SOME NEW BOOKS.

Herbert Spencer on Political Institutions.

After some delay, required by the peculiar complexity of the subject, Mr. HERBERT SPENCER has published that portion of his work on "The Principles of Sociology" which deals with *Political Institutions* (Appletons). To discover what truths may be affirmed of political organizations at large is the problem which the author has undertaken to solve in the present volume, and as he has been able to devote to it only two years, he does not presume to offer more than an approximation toward a satisfactory solution. The topic, however, is in itself so interesting that this book will probably find more readers than any in the long series of the synthetic philosophy, except possibly that which set forth the data of ethics.

The chapters of this work which will be most carefully examined in such countries as possess a parliamentary or presidential scheme of government, are those which treat of representative bodies, of ministries, of local governing agencies, and of judicial and executive systems. Tracing the method by which governmental influence of the people is acquired, Mr. Spencer reminds us that the primitive political assembly was essentially a war council, formed of leaders who debated in presence of their followers. That this is the normal order is attested by the fact that, after a political dissolution, organization begins *de novo* in this way, as in the instance of the Italian cities. Attendance at such primitive parliaments was enforced by a fine, because the obligation to fight comes first and the right to vote comes second. The obligation was primary and the power secondary, and to vote money was at an early date understood to be the fundamental purpose for which delegates or representatives were assembled. If we keep this essential purpose of the representative system in mind, we shall see that antiquity was not so ignorant of delegated authority as it is supposed to have been. It is certain, for example, that Gaul, Spain, all the Eastern provinces, and Greece had representative assemblies under the Roman empire, but the author should have noticed that in most cases these bodies never advanced beyond the initial stage of political development; that they existed for the sole purpose of fulfilling obligations and not at all with the object of exercising power. In Gaul, for instance, as Guizot has shown, to be elected a member of a municipal council during the fourth century of our era, and to be thereby made responsible for the tax levied on the town, was an office which citizens sought, by all means in their power, to avoid.

So long as the central authority represented the only power in the State, as was the case under the Roman empire, it was impossible for representative assemblies, numerous as they in fact were, to pass beyond the rudimentary stage of burden bearers. It was only when the feudal system brought the sovereign in collision with a powerful aristocracy that these representative assemblies became indispensable to one or the other of the two parties opposed, and thus were enabled to acquire, first a consultative, and then a legislative function. It is easy enough to understand how, from the ability to prescribe conditions under which money was to be voted, would grow the ability to join in legislation. But how does the representative body become separated from the consultative body? This is a difficult question to answer, although from a very early period we see foreshadowed a tendency to differentiation. Thus in England, though in the writs calling together Simon of Montfort's Parliament, no distinction was made between magnates and deputies, yet a generation afterward "counsel" was deliberately mentioned in the invitation to the magnates, but "assent and consent" in the invitation to representatives. But though at first of little account, and growing in power only because the free portion of the community occupied in production and distribution grew in mass and importance, the representative body came in the end to be that part of the governing agency which more and more expresses the sentiments and ideas of industrialism. While the monarch and upper House in the British political system are the products of the ancient system of compulsory coöperation, the spirit of which they still manifest, though in decreasing degrees, the House of Commons is the product of that modern régime of voluntary coöperation which is replacing it. And, in an increasing degree, this lower House carries out the wishes of people habituated to a daily life regulated by contract instead of by status. In short, we trace in the development of this political institution the operation of the general law of organization, whereby difference of function entails differentiation of the parts performing them. At first summoned to the national assembly for purposes partially like, and partially unlike those of the other members, the elected members evince a segregating tendency which, when the industrial portion of the community continues to gain power, ends in the formation of a representative assembly, distinct from the original consultative body.

In his chapter on judicial systems Mr. Spencer marks the very recent date at which the right of self-protection has been disallowed. Down to the thirteenth century the Italian nobles regarded it as disgraceful to submit to laws rather than to themselves justice by force of arms, and the same feeling is traceable throughout the history of Europe in the slow substitution of public arbitration for private rectification of wrongs. In France, for instance, judicial duels (which were the authorized substitutes for private wars between families) continued down to the close of the fourteenth century. In England, as late as 1768, a legislative proposal to abolish trial by battle was so strongly opposed that the measure was dropped, and it was not until 1819 that the option of such trial was formally prohibited. When protection by the State displaces self-protection, it takes one of three forms, the primitive community, consisting of chief, headmen, and people, and one of these three elements being at a given time in the ascendancy. If continued militancy makes the ruling man all-powerful, he becomes absolute judicially, as in other ways, the people lose all share in giving decisions, and even the deputies of the headmen who surround the ruler are overridden by his will. If conditions favor the growth of the leading men into an oligarchy, the body they constitute becomes the agent for judging and punishing offences, as for other purposes, its acts being little or not at all qualified by the opinion of its leader, or by that of the mass. Where the surrounding circumstances and mode of life are such as to prevent the supremacy of one man, or of the leading men, the primitive judicial power is preserved by the aggregate of freemen, or is regained by it, where it reacquires predominance. And where the powers of these three elements are mingled in the political organization, they are also mingled in the judicial régime. It is further noticed by Mr. Spencer, in generalizing upon this subject, that in those cases in which habitual militancy entails subjection of the people, and in which, consequently, political and judicial power come to be exercised exclusively by the several orders of chief men, the judicial organization which arises as society becomes complex is officered partly by members of the sacerdotal class, or the legally instructed class, or partly the one and partly the other, both their respective shares being apparently determined by the ratio between the degree of conscious subordination to the human ruler, and that of conscious subordination to the divine ruler, whose will the priests are supposed to declare. With the growth, however, of industrialism, and the rise of a class which, acquiring property and knowledge, gains consequent influence, the judicial system may be re-formed by men derived from this class, who become distinguished from their predecessors, not only as civilians, but also as being exclusively devoted to judicial functions.

The chapter of this volume in which Mr. Spencer discusses the institution of property will be scanned with peculiar interest. He thinks the rise and development of arrangements which fix and regulate private possession admit of tolerably clear delineation. He points out that the desire to appropriate lies deep, not in human nature only, but in animal nature, being, in fact, a condition to survival. The consciousness that conflict and consequent injury may result from the endeavor to take that which is held by another, ever tends to establish and strengthen the custom of leaving each in possession of whatever he has obtained by labor, but this claim to private ownership, fully acknowledged in respect of movables manufactured by the possessor, and more or less completely recognized in respect of game killed did not at first apply to the land, to which members of the community wander, is not recognized among primitive men in respect of this territory itself or of tracts of it. At such a stage of civilization property is not individualized in respect of land, because, under the conditions, no individual claims can be effectually marked off. With the passage, however, from a nomadic to a settled state, ownership of land by the community becomes qualified by individual ownership, but only to the extent that those who clear and cultivate portions of the surface have undisturbed enjoyment of its produce. Habitually the public claim survives, and often after a few crops the cleared tract is abandoned, or who after transmission to descendants it has ceased to be used by them, it reverts to the community. Mr. Spencer keeps in view the fact that this system of temporary ownership, which is congruous with the sentiments and usages inherited from ancestral nomads, is also associated with an undeveloped agriculture, land becoming exhausted after a few years. It is war which, both by producing class differentiations within each society, and by effecting the subjugation of one society by another, undermines or destroys communal proprietorship of land. For this arrangement, war substitutes either the unqualified proprietorship of an absolute conqueror, or ownership by a conqueror, qualified by the claims of vassals holding it under certain conditions, while their claims are in turn qualified by those of dependants attached to the soil; that is to say, the system of status which militancy develops involves a graduated ownership of land as it does a graduated ownership of persons. If we do not mistake the drift of the author's argument, which is propounded with much caution, he means us to infer that absolute ownership of land as a truly a mark of imperfect civilization as is ownership of human beings.

It is not, of course, denied by Mr. Spencer that the tendency toward individualization of ownership in respect of land, as well as movables, is an accompaniment of industrial progress. Bought and sold by measure and for money, land is gradually assimilated to the personal property produced by labor, and becomes in the general apprehension confounded with it. Our author does not believe that the dreams of the Socialists will ever be realized, so far as movables are concerned; but while he thinks the private possession of things produced by labor will grow even more definite and sacred in the future than it is at present, he sees reason to suspect that the inhabited area which cannot be produced by labor will eventually be distinguished as something which may not be privately possessed. As the individual, primitively owner of himself, partially or wholly loses ownership of himself during the militant régime, but gradually resumes it as the industrial régime develops, so it is possible that the communal proprietorship of land, partially or wholly merged in the ownership of dominant men during evolution of the militant type, may be resumed as the industrial type becomes fully evolved. Such is the conclusion reached in the present discussion of the institution of property, and it is noteworthy that of all the systems advocated by modern Socialists, that of Mr. Henry George alone seems to have commended itself to the author's judgment.

In a chapter entitled "Political Retrospect and Prospect," Mr. Spencer says that the days are past when paper constitutions were believed in by instructed people. The general truth that the characters of the units determine the character of the aggregate, though not admitted overtly and fully, is yet so far acknowledged that most politically educated persons do not expect forthwith completely to change the state of society by this or that deal of legislation. But Mr. Spencer points out that this truth, when fully admitted, carries with it the conclusion, not only that political institutions cannot be effectually modified faster than the characters of citizens are modified, but also that if greater modifications are by any accident produced, the excess of change is sure to be undone by some counterchange. When, as in France, people undisciplined in freedom are suddenly made politically free, they show by some plebiscite that they willingly deliver over their power to an autocrat, or they work their parliamentary system in such a way as to make a popular statesman a dictator. When, as in the United States, republican institutions, instead of being slowly evolved, are all at once created, there grows up within them an agency of wire-pulling politicians, exercising a real rule over the nominally ruling citizens at large. When, as in England, an extended franchise, very soon reëxtended, vastly augments the mass of those who, having before been controlled, are abruptly made controllers, they presently fall under the rule of an organized body, like the Birmingham caucus, that chooses their candidates and dictates their votes, and becomes a power which they must either accept or be powerless. So that, in the absence of a duly adapted character, liberty, given in one direction, is lost in another.

Mr. Spencer insists that in proportion as political structures become popular in their origin, they must be restricted in their functions, otherwise coercion over the individual, relaxed in one direction, will be tightened elsewhere. If political structures become more popular in their origin without being more circumscribed in their functions, the effect is to foster arrangements which benefit the inferior at the expense of the superior, and by so doing, work toward degradation. Swayed as individuals are, on the average, by self-interest, and by sentiments which are more or less identical with it, those who are sufficiently numerous to dominate over their sympathy for others, it must happen that even when they become so far equitable in their sentiments that they will not commit direct injustice, they will remain liable to commit indirect injustices, unless they are to be of direct kinds. And since the laws that work must ever be formed of the inferior, legislation, if unrestricted in its range, will inevitably be made by them in such way as more or less remotely to work out to their own advantage and to the disadvantage of the superior. In our unions in England exemplifies this tendency. He thinks that our unions exemplifies this tendency. He thinks our wages have been such that the more energetic and skillful workmen are not allowed to profit to the full extent of their capacities, because, if they did so, they would discredit and thrust aside those of lower capacities, who, forming the majority, establish and enforce the usages. In multitudinous ways a like tendency must act through a political organization if, while all citizens have equal powers, the organization can be used for any other purposes than the simple end of administering justice. State machineries, worked by citizens of all classes, will be so worked as to favor those whose greater powers have brought them greater means, will give to citizens of smaller powers benefits which they have not earned. This burdening of the better for the benefit of the worse must, if continued in our author's forecast, check the evolution of a higher and more adapted nature, the ultimate result being that a community which, while maintaining just laws, will other things being equal, fail in competition with a community which pursues equitable policy, and will eventually disappear in the race of civilization.

Mr. Spencer, in short, avers that the diffusion of political power, unaccompanied by the limitation of political functions to the single purpose of administering justice, leads to communism. Such a state of things subsists, he says, for the direct defrauding of the few by the many; and he declares that evil proportionate to the iniquity will be the result in the one case as in the other.

M. W. H.

A New Life of Gray.

The latest addition to the series of "English Men of Letters" (Harpers) is devoted to a critical estimate of *Thomas Gray* by Mr. EDMUND W. GOSSE, from which Mr. Gosse undertaken to vindicate Gray's reputation against the attack made upon it by Dr. Johnson and renewed by Mr. Swinburne in our own day. There can be no question that in the process of time the great popularity of the "Lives of the Poets" did much to injure Gray with the unthinking. Against the condemnation of Johnson there were placed almost instantly the enthusiastic praises of Adam Smith, Gibbon, Hume, Mackintosh, and others of no less authority, who were unanimous in ranking his poetry only just below that of Shakespeare and Milton. This view continued to prevail until the splendors of the neo-romantic school, and especially the reputations of Wordsworth and Byron eclipsed the academic luminary. The Lake school, and particularly Coleridge, averred that the Cambridge poet had been unduly overrated, and it was rather Byron and Shelley who in our century sustained Gray's fame, as in some directions they continued his artistic traditions. The one writer of authority who since the death of Johnson has ventured to depreciate Gray's poetry, Mr. Swinburne, who, in his ardor to do justice to Collins, has been unjust to the greater man, has set himself out to credit the "Elegy in a Country Churchyard" as a "poem of high perfection and universal appeal to the tenderest and noblest depths of human feeling," and to admit that "as an elegiac poet Gray holds, for all ages to come, his unassailable and sovereign station."

It is certain that the fame of Gray's "Elegy" has spread to all countries, and has exercised an influence on all the poetry of Europe, from Denmark to Italy and from France to Russia. With the exception of certain works of Byron and Shakespeare, no English poem has been so widely admired and imitated abroad, and after more than a century of existence, we find it as fresh as ever when its copies, even the most popular of all—Lamartine's *Le Lac*—are faded and tarnished. It possesses the charm of incomparable felicity; of a melody that is not too subtle to charm every ear; of a moral persuasiveness that appeals to every mind, and of a metrical skill that in every line proclaims the master. Mr. Gosse looks upon the "Elegy" as the typical piece of English verse, as our poem of poems: not that it is the most brilliant or the most profound lyric in our language, but because it combines in more balanced perfection than any other all the qualities that go to the production of a poetical effect. The biographer reminds us that the measure itself from first to last is an attempt to render in English the solemn alternation of passion and reserve, the interchange of imploring and despairing voices that is found in the Latin elegiac, and it is noteworthy that Gray gave his poem in the first publication an outward resemblance to the text of Tibullus by printing it without any stanzaic pauses. We may here mention that this poem, instantaneous and universal as its success was, brought the author no money. He gave the right of publication to Dodsley, as he did in all other instances, and it was averred by another bookseller that Dodsley made nearly a thousand pounds by Gray's poetry. Gray had a Quixotic notion that it was beneath a gentleman to take money for his inventions from booksellers, a view in which, we need not say, the latter warmly coincided. Gray's contemporary, Dr. Johnson, held a widely different view, and it is hard to understand how the former conceived such a preposterous idea, for if there is anything in the doctrine of heredity, Gray ought to have evinced the instincts of a shopkeeper. His grandfather and father were tradesmen, and his mother was a milliner, who paid for her son's schooling at Eton and his maintenance at Cambridge from the earnings of her shop. Gray's affectation, therefore, of indifference to the pecuniary proceeds of the only property he had to sell, strikes us as supremely silly. The truth is that Gray was essentially a snob, whose notions of life were permanently moulded by the relation of parasite, which during his youth and for some time afterward he occupied toward Horace Walpole. We are told, in fact, by Mr. Temple, who knew him well, that Gray had the weakness which disgusted Voltaire so much in Congreve. He could not bear to be considered merely as a man of letters, and though without birth, or fortune, or station, he desired to be looked upon as a private gentleman.

It cannot be gainsaid that Gray is the main example in our literature of a poet possessing the Greek quality of structure in his lyrical work, and Mr. Gosse points out that throughout his career, it never left him, even on occasions when he was deserted by every other form of inspiration. This power of structural evolution has not by any means been common among lyrical poets, even of a high rank. In Milton, for example, it is strangely absent, and you feel that all his odes, beautiful as they are, do not hold the branch and fall in fruit, closing with the exhaustion of their functions, but merely cease because all poems must stop somewhere. In Collins you notice the same failing: the poem is a burst of cadence, but not an organism. Shelley, too, in his longer odes, seems to lose himself in beautiful meandering oratory, and to stop, as he began, in response to a mere change of purpose. Keats, on the other hand, is always consistent in his evolution, and so is Wordsworth in his more elevated moments, and Mr. Gosse recognizes the same merit in Edgar Poe. But Gray's poems are never chains of consecutive stanzas, each line, each group of lines, has its proper place in a structure that could not be shorter or longer without injury to the whole.

Miserable Manuals of Scientific Knowledge.

Undoubtedly the methods generally employed in our schools for teaching the rudiments of science are very miserable. Those who believe most strongly in the benefits to be derived from the introduction of scientific studies into all schemes of education, are now foremost in saying that, as at present pursued, such studies do more harm than good. It would have been even recommended that they should be entirely abandoned, in preference to continuing the perverted methods which now prevail. Yet even the most partisan advocate of classical education would hardly be bold enough to say that he should gain some knowledge of the laws governing the world in which he has to dwell, and some slight acquaintance with the ways of that nature upon his relations with which so largely, if not entirely, depends his future welfare or misery. It is only with regard to the amount of such knowledge to be acquired that the rival partisans of classical and scientific schools dispute. They must both be agreed in desiring that, whatever the amount may be, it shall be imparted in a manner to secure the best possible results.

Considering the deplorable condition of this most important department of education, every attempt at improvement should be welcomed, and especially when it comes from one whose position as a professor enables him to understand the difficulties to be overcome. For this reason the *Guides for Science Teaching* have a substantial value. There are a series of small pamphlets, in all but one or two cases prepared by members of the Boston Society of Natural History, which, in the introduction to the work of Prof. ALPHEUS HYATT, and published under the auspices of the Boston Society of Natural History (Ginn, Heath & Co.). To these Mr. H. Hyatt has now added a series of books which are for pupils, a set that supplies themselves to study from as they go to school, the admirable companion to the guides in that the proper improvements, and not a bad idea, in a common excellent hint as to the best way of imparting information to pupils that we have seen.

But in spite of these advantages there is a fundamental error in Prof. Hyatt's system of imparting knowledge, and it is exactly the error against which the advocates of scientific education for the young are so earnestly protesting. This can be clearly seen from a short preliminary which Prof. Hyatt discusses (the pamphlet on Worms and Crustaceans is the latest issued) he offers to the student, through the teacher, a mass of ready prepared facts in the first place, and a number of ready drawn deductions in the second. The evils of this plan are certainly to some extent obviated by the fact that Prof. Hyatt insists that the pupil shall see for himself everything, and carefully follow all the steps in the deductions drawn from them.

But it is not with any such modifications of old pedagogic theories that we should be content. The disciples of science claim, for it that it has never been the cause of mental sloth, esslly deceived, than will the pursuit of other branches of learning. But these advantages they say can only accrue to those who have studied science at first hand, who have observed their own facts, drawn their own conclusions, corrected their own errors, until they have gained in the process an accuracy, vigor, and independence of mind which can never be the result of passively receiving information from others. The great problem which still remains to be solved is how to secure this condition of mental independence for the pupil while avoiding aimless license and waste of labor; how best to leave his mind free for spontaneous effort, and yet to give him the benefit of the knowledge slowly accumulated by the combined efforts of the human race. With so difficult a problem confronting us, we cannot expect to find an easy solution. While hoping that in the future there lies before us something better than that which Prof. Hyatt offers, his work must still arouse in any one interested in such subjects the respect which is always a tribute to serious effort, even if it falls short of success.

Very different are the sentiments awakened by a *Series of Readers in Natural History*, otherwise entitled *Science Ladders*, by N. D'ANVERS (G. P. Putnam's Sons). These books are made to aid, and shelter under false pretences by an assumed scientific name. The scholars who employ them as readers are likely to learn from them a slovenly use of the English language, as a few quotations will show:

Seas means anything near the sea which sometimes becomes dry.

No one can tell for certain what causes the disturbance in the inside of the earth.

It is a spring in the earth's fountain head, which means a beginning.

The beginning of change in a stem is called a bud.

At the end of each lesson the pieces of information imparted to the pupil are recapitulated and numbered, as steps on a supposititious ladder. The author consents to count the definitions of several words as steps, because, as he or she observes, "They will help our climb."

After claiming that these works form a series of readers, the short preface goes on to say that the volumes are "planned to teach the great laws of nature." Here are a few of the great laws taught:

By degrees a great quantity of water is stored up or gathered together inside the earth, and this water is always trying to get out to the air and light.

If the spring has so far down in the valley be low, it will run over in the earth, and has for ever always seeks other water.

The poets, who lived long ago, used to like spring water very much, and so they fancied that spirits dwelt in them (the springs).

The poems which spring from the meeting of the pebbles in the water has sometimes formed quite a little pile of little spirit.

In promulgating these and other equally original "laws of nature," the author seems to write in ignorance of the truth that water is not supposed to be actuated by likes or dislikes, to suffer from loneliness, or to be subject to any foreign wiles; of the fact that the poets have been in the habit of making clear and definite... get into the light or the air. The theory that the movements of streams and rivers are dependent upon the simple fact that water, like everything else, obeys the law of gravitation, and always falls to the lowest possible level, would probably strike N. D'Anvers as an exceedingly tame idea. Neither, probably, would the author be much affected by such an argument that, as plants possess neither liver nor lungs, it is not worth while to tell a child that any portion of them may be called by those names. And, apparently, the writer in question has not considered it necessary, before undertaking to teach the science of botany, to study it sufficiently to learn that, instead of a rare device to produce vegetable novelties with a distant resemblance to their parents, such cross-fertilization as is spoken of is only effectual between similar plants, and is the ordinary means adopted by nature to perpetuate the different species, and with them their minutest peculiarities.

Finally, the preface says that these volumes aim at "awakening the powers of observation and reasoning." It is sufficient to say in regard to this that it would be difficult to conceive of any lesson books more exactly calculated in every respect not only to crush all powers of observation and reasoning, but also to destroy all mental activity, of any kind whatever. The bad sense, the inaccuracy and of old-fashioned school books could not do this half as effectually as these little works, in which there is just sufficient admixture of new ideas, misapprehended and misapplied, to produce the worst possible effect.

It is a pity that such a firm as Putnam's should have placed this series of books before the public prepared, as regards binding and illustrations, as to make them more attractive to those who have not time to study the contents before presenting them to their children.

RISTORI IN ENGLISH.

A Rehearsal and First Night of her Lady Macbeth—About Booth and Barrett.

LONDON, July 8.—Not many days ago I went to old Drury Lane Theatre to get seats for Wagner's "Meistersingers." What should my eye fasten upon, but the following announcement, "Ristori in English, 'Macbeth.'" What pluck and what perseverance! I helped to give Ristori her first lessons in English, and now she is daring enough to attempt Shakespeare in his original tongue, and on his native heath.

"Give me Mme. Ristori's address," I said to the box office man.

"Don't" whispered a voice proceeding from a man who, on catching sight of me, rushed forth, exclaiming, "Oh, it is you; that's quite another affair. So many people have to-day asked for Madame's address that we refuse to give it out of self-defence. But you—c'est autre affaire." It was Wertheimer, Ristori's agent.

Ristori was rehearsing. Would I go in front? Of course. So we stumbled along the dark corridors of the big theatre, and I sat—an audience of one—in a stall, while Wertheimer went to Ristori, who called me to her, and I chatted on the stage, on which I found her and on which the rehearsal was going on. At this moment Augustus Harris, the manager, Augustus Harris, and several others. It was very interesting. Ristori talking to me in Italian, giving instructions to Harris in French in the interpreting into English, and then speaking Shakespeare with an accent.

On Monday last I assisted at the début in "Macbeth." Truth compels me to say that in my opinion Ristori has made a mistake. Her English is a tremendous *tour de force*, and remarkable from that point of view; but she is not at home in it. If she had played Lady Macbeth in Italian, and with the English support, she would have scored, and altogether it would have been a success and a pleasure, but such as it is, and such as it has been, with all the aspect of a task that is not worth the pains and labor that she has bestowed on it—she has not submitted herself to unprejudiced criticism. Of course she was the artist, and her sleep-walking scene was great. The support was bad.

The other day at Floral Hall I heard Patti, Lucca, Albani, and others. Wagner's "Meistersingers" is an awful bore in some respects very fine in others. On the last night of the German opera there was great enthusiasm. Richter, the celebrated conductor, was one of the prominent figures in his own circle, and I heard Patti in "Traviata" on Tuesday night I heard Patti in "Semiramide." Albani, Velectra, and others. The story is very well known. Then there came... founded in this the Frenchmen... Booth, Barrett... and the audience of French and English swells, and Barrett gave... given Dr. Johnson... special... some of the old building.

The Easiest of the Lot.

"Is it spelled 'a-n' or 'a-n'?" asks the Boston *Herald*, is this an extraordinary... anything so horrible? Is—but what is the use of it?

POEMS WORTH READING.

A Poem by Garibaldi.

From the London Telegraph.

CAPRERA.

[Translation.]

CAPRERA, Dec. 15, 1880.

Upon thy granite peaks—not in the plain—
Of liberty my palace—I feel the breath
Of liberty—on thee, Caprera! I here
Thy sad seasons have my paths and wanderings
But safe and sound, and here I pass my days;
Gives me the solace of calm... sooth
Ere I few inhabitants are rough and rude.
As those who dwell beside the rocky shore...
And like them, proud—disdain to bend the knee,
To base desire, or bow before the mighty;
Where slaves... Heart finds a resting place,
Is not my oceanic... Round me the breakers are;
But by the rolling wheel of insolence
Unlike the slaves of wealth and of the vile!
Splashed by vile mud, Pure from all lies, I am
There to the hilltop, still the coward makes his nest
Forever by thought—strike the spaces vast,
To the recesses of this azure dome,
That worlds enclosed, to the infinite
Intelligence—I turn with the fervent glow
Of gratitude ...
And o'er my soul on thy immortal spark
Which makes me ever like to God.

G. GARIBALDI.

A Youthful Martyr.

From Wide Awake.

He sat beside a blackboard tall, and slowly drew diameters,
And cried his many woes meantime in sounding Greek hexameters;
He wiped his eyes, his tale had who might have seen twelve years or more,
And sobbed in tones of grief, that he was twelve years or more.
He looked so solemn and so sad, though not the least bit shy at all,
We could not for the life of us make out what made him cry at all.
So, coming gently to his side, in accents quite mellifluous,
We asked the reason of his grief if we were so superfluous.
"Did some one do a thing unkind? Did supper not agree with you?
My pretty boy with eyes of blue, what can the matter be with you?"
"Alas," he said, and raised his head, while bigger tears did flow and fall,
"I'll tell you all my hapless case; you'll see I have no use of play at all.
But, oh! my wrongs are such, alas, the memory which grieves me so,
And all of these many sorrows which make me melt in tears are beaten me so.
You see I'm such a little chap I ought to have no care at all;
Instead of which I'm putting gray, and soon will have no hair at all.
From morn till night, and night to morn, without the least apology,
I'm forced to a high pressure plan of study on some 'ology.
I came of such a learned race, and such illustrious pedigree,
That I'm brought up on such strict rules, it almost breaks the heart of me:
And everything I say or do they fain would make a medium
For teaching me some truth remote, which has a certain tedium.
Suppose I try to play hop-scotch, they talk of trigonometry;
And square on the hypothenuse, and angles in geometry;
If I attempt to clip a stone, or make a short gyration,
They say the laws of...
They want to point a moral with some fact in gravitation then!
If I roll a hoop or peg a top, and straightway they all look at me,
And point out formulas and facts enough to make a tedious book at me!
I speak a word they want it spelled, and all its derivations, ma'am!
Of bits of Latin and of Greek and doubtful derivations, ma'am;
Of history and algebra, and learned Greek quotations, ma'am!
I'm plethoric with rhetoric, I'd rather change my rations, ma'am!
No wonder that I'd rather be a Choctaw or a Cherokee!
No wonder that I sometimes wish they'd never begun to teach me!
No wonder that I will wear, and wish of woes this head of me;
And that I never, never came of such a learned pedigree!"
He ceased, and wiped his sweet blue eyes. My! didn't he look pretty just!
I never saw a child so sad that I did truly pity so!
And then he went to the blackboard, and drew diagrams tolerably,
And crying out his many woes in sounding Greek hexameters!

M. E. B.

De Lam' a Strayin'—An Exhortation at a Camp Meeting.

From the Pittsburgh Labor Tribune.

Look out, backslider, whar you walkin'!
Keep a lookin' out, I say!
I'll tell you, an' I'se no use talkin',
If you stay on dis crooked way.
Fo' de debbil is lurkin' roun' an' watchin',
Ruts an' sink holes eb'ry whar!
He's sho' to git de soul dat he's a catchin'
If you don't keep yo' eye on dar.
Fo' he'll git ye—yes, sir—git ye shuah!
Speak' de debbil's walkin' roun'.
Fo's thing you know he'll say yo' "howdy"—
Laf' his head an' stomp de groun'.
Don't you see de sinner's a-pinin'?
Don't you hear de trumpet blow?
Hear de awful thunder peal!
Look! Hear the lightnin' kiss'in' rain—
Oh, backslider, how you feel?
Oh, say yo' knees an' go to prayin'!
An' de Lawd to help you out;
Chile, tell him you's a strayin'—
Done got los' an' stumblin' bout,
An' say dat you's de sta'n a glea'n'—
Kneelin' all de way.
Yes, ne'er fear lightnin' twinklin' beamin'—
Sweepin' debbil's way.
But of you fall, debbil go you,
Dat's de lamb is strayin'
You'll feel mos' like er grapeshot hit you,
Drapp'd fum half way to de sky.

ROBERT MCGEE.

The Fate of Tomato Khan.

From the Denver Tribune.

Old Bagdad Bey, a venerable man,
Arose one morn and to his serf-ant said:
"Send hither, slave, my son Tomato Khan—
If, to the prophet's beard, he's out of bed."
Tomato Khan appeared before the sire,
And kneeling on the earth before his sire,
Kissed thrice his feet and said in tones of fire:
"Why hast thou called?" politely did inquire.
"Most vile!" cried the old man in a breath,
"Your country is in dire confusion. I see,
In every home in deep and bloody death,
The stalwart warrior ...
From Abdul Tiflis unto Bagdar's well,
From Balrak's palms to Guido's earthly shrine,
From Balrak of arms and war's intense refrain.
Bind on thy curved scimitar, go, son, and kill
The Chief of the Hordes, the scoundrel thief,
Thy dishonored father's...
Then with thy sword, unsheathed, come back to me,
And I will name thee chief of all the Band."
Tomato Khan strode on his vengeful way.
He fell, not ... Bagdad would be bred,
He did not fight on Ascalon's plain,
No Christian sword wielded with his blood,
No steed ... hoof fell at Soomi...
He fairly murdered, "Allah, this is rough!"
And died in the rough and warlike times.
So for his country died Tomato Khan,
Among the fickle ... sand,
Dead by a mule, a martyred man,
A patriot, the idol of his land.
He did not come to glory wear
A mansion ... bath and Bagdar bold
And ... Tomato Khan's brave deeds,
While far Ankara ... old.

Opening Week at a Summer Resort.

From the Boston Post.

Yes, I have been here a week. I've had just one flirtation,
...

Odelette.

From the Century.

All the grass is growing.
All the flowers are blowing;
'Tis thy love alone is withering
Night and day.
...

HARLEY YORKE.

A Spelling Match.

From the Texas Siftings.

Stand up, ye teachers new and spell;
Spell phenomenon and cavil well;
...

THE SECRETS OF THE BOURBONS.

PARIS, July 10.—Last week, on July 5, in the town of Mantes, called "Mantes la Jolie" from the prettiness of its situation on the banks of the Seine, between Paris and Rouen, there died an old gentleman of 77 years of age, M. George Granville Brown, who was the natural heir of the legitimate Bourbon Kings of France. You will search in vain for George Brown's name in the biographical dictionaries. Hardly anybody knew of his existence, and everybody was surprised, when he died, to find that this modest old gentleman had royal blood in his veins, and that he was, in fact, no other than the son of the Duc de Berry by his first marriage with Miss Amy Brown. The historians and the biographers of the Duc de Berry mention his marriage with Miss Brown and say that by her he had two children, Countesses de Vierzon and d'Issoudun, and who afterward became, the one Princess Faucigny-Lucinge and the other Baroness de Charette. But they say nothing about a son.

The recent researches of M. Charles Nauroy have brought to light some new documents relative to this first marriage of the Duc de Berry. With their aid I propose to reconstitute this curious chapter of French history to which the death of M. Brown has given renewed interest. Even the doubt cast upon the legitimacy of the Comte de Chambord would be sufficient to justify the discussion.

Miss Amy Brown was born in Maidstone, Kent, England, on April 8, 1783. Her father, Joseph Brown, was vicar of St. Sainte, Maidstone. He died in 1824. Her mother, Mary Ann Deacon, died in 1808. Miss Amy Brown had six or seven brothers and sisters, almost all of whom died young. One of her brothers was a pumpmaker at Maidstone. We know nothing of the childhood and youth of Amy Brown, except that she grew up to be a singularly beautiful girl. Probably she would have lived and died in obscurity if the French Revolution had not put to flight the members of the royal house of France and brought together Amy Brown and the Duc de Berry in 1801. Miss Brown was then 21 and the Duke was 26. Physically, he was an attractive enough man; intellectually, he was a superficial, and morally, worse than mediocre. The two young people fell in love, and on April 29, 1803, Amy Brown had a son at London, who received the name of George Granville Brown. He was the child of mystery, and always remained such.

At this time the empire seemed to be firmly established in France; Napoleon was reigning, and his hand weighed so heavily on Europe that his word became a law to almost all people. The probabilities of a Bourbon restoration seemed smaller than ever, the Bourbons were forgotten; a new generation had sprung up that knew them not, and many of their partisans deserted their cause. The Duc de Berry therefore determined to marry Amy Brown. The marriage was celebrated in the Catholic chapel, King street, Portman square, London, in 1806, in the very chapel where, in 1810, the Abbé Bourbon the Duc de Berry's own was performed over Marie Joséphine Louise de Savoie, wife of Louis XVIII. Two years previously Amy Brown had become a Catholic. The two were married according to English law, openly and with witnesses. Neither the Comte d'Artois, the father of the Duc, nor Louis XVIII, his uncle, protested. The Comtesse d'Artois died in 1805. Leaving aside the question of loyalty, did the Duc de Berry act in good faith? That he no more doubted his honor, is clear. It would seem that he cohabited with Amy Brown until 1814, and treated her as his wife up to the day of his death, though on the other hand, he seems to have taken advantage of the ignorance of French law concerning marriage to obtain from the Pope the annulment; when he... as a mere witness in the marriage. Amy being ignorant of French law and unable to... In this enlightened her. If the Duc de Berry had been honest, he would not have taken advantage of his wife's ignorance. On July 13, 1808, Amy had a daughter, Charlotte Marie Augustine, denominated in the birth certificate as the daughter of Charles Ferdinand and Amy Brown. This certificate is dated 1810. This designation, Charles Ferdinand, was the given name of the Duc de Berry. There has been preserved all the documents relative to this affair. The delay in registering the birth is to be noticed in connection with the position of the duke to his marriage, and to the whole course of the business. But it must be remembered that it was in the name of the husband and wife. It was prudent to publish in so many words the fact that Charles Ferdinand and Amy Brown were husband and wife at the time of the... 1808 is the year of the Spanish war, in which the Bourbon was quite at the period of... who had lost like Talleyrand, among others, saw the germ of the fall of the... fact? But the Louis XVIII, too, of the baptismal certificate of the second daughter, born in 1809, the omissions are equally significant.

After 1814 the empire was diminished; he was unfaithful to her. Meanwhile, after the retreat of Moscow and the battle of Leipzig, the fall of the empire became more and more imminent, and gradually it became certain that the Bourbons would return. Then it was that the Duc de Berry, the man who had loved, seduced and married her, was going to deny her. She reproached him bitterly once for all, and afterward maintained that silence which worthy of her wronged estate. When Louis XVIII ascended the throne he asked the Pope to annul the marriage of the Duc de Berry on the ground that it had been contracted without the consent of the head of the royal family. The Pope accordingly annulled the marriage, and the Duc de Berry married Marie Caroline, Amy offered no opposition. She had remained in London.

The Bourbons and their counsellors then proceeded to concert a scheme for deceiving the public and posterity. When negotiations for the union of the Duc de Berry with the Princess Caroline of Naples were going on, the Neapolitan Government exacted proof of the annulment by the Pope of the first marriage. A correspondence on the subject took place between the Courts of Rome and Paris. This correspondence has disappeared from the Italian and from the French archives, and disappeared too has the marriage certificate of Amy Brown, which is now in the hands of the Charette family. It is certain that the Duc de Berry... Chateaubriand in his memoirs of the Duc de Berry makes no mention of his first marriage... Amy Brown... and treats the Duke's union with her as one of his youthful follies. On the death of the Duc de Berry, in 1820, the Government of the Restoration could not... one of this... human frailty excuses," and while relating the fact that the Duke on his deathbed recommended his two daughters to the care of the Duchesse de Berry, Chateaubriand says nothing about the son.

The Duc de Berry had married the Princess Caroline in 1816. Amy, for the sake of her children, came to France, leaving her son in England, and resided for some time at the Château d'Augerville (Loiret). Then she bought the house, and then another in the Rue Neuve des Mathurins 14. Almost every day, about 5 o'clock, he used to come to see his two daughters, on Feb. 13, 1820, he was assassinated. On his deathbed he sent for his two daughters, and recommended them to his wife. Louis XVIII de Berry. The two girls were naturalized as French women. Their consecutive titles of Countesses de Vierzon and d'Issoudun, and by order of the Court and the Prince Faucigny-Lucinge and the Baron de Charette, though the intermediary of the Duchesse de Berry, who gave them handsome dowries.

In the documents of naturalization and of marriage of the two girls, there is mentioned the Duc de Berry, as their father. The records are full of irregularities and of silence... We understand the object of which was to conceal the fact of the first marriage of the Duc de Berry, and to leave it... that the Duc de Berry had recognized two daughters by Amy Brown.

Meanwhile nothing was heard of the son, George Brown, who was unable to come and see his father. However, after the revolution of 1830, George Brown, with his mother and sister, came to reside in France, and was brought up at Ouchy, near Lausanne, in the canton of Vaud, Switzerland, in a pension. After having served some time in the army of the King of Naples in 1840 he came to France in 1841, and bought a house at Mantes. The Saint Pierre, where he lived until his death. In 1848 he became a French citizen, and he married meantime a cousin, Charlotte Louise Elvena.

Was the marriage of the Duc de Berry legal? Furthermore it was not according to the law, from the point of view of French law there can be no sort of doubt. The Prince, an exile, was a simple private individual, not subject to French law, and he was subject to English law and to common law; his father never demanded the annulment of the marriage; the spouses cohabited together... The marriage was celebrated by a Catholic priest, and the marriage certificate was registered at the French Consulate at London. But let us imagine, for a moment, that before the empire was constantly at war with England, and how was it possible for the Duc de Berry to have been at any French consulate? There was no Consul in London, nor no Consuls in English territory. The Pope cannot annul a marriage contracted by a Catholic. It is impossible, therefore, to annul a marriage without the interference of the French civil courts. This much is certain, and this fact is acknowledged, that the marriage of the Duc de Berry and Amy Brown... certificate of annulment of the marriage has never been produced... and as sure as its... evidence... France, all the... the papers relating to... have disappeared from the French archives. If the marriage of Amy Brown was legal, the result is that the present French nobility and the French Chambord... to the throne of France...

Without entering into the Duc de Berry's... Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d'Artois, Duc de Bordeaux, Comte de Chambord, was born Sept. 29, 1820, seven and a half months after the assassination of his father, the Duc de Berry. He was the son of the second marriage, and the legitimacy of his birth has been questioned. Louis Philippe's friends, in 1830, ... the Duchesse de Berry... Naples... in 1847... and the Comte de Chambord's... of the Orleans branch... throne... but if Amy Brown's son... must admit that Henri V... legitimate... and Bonaparte...

The famous Patterson-Bonaparte trial revived the griefs of Amy Brown. The marriage of Jérôme Bonaparte, father of the present Prince Napoleon, with Miss Patterson of Baltimore resembled so closely her own marriage with the Duc de Berry that it was naturally referred to it, and Amy Brown took advantage of the argument her lawyer advanced. In his speeches before the court M. Allou referred at length to the marriage of the Duc de Berry with Amy Brown, the unpublished history of which was well known. The controversy was revived, and Amy Brown, as may be imagined, was revived. The controversy was revived, and Amy Brown, as usual, held her peace.

Amy Brown remained in France, living only for her children, whom she visited alternately at Mantes; at another with Mme. de Lucinge, in Piedmont; at another with Mme. de Charette at Château Loire Inférieure. During the Franco-Prussian war her son had Amy Brown at Sennes, who reached her... at Paris... took refuge with... the Comte... at Passy... she... During the Commune she took refuge with her daughter Mme. de Charette... on May 7, 1876. The Duchesse de Berry died in Styria in 1870. In the death certificate, Amy Brown is called the widow of Charles Ferdinand, is a right which the Restoration could never have permitted.

Amy Brown's daughter, Mme. de Lucinge, has five children, and Mme. de Charette has six. The son, George Brown, died childless.

About the life of M. Brown little is known. He appeared to have a good income, most of which was spent in charity. He was a member of the vestry of the Church of Notre Dame at Mantes, President of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, and a patron of other charitable institutions. His leisure moments were given to music.

M. Nauroy states as a fact for which he can vouch that the Comte de Chambord always recognized M. Brown and his sisters as the *legitimate* sisters.

M. Nauroy, to whose researches I have referred, has recently devoted several volumes to the history of the secrets of the Bourbons, namely, the fate of the son of Louis XVI. The history of the fate of the little Dauphin that have appeared in France since the revolution forms a whole library. Here I cannot even mention the literature in question, for they are so numerous, as one of the best authorities on the subject. Besides, M. Nauroy maintained that the story of the child who entered the Temple on June 8, 1795, was not the son of Louis XVI., but another child, at the Temple, and that the real Dauphin into Vendée, where there was a struggle... between the chiefs of the Vendean army and the... had a... Prince... When the... of Provence... proclaim Louis XVII. When he substituted child in the temple died, the Comte... proclaim Louis XVIII., immediately. From... Louis XVII... the... shot... mediocre... at the... Vendean... tried to... The Vendean chiefs... the royalist party, and... yielded. The history of the Vendean insurrection is still obscure, part of the Vendean chiefs were shot with the escape of Louis XVII. Charette was shot in 1796, Frotté in 1800, and Puisaye died in England in 1827. The unfortunate Dauphin had to live in tow alternatives—to live in obscurity or to die. Of course, it was necessary that he should not be heard of... he seems... the ... of an impostor. Being, from what M. Nauroy has discovered, a very ordinary man, he preferred obscurity. When the Restoration came, his protector... Louis XVIII. ... saw passing... Dauphins, ... among them his old valet, Naundorff. M. Nauroy suggests that... Dauphin lived under the name of Laroche in 1872, at Savenay, in the Loire Inférieure, the same department where the... Louis XVII. ... if... have been Queen of France, who... been born in 1785.

THEODORE CHILD.

EMERSON TO CARLYLE.

An Interesting Letter Written Thirty-four Years Ago.

From the Athenæum.

We publish this week another letter addressed by Emerson to Carlyle, which is interesting as giving a sketch of the writer's life at the time it was written, and of his affection to all Carlyle.

CONCORD, May 10, 1838.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Yesterday I had your letter of March. It gave me great joy, and has put me all but ripe to write to you. It is good to come from you to be conforming to have confirmed in my original purpose of publishing "Selected Miscellanies of T. C." As it is we are for on in the publishing of your pieces, and we have sent you a list of "the papers as they stand in our list, and which we reprint and so far as are for the seventeenth or eighteenth articles. I regret it, because we have made the best of these papers. I chiefly desire to provide people. If we have not a profit, it may be some time, in these years of bankruptcy and famine, before we get you a payment. But we have printed two volumes, more. But Loring is a good man, and you shall see, if you will have to be sure of some success of Nile. I, for my part, fancy that we meet the taste of the readers we should publish from the list backward, beginning with the paper on Scott, which was a book and has the best reception ever known. Carlyleism is becoming so fashionable that the most austere asks are glad to get... The... reproduction by... the... which... I... is to be guarantee to you on two... copy he sells \$1; and you are to have the... the total profit... cost. The... copy... the retail price to be \$2.50. The exact... work is not yet precisely ascertained. The work will probably appear in... The sale is sold you shall have \$1,000.

"The French Revolution" continues to find friends and purchasers. It has gone to New Orleans, to Nashville, to Vicksburg. I have been in Boston lately, but have determined that nearly or quite 1,000 copies should go. The booksellers, and I hope to be able to... as the... On July 1 I shall make the accounts with the booksellers, and I hope to be able to send... cash to you. I shall send the... advice of Barnard, Adams & Co. in regard to remittances.

Here at home we have made ready... in this... Is... the... from... the... a... The fine ... has as a new book which... the... you... Ever... heard... time... the... of... you in the... was... this... so far is... the... a... mild... a... so... to... I... new... the... and... learning in the New World. Think of it in great... earnest. In all of your friendliest... I will put down... of the house... on God's earth... can... with... you... fire... say... may... empty barn. My house is your... The... I... have a... a... a... money in... income... I... and... write... so... that... I... learning... The... world... with... I... say... I... warmth, leisure, books, friends. Go away from me, I am rich enough.

I suppose, ever you feel rich in the... I am... to... a... I... my... wife Lidian is an incarnation of Christianity—I call her Asia—and keeps my philosophy from Antinomianism; my mother... the... best... who... the... so... and... a... of... women, the... of... I... have... in... that... the... shall... you... but... of... the... a... In summer, with the aid of a neighbor, I have a... on the... of... the... house... I... the... of... a... in the... I... the... I... the... have... the... so... the... I... of... the... of January. The... ornament of the place is the... which... the... to... My... and... of the... I... the... blessed... and... I... the... like... now... But... to the... I... one... own... at... to... wife and my wife's... I... I... a sister?... Come... and I will... Your... to the... New... to... the... of... New England well enough... to... that... Come... you... the... in... you... many languages)... You will come and dwell with me.

I gladly hear what you say of Sterling. I... which... a... the... the... ... England... I... the... the... at... *Blackwood*... March... had... the... I... yet... I... Miss Martineau, I know... I... to say. ... what... a... to... a... I... the... justice... whom... seen... Yet... you... Read... said... but... the... a... to... Farewell, dear... and... I... wife... and... I... Brother... this... To the... Edmund... the... dropped... I... the... A young engineer in Cambridge... McLean... the... ... Wastes... the... I... the... My... I... R. W. EMERSON.

My old... before... the...

...

My old friend...