to the close of the struggle. I might go further, and refer to the tone which pervades the correspondence of these two men, the one always keeping in view self-aggrandizement, and the interests of party, the other taking no serious thought of anything except the public service, and the best means of promoting it. But this is not necessary; Marlborough and Wellington were both great men,—great in politics, per-

haps greater in war ; but except that neither of them ever sustained a defeat, there is little which, to him who examines their respective courses with attention, will serve to place them in any degree of parallelism one towards the other.

And this naturally leads to a consideration of the calls which were made upon them for the management, not of combined armies alone, but of Courts and Cabinets, of which the views were often as narrow as they were discordant. The task imposed upon Marlborough in this respect was heavy enough. He had to excite the States-General, always indolent and greedy, to self-denial and activity, while he kept up the sinking courage of the emperor, and restrained the impetuosity of the House of Savoy. He succeeded, as he invariably did, in diplomacy, by dint of great penetration into the characters of others, by winning manners, and the hearty support of Godolphin and the Duchess Sarah at home. But success enabled him only to lay upon others a responsibility which he could not himself undertake. He never found it necessary, first to create the resources of the states with which he was in communication, and then to wield them. How it fared with Wellington in these respects in India, in the Spanish Peninsula, and in France, I need not here stop to point out.

The place to be allotted to the Duke of Wellington as a leading statesman under a constitutional Government will be determined, as a matter of course, according to the opinions entertained by those who sit in judgment upon him, on certain great constitutional questions. That he was a Royalist in every sense of the term, all who came in contact with him understood. The Government of the empire was for him the King's Government ; the peace of the realm was the King's peace ; the army, the navy, the magistracy, the Parliament itself were the King's. The throne was the fountain, not of honour only, but of all the rights and privileges which the people enjoyed. Yet the throne, as he regarded it, was as much hemmed in by law, and even by custom, as the humblest of the lieges. And so it came to pass that, Royalist as he was, no man stood up

more stoutly for the people and their rights than the Duke of Wellington. Like the best of the cavaliers in the time of the first Charles, it was for the Crown, as the greatest institution in the country, that he was prepared to risk everything. Hence, if the King's ministers proposed measures which he believed to be mischievous or unsafe, he opposed them. Hence, too, if the Sovereign expressed wishes, a compliance with which would tend in his opinion to bring the Crown into disrepute, he resisted such wishes. Had his advice been taken, the country might have escaped much, if not all, the scandal of Queen Caroline's trial. He overruled George IV. in other caprices, equally with that calculated to add to his unpopularity. While prepared at all hazards to deliver William IV. out of his difficulties, he did not hesitate to point out to his Majesty where he had gone wrong. And even towards Queen Victoria, for whom he would have cheerfully laid down his life, he took on one memorable occasion an attitude somewhat savouring of harshness. He joined the opposition to the grant proposed by Lord Melbourne for Prince Albert on his marriage, and cut it down from £50,000 to £30,000 a year. However unpalatable at the moment this act might be, neither the Sovereign nor the people could mistake his motive, and both the Sovereign and the people gave him in return increased esteem and reverence.

For many years after he became a minister, the Duke's place in the Cabinet was a subordinate one. His own tenure of office as head of an Administration was brief. Yet he contrived in that interval to pass a measure from grappling with which all previous Governments had shrunk. His Catholic Relief Bill would have been more satisfactory had he been able to carry it in its original form. But with all the imperfections which others ingrafted upon it, who will speak of it as a blunder? That the Tories of 1829 blundered in breaking off from his guidance, there are probably few survivors of that gallant but headstrong band who will now deny. But surely the blame of subsequent misfortunes, if misfortunes we are to consider them, rests, not with him who got rid of an insuperable obstacle to all

Government, but with his angry followers, who, to gratify a spirit of revenge, placed him in a minority in the House of Commons, and insured the accession of the Whigs to office.

The Duke's policy and system of management on the two great questions of Parliamentary reform and free-trade in corn, are, and will remain to the end of time, fair subjects of discussion. That he exaggerated the amount of danger to be apprehended from both measures, may be true. Experience, as far as it has yet instructed us, seems to indicate as much; but believing, as he did, that Lord Grey's bill, if passed into law, would sap the foundations of the monarchy, and that the means adopted by the minister to pass it into law were even more pregnant with danger than the bill itself, we cannot, understanding his nature, and taking proper measure of his principles, blame him for having resisted it at every stage. Of his subsequent conduct when in opposition, and his perfect disinterestedness after the Conservatives returned to power, there cannot be two opinions. And if he seemed to desert his party when Sir Robert Peel gave up the Corn Laws, let it not be forgotten that he went with Sir Robert for the party's sake. It was in the hope of keeping power in the hands of Conservative statesmen that he sacrificed the most fondly cherished of all his political opinions.

All this, however, only brings us back to the point from which we started in 1826. Was it possible for a man, already so great as the Duke of Wellington, to descend into the arena of party politics, without subtracting from his greatness. Add to it he could not, and therefore be the results of the experiment what they may, both to the country and to himself, this at least is certain, that in making it he yielded to no suggestion of merely selfish ambition.

Of the Duke as an orator enough has already been said to convey a tolerably accurate impression to the mind of a careful reader. He had been many years a regular attendant in the House of Lords, before he ever thought of addressing it, except when some appeal was made directly to himself, and then he spoke briefly. He became all at once its leader, not in council only and by the force of his strong

understanding, but in debate. His speeches, like his letters, are plain, straightforward, and to the purpose. His arguments were from time to time well sustained, and even ingenious; as in his censure of Earl Grey for dissolving Parliament in 1831, and in the view which he took of the effect of the laws against Roman Catholics upon the constitution properly so called. His articulation, never very clear, became in latter years difficult, and sometimes painful. He would make long pauses when speaking, repeat himself, and occasionally employ terms which amounted to exaggeration. But in every instance what he said had in it a large measure of good sense, and was invariably listened to, both in the House of Lords and elsewhere, with respect.

The attention which the Duke commanded for himself, he never failed to give to others. There he sat, with his hat drawn over his brows, and his hand up to his ear, listening to one noble lord after another, as if each had an argument to advance which might possibly change his own views of the point under discussion. And when otherwise unable to catch the substance of what was said, he would move as close to the speaker as the customs of the House allowed, and stand till the speech came to a close.

Of the Duke's personal peculiarities, both physical and mental, enough, it may be thought, has been said elsewhere, yet my portrait would scarcely be complete were I to omit all notice of them in this place. Nature had endowed him with a robust frame and an iron constitution. In height he measured about 5 feet 9 inches,—I speak, of course, of what he was in the vigour of his days, for latterly old age had shrunk and bowed his frame, and given him the habit of stooping. His shoulders were broad, his chest well developed, his arms long, and his hands and feet in excellent proportion. His eyes were of a dark violet blue, or grey, and his sight was so penetrating, that even to the last he could distinguish objects at an immense distance. The general expression of his countenance when silent or pre-occupied, was grave; but his smile had a charm about it which, when once seen, could never be forgotten. A forehead not very high, but broad and square, eyebrows straight and prominent, a

long face, a Roman nose, a broad under jaw, with a chin strongly marked, gave him a striking resemblance to more than one of the heroes of antiquity, especially to Julius Cæsar. His hair, which was originally a clear brown, had become white as silver before he died, but to the last there was no baldness, even at the temples. If you met him in a crowd or upon the street, and were entirely ignorant that he was a great man, you would be impelled by some secret impulse to fix your eye upon him, and to turn round and look after him when he had passed. I saw him for the first time as he crossed the line of march during a military operation in Spain. Only three mounted officers attended him, and he was simply dressed in a grey frock, a cocked hat covered with oil-skin, and grey trowsers; but instinctively he was recognized as the commander of the forces, and the impression then made upon the mind of a boy, never in after-life passed away.

The military costume of the Duke on active service was singularly plain, though becoming, and very peculiar. On state occasions he wore the full dress of his rank, with all his orders and decorations; but in the field his garb was either a blue or a grey frock—blue when fighting was not expected; grey, if a battle were in preparation or in progress. Over this, that he might be more easily recognized from afar, he often threw a short white cloak, which is still in existence, and may be seen in a glass case at Apsley House. His cocked hat was very low, rising but little above the crown of the head, and he rarely surmounted it with a plume. The boots known as "Wellingtons" were of his own invention, and outside the trowsers he used often to wear mud-guards of strong leather, which overlapped and were fastened with straps and buckles. His sword was a light steel-mounted sabre, which he suspended from his waist by a black belt. He never wore a sash except *en grande tenue*.

His morning dress, as a civilian, was scrupulously neat and clean, but varied very little, and that only with the change of seasons. In summer he might be recognized, on foot or on horseback, by his low-crowned narrow-brimmed hat, his white cravat fastened with a silver buckle behind;

his blue frock, white waistcoat, and white trowsers. In winter there were the same hat, neckcloth, and frock, with a waistcoat blue, sometimes red, and blue trowsers. He never wore a great coat, but in severe weather threw a short cloak or cape over his shoulders, made of blue cloth, with a white lining. His evening attire, except when he was in mourning, consisted of a blue coat with metal buttons, a white cravat and waistcoat, black breeches, and silk stockings, or tight black pantaloons. On these occasions he wore the order of the Garter under the left knee, with the Golden Fleece suspended round his neck, the blue or other ribbon, and a star. When at Walmer, he often dressed for dinner in the uniform of the Cinque Ports, viz., a blue coat with scarlet collar and cuffs, and blue trowsers with a red stripe down the outer seam.

Though a bold rider and a fearless driver, it cannot be said that the Duke was either skilful in equitation or an expert whip. His seat when mounted was loose, and latterly not very graceful. He spared no expense in furnishing his stables, but somehow or another his horses were rarely without a fault. The truth, I believe, was, that besides being but an indifferent judge of the animal at the outset, he became so much attached to it when he had ridden it for a while, that he continued to use it after any other man would have exchanged it for another. Of the sort of carriage in which he used to be conveyed to and from the Horse Guards, I have already spoken. In the country, before he ceased to be his own charioteer, he was in the habit of driving sometimes a curricule, sometimes, when his house was full of guests, a sort of *char-à-banc*. Being deaf in the left ear, he sat always on the left side of the box, and his driving was like that of Jehu the son of Nimshi, furious. It happened that on one occasion I, being in another carriage behind him, endeavoured to follow close through the narrow uneven lanes which connect Barfriston with Walmer. It was a vain effort; he was soon out of sight. Arriving by and by at the Castle gate, I was met by Lord Clanwilliam, who had been the Duke's companion in the curricule. "The Duke gets along," was the remark, "he soon left me behind."

“There is no doubt of that,” was the answer; “I thought more than once that he would have left me behind too.”

The Duke's manner of life was plain, regular, and methodical. He mixed, indeed, freely in the society of London during the season, for everybody desired to have him, and he went everywhere—not in search of personal gratification to himself, but because he knew that others would be gratified by his presence. Indeed he felt, and to his more intimate friends often complained, of the burden which society was to him, though in this, as in graver matters, his own ease was invariably postponed to what he held to be a duty. Elsewhere than in London, his habits were simple, I had almost said severe. The rooms most plainly furnished in Strathfieldsaye and Walmer Castle were those which he personally occupied. He slept at Strathfieldsaye upon a sofa, at Walmer upon a small iron bedstead, which might have served him, and was commonly, though erroneously, supposed to have done so, throughout his wars in the Peninsula. Both couches were without posts or curtains, or hangings of any kind; and the bedding consisted of a hair mattress, a blanket, and an eider-down quilt. At Walmer, his bed-room served him as a private sitting-room also. It was situated within one of the bastions of the Castle, and, besides his couch, contained a few chairs, two tables, and a bookcase so placed that he could take down a volume from it at pleasure while in bed, and a chest of drawers. The Bible, the Prayer-book, a copy of Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying*, and Cæsar's *Commentaries*, lay within his reach, and judging from the marks of use which are upon them, must have been much read and often consulted.

The Duke was most exact and particular in his correspondence. No letter, even the most eccentric, remained unanswered. When, indeed, numbers of persons took to writing to him for the mere purpose of obtaining his autograph, he so couched his replies as to meet the peculiarities of each case. There was much originality in these answers. Some ran thus: “F.M. the Duke of Wellington regrets that it is not in his power, &c., &c. He is one of the few persons in this country who don't meddle with matters with

which they have no concern." Others took this turn:—"F.M. the Duke of Wellington can give no opinion upon a matter of which he knows nothing."

In 1845, when the Queen paid him a visit at Strathfieldsaye, the newspaper reporters applied to him, according to the custom of the country, to be admitted into the house, in order that they might give an account of what was passing there. The Duke wrote to them in these terms:—"F.M. the Duke of Wellington presents his compliments to Mr —, and begs to say that he does not see what his house at Strathfieldsaye has to do with the public press."

A gentleman of Belfast wrote to him the following letter:—"May it please your Grace, I have taken the liberty of requesting your opinion—Was Napoleon guilty or not of the murder of his prisoners at Jaffa? and if there is any military law or circumstance that would justify the deed?" The following was the Duke's answer:—"F.M. the Duke of Wellington presents his compliments to Mr H.; he has also received Mr H.'s letter, and begs leave to inform him, that he is not the historian of the wars of the French Republic in Egypt and Syria."

A great number of authors applied to the Duke to subscribe to their works. His answer was always the same. "F.M. the Duke of Wellington begs to decline to give his name as a subscriber to the book in question. If he learns that it is a good book he may become a purchaser."

Equally characteristic were the Duke's letters, whether of courtesy or of kindness. The author of the Subaltern, whose work obtained, perhaps, a greater measure of success than it deserved, was informed by some of his friends that it had attracted the attention of the Duke of Wellington, and the suggestion was made to him that he also should apply for leave to dedicate a new edition to the Duke. He received by return of post the following answer:—

"London, 9th November, 1826.

"DEAR SIR,

"I have this day received your letter of the 7th inst., and I beg to assure you that you have been correctly in-



formed that I had read your work with the greatest interest, and that I admired the simplicity and truth with which you had related the various events which you had witnessed; the scenes in which you had been an actor, and the circumstances of the life which you had led as an officer of the 85th regiment, in the army in the Peninsula and the south of France.

“I should be happy to have an opportunity of testifying my sense of the merits of your work by consenting to the dedication to me of the second edition, only that I have long been under the necessity of declining to give a formal consent to receive the dedication of any work.

“I conceive that by such consent I give a sort of tacit guarantee of the contents of the work so dedicated. I know that I should be considered to have placed myself in that situation by some who might not, perhaps, approve of those contents. From what I have above stated, you will see that I could have no objection to stand in the situation described, in relation to your work; and I must admit that it would be better to draw a distinction between good and meritorious works and others, and to give my sanction, so far as to consent to receive the compliment of their dedication gives such sanction, to the first and not to the last. But then there comes another difficulty. Before I give such sanction I must peruse the work proposed to be dedicated to me; and I must confess that I have neither time nor inclination to wade through the hundreds, I might almost say thousands, of volumes offered to my protection, in order to see whether their contents are such as that I can venture to become a species of guarantee for their truth, their fitness, &c., &c. I have therefore taken the idlest and the shortest way of getting out of this difficulty, by declining to give a formal consent to receive the dedication of any work. This mode of proceeding frequently gives me great pain; but in no instance has it given more than on this occasion, as you will perceive by the trouble which I give you to peruse, and myself to write, these reasons for declining to give a formal consent to accept the compliment which you have been so kind as to propose to me.

“ If, however, you think proper to dedicate your second edition to me, you are perfectly at liberty to do so ; and you cannot express in too strong terms my approbation and admiration of your interesting work.

“ I have the honour to be, dear Sir,

“ Yours most faithfully,

“ WELLINGTON.

“ I was informed when I landed at Dover in April of the change of your line of life and circumstances, by one of your former brother officers.”

The individual to whom this letter was addressed derived from it, as may be supposed, the highest gratification ; and the kindness which it manifested personally to himself ceased only with the life of the illustrious writer.

The Duke's correspondence during the agitation of Lord Grey's Reform Bill was, as we have seen, immense. If printed in detail it would fill volumes ; but a few specimens, merely to show upon what principle he acted, both as a public man and as an individual, may be with perfect propriety inserted here.

At a moment when the public mind was at the height of its agitation, I took the liberty of expressing by letter a wish that certain concessions should be made. The following is the Duke's reply :—

“ London, 11th April, 1831.

“ I have received your letters of the 8th and 9th. It is curious enough that I, who have been the greatest reformer on earth, should be held up as an enemy to all reform. This assertion is neither more or less than one of the lying cries of the day.

“ If by reform is meant Parliamentary reform, or a change in the mode or system of representation, what I have said is, that I have never heard of a plan that was safe and practicable that would give satisfaction, and that while I was in office I should oppose myself to reform in Parliament. This was in answer to Lord Grey on the first day of the session. I am still of the same opinion. I think that Parliament has done its duty : that constituted as Parliament is, having

in it as a member every man noted in the country for his fortune, his talents, his science, his industry, or his influence; the first men of all professions, in all branches of trade and manufacture, connected with our colonies and settlements abroad, and representing, as it does, all the states of the United Kingdom, the government of the country is still a task almost more than human. To conduct the Government would be impossible, if by reform the House of Commons should be brought to a greater degree under popular influence. Yet let those who wish for reform reflect for a moment where we should all stand if we were to lose for a day the protection of Government.

“That is the ground upon which I stand with respect to the question of reform in general. I have more experience in the government of this country than any man now alive, as well as in foreign countries. I have no borough influence to lose, and I hate the whole concern too much to think of endeavouring to gain any. Ask the gentlemen of the Cinque Ports whether I have ever troubled any of them.

“On the other hand, I know that I should be the idol of the country if I could pretend to alter my opinion and alter my course. And I know that I exclude myself from political power by persevering in the course which I have taken. But nothing shall induce me to utter a word, either in public or in private, that I don't believe to be true. If it is God's will that this great country should be destroyed, and that mankind should be deprived of this last asylum of peace and happiness, be it so; but, as long as I can raise my voice, I will do so against the infatuated madness of the day.

“In respect to details, it has always appeared to me that the first step upon this subject was the most important. We talk of unrepresented great towns! These are towns which have all the benefit of being governed by the system of the British Constitution without the evil of elections. Look at Scotland. Does Scotland suffer because it has not the benefit of riotous elections? I think that reform in Scotland would be, and I am certain would be thought, a

grievance by many in that country. I can answer for there being many respectable men in Manchester, and I believe there are some in Birmingham and Leeds, who are adverse to change.

“ But how is this change to be made ? Either by adding to the number of representatives in Parliament from England, or by disfranchising what are called the rotten boroughs ! The first cannot be done without a departure from the basis and a breach of the Acts of Union. And, mind, a serious departure and breach of these Acts, inasmuch as the limits of the extension could not be less than from fifteen to twenty towns. The last would be, in my opinion, a violation of the first and most important principle of the Constitution, for no valid reason, and upon no ground whatever excepting a popular cry, and an apprehension of the consequences of resisting it. But this is not all. I confess that I see in thirty members for rotten boroughs thirty men, I don't care of what party, who would preserve the state of property as it is ; who would maintain by their votes the Church of England, its possessions, its churches and universities, all our great institutions and corporations, the union with Scotland and Ireland, the connection of the country with its foreign colonies and possessions, the national honour abroad and its good faith with the King's subjects at home. I see men at the back of the Government to enable it to protect individuals and their property against the injustice of the times, which would sacrifice all rights and all property to a description of plunder called general convenience and utility. I think it is the presence of this description of men in Parliament with the country gentlemen, and the great merchants, bankers, and manufacturers, which constitutes the great difference between the House of Commons and those assemblies abroad called ‘ Chambers of Deputies.’ It is by means of the representatives of the close corporations that the great proprietors of the country participate in political power. I don't think that we could spare thirty or forty of these representatives, or change them with advantage for thirty or forty members elected for the great towns by any new system. I am certain that the country would be in-

jured by depriving men of great property of political power, besides the injury done to it by exposing the House of Commons to a greater degree of popular influence.

“You will observe that I have now considered only the smallest of all reforms—a reform which would satisfy nobody. Yet it cannot be adopted without a serious departure from principle (principle in the maintenance of which the smallest as well as the greatest of us is interested), and by running all the risks of those misfortunes which all wish to avoid..

“I tell you that we must not risk our great institutions and large properties, personal as well as real. If we do there is not a man of this generation, so young, so old, so rich, so poor, so bold, so timid, as that he will not feel the consequences of this rashness. This opinion is founded not on reasoning only, but on experience, and I shall never cease to declare it.”

Everybody at that time had some suggestion to make; and having, among others, consulted the Duke on the propriety of forming constitutional societies, I received the following answer:—

“I quite concur in all that you suggest as steps to be taken, with the exception of the formation of societies. We must never forget the Roman Catholic Association in Ireland, in its various modifications and forms. There is nothing so easy as to give a society a constitutional title, and to hold out for it the most beneficent objects, and then to turn it to the most mischievous purposes. Those who have not had to deal with these mischievous societies, are not aware, as we ‘hacks’ are, of all that can be done with them. I don’t think that I could belong to one that had the most innocent views and objects.”

In 1834 Lord John Russell did me the unexpected favour to present me to the chaplaincy of Chelsea Hospital. As the offer of the appointment came entirely unsolicited, and as there was no accord at that time between Lord John’s policy of Parliamentary reform and the views which I was known to entertain, the circumstance naturally excited some

surprise ; and the same post which conveyed to his lordship my acknowledgments, carried a letter to the Duke, stating how the case stood, and venturing to ask advice. I received, with the least delay possible, the following answer :—

“ Strathfieldsaye, 12th February, 1834.

“ I was in town yesterday ; and am just now returned, and have received your note.

“ I don't think that it will be disagreeable to you, or will do any harm, to tell you what I know of your appointment.

“ Lord John inquired about you from Lord Fitzroy Somerset, who told him that he would apply to me about you. The object of the inquiry was to know whether you were a party-writer.

“ I desired Lord Fitzroy to tell Lord John that you, as most other good clergymen of the Church of England, were a zealous Conservative politician ; but that I did not believe you had ever been a party-writer ; that when I was in office I was anxious to promote you in the Church * * * * * and that I had earnestly urged you, by all means in your power, to avoid party-discussions ; that I never heard of your having engaged in them ; and that I firmly believed you had not.

“ I learned no more upon the subject till I received your letter.

“ You see that the advice that I gave you was judicious ; and that you are in the enjoyment of the advantage resulting from it.

“ I shall be very sorry to lose your society at Walmer Castle, but I hope that I shall see you in London.”

One more specimen, in rather a different style, and I pass on to other matters.

In 1836, a Bill was brought in to effect certain changes in the constitution of the Scotch universities. It was greatly disliked by the High Church party in both kingdoms ; and one of these, hoping to engage the Duke's opposition to it, called his attention to its assumed defects. The following was the Duke's answer :—

“London, 12th June, 1836.

“The question of the Scotch universities has not escaped my attention. Care is taken that nothing should. Neither has it escaped me that this Bill is founded on the report of a commission, appointed, I believe, by Sir Robert Peel in 1828. We cannot blow hot one day and cold another on such subjects: at least I cannot. Moreover, I know that I should have nobody to support me on that subject.”

Of the Duke's habits of patient industry it may well appear superfluous to speak. We have seen how in India, in the Spanish peninsula, and in France, hours which others would have devoted to necessary repose were spent by him in toil. And as if all this had not been sufficient to tax his energies fully, he seems to have made copies of many of his own letters, and to have arranged and docketed them all. This, indeed, was a practice which he appears very early to have begun, as if there had been present with him from the outset a conviction that his name would sooner or later become historical, and that means ought to be at hand of connecting it only with the truths of history. And he never abandoned the habit to the end. Boxes of his papers, chronologically arranged, stood in their proper order at Apsley House when he died, and stand there still. When re-examined and re-sorted, a process to which the filial piety of his son is now subjecting them, they will account, in a great degree, for the manner in which every day of the Duke's long life was spent.

A volume might be filled with anecdotes illustrative of various traits in the Duke's character,—his perfect self-possession in moments of difficulty and danger, his kindly disposition, his wit, and severe wisdom.

Of his self-possession on the field of battle I have given in the course of this narrative several examples. Many more might be added did the occasion require; for no event in war appeared to take him by surprise, no blunder on the part of his subordinates discomposed him. He was equally calm and collected on other occasions less in unison, as might be assumed, with his professional habits. He never