SOME NEW BOOKS.

Rhetoric.

We are not accustomed to go to college text books for entertainment, yet one may find it, as well as instruction, in the revised and enlarged edition of *The Principles of Rhetoric*, by ADAMS SHERMAN HILL (Harper's.) The author, who is the Boylston professor of rhetoric and oratory in Harvard College, has here produced a work which seems likely to supersede its predecessors and competitors, by reason of the soundness of its fundamental conceptions, the clearness of its arrangement, the lucidity of its definitions, and its combination of scholarship with common sense. Prof. Hill believes that the function of rhetoric is not to provide the students of composition with materials for thought, nor yet to lead him to cultivate style for style's sake, but to stimulate and train his powers of expression, thus enabling him to say what he has to say in appropriate language. He holds that rhetoric should be studied in school and in college, not as a science, but as an art, with practical ends in view. It is an art and not a science, because it neither observes, nor discovers, nor classifies; it simply shows how to convey from one mind to another the results of observation, discovery, or classification; it uses knowledge not as knowledge, but as power. Hence its rules are not absolute, like those of logic, but relative to the character and circumstances of the person or persons addressed. For, though truth is one, and correct reasoning must always be correct, the ways of communicating truth are many.

I.

The true test of good English is unquestionably this: Is a given expression sanctioned by good use, that is, by present, national, and reputable use; present, as opposed to obsolete or ephemeral; national, as opposed to local, professional, or foreign; reputable, as opposed to vulgar or affected? But what definition of national use should be accepted by Americans? In the opinion of many Englishmen and some Anglomaniacs in America, every expression which is in national use in the United States, but not in national use at the present time in England, is a provincialism. Prof. Hill points out that to this assertion it is no answer to say, what is no doubt true, that many so-called Americanisms were in good use in England in the time of Chaucer, of Milton, or of Fielding. This argument would justify many expressions which are now vulgarisms, as *are* for ask, *learn* for teach, *you was* for you were. The real question is: Are the United States, so far as language is concerned, still provinces of England, or do they constitute a nation? In our author's opinion, the true answer to this question was given by the late Edward A. Freeman, whose opinion on the point is valuable because he was an Englishman of Englishmen. After discussing several cases in which usage differs in the two countries, Mr. Freeman went on to say: "One way is, for the most part, as good as the other; let each side of the ocean stick to its own way; if only to keep up those little picturesque differences which are really a gain when the substance is essentially the same. This same line of thought might be carried out in a crowd of phrases, old and new, in which British and American usage differs, but in which neither usage can be said to be in itself better or worse than the other. Each usage is the better in the land in which it has grown up of itself. A good British writer and a good American writer will write in the same language and the same dialect; but it is well that each should keep to those little peculiarities of established and reasonable local usage which will show on which side of the ocean he writes." Some American writers, including the late John Lothrop Motley, have maintained that there is, or is soon to be, an American language radically different from the English, but Mr. Hill denies that they have as yet succeeded in bringing any considerable body of evidence to support their views. They usually rely on a few hackneyed expressions which are no doubt peculiar to the United States, or on words and phrases which, so far from being in good use on this side of the Atlantic, are confined either to certain parts of the country or to certain classes, and are avoided by the best writers in America no less than by those of England. The possibility, also, is often overlooked that, with increasing facilities of intercourse between the two countries, the little picturesque differences of which Mr. Freeman spoke may become fewer and fewer.

Proceeding to details, Mr. Hill observes that, in some cases, the British term is coming into use in America, while, in a few cases, the American term is coming into use in England. Thus, in the United States, cab is now frequently used for hack, drawing room for parlor, braces for suspenders, biscuit for cracker, shop for store, post for mail, underdone for rare, and railway for railroad. In England, on the other hand, trunk is now often used for box, and baggage sometimes for luggage. Some words, too, that originated in the United States have been carried into England, with or without that which they named, for example: caucus, gerrymander, co-education, lengthy, sleigh, blizzard, transom (for transom window); the names of some drinks, as sherry cobbler and mint julep; and words of Indian origin, as squaw, moccasin, and wigwam. Certain words, again, continue to be peculiar to England or America. Among those peculiar to England are hustings, whip (a Parliament officer), board-school, cheap-jack, hawker, green-grocer, costermonger, haberdasher, barrister, and navvy. Among those peculiar to America are State House, to lobby, lobbying, lobbyist, sophomore, cookie, doughnut, cruller, carryall, buggy, fish-flakes (for drying codfish), trapper, schooner, stampede, sidewalk, lumber (cut timber), lumberer or lumberman, lumber yard. Mr. Hill also gives a partial list of expressions as to which national use in England differs from that in America. The British, for example, speak of beet root for beet, vegetable marrow for squash, maize for corn, corn for grain (oats, wheat, &c.), chemist for druggist, draper's shop for dry goods store, shopman or shopwoman for clerk or saleswoman, carriage (railway) for car, goods train for freight train, luggage van for baggage car, booking clerk for ticket agent, guard for conductor, to shunt for to switch, tram for street car, lift for elevator, reel or bobbin for spool, tap for faucet, jug for pitcher, chest of drawers for bureau, and beetle for bug.

II.

In a chapter on the choice of words, we encounter some instructive remarks on the judicious employment of connective particles, the joints or hinges on which sentences turn. There is no doubt that a close reasoner and a good writer in general may be known by his pertinent use of connectives. Useful, however, as is a connective particle that expresses a real connection of thought, one that serves no purpose is worse than useless, and one used for an unsuitable purpose leads astray. It is pointed out that *but* and *and* are frequent offenders in both ways. They are properly used to connect words or clauses closely related in meaning, and similar in construction; *but*, by way of subtraction or opposition, as in "poor but honest;" *and*, by way of addition, as in "poor and honest." A composition should never begin with *but* or *and*; for, if nothing precedes the conjunction, there is nothing for it to connect with what follows. A paragraph, on the other hand, may so begin when there is real opposition or real connection between two paragraphs as wholes; but usually a new paragraph indicates a break in the sense too important to be bridged by a conjunction. Objection is sometimes made to the employment of *but* or *and* at the beginning of a sentence; but Mr. Hill contends that for this there is much good usage. In some cases, however, *but* or *and* at the beginning of a sentence not only serves no purpose, but is misleading.

In a section which bears the caption "ease," the author discusses the quality which makes language agreeable as distinguished from clearness which renders it intelligible and from force which renders it impressive. This quality has been called by different names, as euphony, beauty, harmony, smoothness, grace, elegance, and ease. No one of these words covers the whole ground, but, in Mr. Hill's opinion, ease covers more than any of the others. To avoid harsh or clumsy expressions is comparatively facile; but to acquire the positive excellencies that contribute to ease or charm of style is very difficult. These excellencies, few even among famous authors possess in full measure or have always at command. They are unattainable by any one who does not possess the qualities of character out of which they spring; for ease or grace or harmony of style in its highest form is a gift rather than an acquisition, the gift of an engaging personality. It is, however, a gift that may be developed; even Steele and Addison, Goldsmith and Irving, Newman and Thackeray did not attain perfect ease without patient and persistent labor. Of course, a conscious struggle for ease is often fatal to the desired result, or is successful at the cost of things vastly more important. In the former case, the writer's effort interferes with the comfort of his readers; in the latter case, clearness or force is sacrificed to smoothness, sense to sound.

Considerations of euphony have prevented the adoption of a rule insisted upon in some quarters, the rule that the relative pronoun *who* or *which* should be confined to cases in which the relative clause explains the meaning of the antecedent, or adds something to it, and the relative pronoun *that* to cases in which the relative clause restricts the meaning of the antecedent. This rule, however helpful to clearness it may be in theory, is observed by few good authors. Its strict observance would lead to harsh combinations, like that condemned by Steele in "the humble petition of *who* and *which*;" "we are descended of ancient families and kept up our dignity and honor many years, till the Jack Sprat *that* supplanted us How often have we found ourselves slighted by the clergy in their pulpit and the lawyers at the bar? Nay, how often have we heard in one of the most polite and august assemblies in the universe, to our great mortification, these words, 'that *that* that noble lord urged;' which, if one of us had had justice done, would have sounded nobler thus, 'that *which* that noble lord urged.'" The "*and which* construction," by which *and* is used to connect a relative clause with an expression not coördinate with it, though found at least occasionally in many good authors, as, for instance, Scott, Disraeli, Trollope, and Leslie Stephen, is regarded by Mr. Hill as an offence against ease. Excessive alliteration, also, is denounced as one of the worst offences against ease, not only because it is uneuphonious, but because it is affected.

III.

To professional writers this book is full of valuable suggestions, but we have read with peculiar interest in the chapter on "arrangement," what the author has to say about the manner of breaking up a composition by paragraphs. The usefulness of this mechanical device is apparent to everyone who has tried to read pages of print or of manuscript that either are unbroken, or are broken into many small fragments. The unbroken text tires the eye in one way, the text too frequently broken, in another. If the sole use of paragraphs were to rest the eye, as a speaker's changes of tone rest the ear, there would be little difficulty in determining their length or their structure. But, as their main function is to mark changes in thought, and thus help a reader to follow a writer step by step, puzzling questions as to their length or their structure must sometimes arise. We suppose that no one will dispute Mr. Hill's fundamental dictum that paragraphs are to sentences what sentences are to words. A paragraph, like a sentence, should be a unit in substance and expression, and should be developed with clearness, with force, and with ease. To secure clearness in a paragraph a writer should suggest in the first sentence the main idea of the paragraph, and the point of view from which it is to be considered, or should at least indicate the direction in which the thought is to move. He should then arrange his sentences in logical order, so that each shall contribute to the development of the idea which is expressed by the paragraph as a whole, and shall occupy the place in which it can be clearly understood, both in itself and in its relations to the rest of the paragraph. If a sentence can be put in one place as well as another, there is a defect somewhere, and usually a defect of such gravity that it cannot be remedied unless the sentence if not the paragraph is recast.

To secure force in a paragraph a writer should make the main idea prominent and keep subordinate ideas in the background, and he should so arrange his sentences that the paragraph shall move from the less important and less interesting to the more important and more interesting, and thus form a climax. The last sentence of a paragraph should bring out the point of the whole effectively, and it must sum up all that has been said in the paragraph which it ends. In the discussion of a difficult problem, or the elucidation of a profound thought, or in a persuasive discourse of any kind, such a sentence at the end of a paragraph, particularly if the paragraph be a long one, is of especial value; the reader having received a full explanation of the writer's meaning, is ready for a thought in a portable form. So much for the mode of giving force to a paragraph. But ease is no less desirable. A writer should show ease not only in the sentences of which the paragraph is composed, but also in the movement from sentence to sentence. Sometimes he may gain ease in transition by repeating a word; sometimes by using a conjunction or other particle which makes the connection plain. The more he varies his methods the less likely he is to call attention to them. If he achieves the result without betraying the processes, he is justly said to have a flowing style. In Shakespeare, as Coleridge noted, one sentence begets the next naturally; the meaning is all inwoven. He goes on kindling like a meteor through the dark atmosphere. A style characterized by the corresponding demerit is described by a French metaphor as *decousu*, a thing of shreds and patches, or, to change the figure, the sentences on a page have the same connection with each other that marbles have in a bag; they touch without adhering.

To assure unity to a paragraph a writer should conform to the general principles that secure unity in a sentence. A paragraph, like a sentence, should contain one main idea, should admit nothing that is not germane to that idea, and should be so framed as to present a well-rounded whole. Clearness, force, and ease it is sometimes impracticable to give to a paragraph in an equally high degree; because the relative importance of these qualities varies with subject and purpose, it may be difficult in a given case to secure in full measure the quality most needed without sacrificing something from one or both of the others. But whatever else is sacrificed in a paragraph, unity must be retained.

IV.

The chapters of this book that deal respectively with description, with narration, with exposition, and with argument, may be heartily commended to newspaper writers of every kind. It is the chapter on argument to which leader writers will turn with especial curiosity. There is, of course, an important difference between argument and exposition. Exposition achieves its purpose if it makes the persons addressed understand what is said; argument achieves its purpose if it makes them believe that what is maintained is true: exposition aims at explaining, argument at convincing. The difference between an argument and an exposition is compared to that between the address of an advocate to a jury and the charge of the Judge. The advocate tries to convince the jury that his client has the right on his side; the Judge, if he has the truly judicial spirit, tries to make the jury understand the question at issue exactly as it is. No doubt the way for argument must be often prepared by exposition. Some words of the assertion in dispute may need to be defined, and their relations to one another made clear. If the subject is novel or complex the assertion may need to be explained before the argument is begun. It is useless to try to convince a man of the truth of anything that he does not understand.

The importance of so arranging the several parts of an argumentative composition that they may render effective support to one another can hardly be overestimated. Should a reasoner begin by stating a proposition to be proved or disproved, or should he lead up to it by the proof? Unquestionably, a reasoner should, at the outset, clearly understand the proposition which he is to maintain; but it does not always follow that he should hasten to announce that proposition to those whom he would convince of its truth. His first object should be to secure favorable attention. If the proposition is familiar to the persons addressed, there will usually be some advantage in beginning with what is new in the proof; for an old conclusion acquires fresh interest when regarded from a new point of view or approached by a new path. If the proposition, whether familiar or not to the persons addressed, is likely to awaken hostility, it should not be announced until steps have been taken to procure for it a favorable reception. Often the best course to be taken to this end is to begin by stating the question at issue without indicating the desired conclusion until some of the arguments on each side have been presented; or it may be wise to begin by securing assent to general principles from which the desired conclusion can be logically deduced. In pursuing either course, a reasoner seems to invite his readers or hearers to join him in an inquiry for the truth. This inquiry results, if he is successful in convincing them of the justness of his conclusions, in leading them to believe that they have convinced themselves; it results, if he is unsuccessful, in inducing them to give attention to evidence to which they would have turned a deaf ear had they known to what conclusion it led. In the absence of such considerations as these, the better course usually is, first, to state what is to be proved, and then to prove it. This course is particularly to be recommended if the subject is abstruse, or if the arguments are numerous, for knowledge of the proposition serves as a clue to difficult reasoning. It was this course which ordinarily was followed by Burke. Other considerations come into play when a reasoner is obliged to meet a formidable opponent, for, until he has weakened the impression produced by his opponent's argument, he can make no headway with his own. It is generally advantageous, however, to begin by making a general answer to the arguments on the other side, but to postpone refutation in detail till a more convenient season. After a reasoner has made out a prima facie case, he can dispose of objections with less trouble and with greater effect. As a rule, the detailed refutation of objections should be near the middle of a discourse or leading article, so that the arguments refuted may not make either the first or the last impression. The beginning and the end of an argument, as of a play, are the most important parts. It is precisely in exordiums and perorations that a young writer is most apt to fail. He does not know how to get at his subject or how to get away from it. He should beware of putting in a word of introduction that is not necessary to prepare the way for his argument, and of adding a word at the end that is not necessary to enforce its conclusions. "Is he never going to begin?" "Will he never have done?" are questions equally fatal.

England Under the Stuarts.

The fourth volume of *Social England*, edited by H. D. TRAILL (Putnam), covers the period from the accession of James I. in 1603 to the death of Anne in 1714. It will be remembered that this work is the coördinated outcome of contributions from various writers, each more or less distinguished for his researches in a specific field. Thus, in the volume before us, the religious and the political movements of the seventeenth century are depicted by different hands, and so are the developments of the navy and the army, of the fine arts and the mechanical arts, of agriculture, trade, finance, literature, and science. These subjects, indeed, are adequately treated in other books, and it is the unique feature of this work, the history of the changes in manners and customs, that seems to deserve particular attention. We confine ourselves, therefore, in this notice, to an outline of the transformation which England underwent during the period above named, from the viewpoint of the historian of manners. The subject, narrow as it is, is naturally divided into three sections, corresponding to four stages of social evolution, namely, the reigns of the first two Stuarts, the epoch of the Commonwealth and the reign of Charles II.

I.

It is to Miss M. BATESON, Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge, that we are indebted for a study of social life, in the more circumscribed meaning of the word, under James I. and Charles I. She detects in the lives of the leisured classes during the reign of the first Stuart the signs of an age of decadence. What had been gayety in Elizabethan society had now become heartless frivolity. Elizabeth's court had not been free from faction and intrigue, but she did not choose as her sole confidants, greedy, unscrupulous adventurers, whose good will had to be obtained by all who hoped for worldly advantage. Amid the plots and counterplots of James's reign no one felt safe, and the sudden fall of men occupying the highest positions, of the Lord Treasurer for peculation, of the Lord Keeper for bribery, of the Lord Chamberlain and the Lord Privy Seal for suspected complicity in murder, served to render the atmosphere of mutual suspicion denser rather than to clear it. In the court of James the number of open and notorious evil livers was great, and the best that can be said of it is that it was not so bad as the court of Charles II. was to be. Most of the old nobility and of the peers of the best type avoided the court and spent their time in travel or in the retirement of their country houses. So far as their own married life was concerned, and in the bringing up of their children, James and his Queen set a good example, but the force of it was destroyed by the countenance they gave to the worst offenders. The story of the Somerset marriage is cited by way of illustration. To heal a court feud James brought about a marriage between the Earl of Essex, aged 14, and Lady Frances Howard, aged 13. After the wedding the Earl was sent to travel for a few years, and returned to find that his wife would not live with him, and that the King's favorite, Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester, was her lover. James, to please Carr, was now as eager to procure a divorce as he had been to make the match, and he appointed Commissioners to try the case. After proceedings of a revolting nature, he secured a verdict which implied that it lay in the King's power to dissolve the marriage tie whenever he saw fit. The divorce proceedings were nominally secret; but their nature was well known in the fashionable world, and Chamberlain's letters show that they were town talk. The shameless wickedness of Lady Essex, or Frances Howard, as she chose to call herself, was notorious. Yet, when she was married to her lover, who had been created Earl of Somerset, that his rank might equal hers, men of rank and fashion vied in doing the young couple honor. The conduct of such people cannot be defended on the ground that they did not know all that we know now. The only thing they did not know was the fact that the countess was actually and not merely in intention a murderess. Her character they knew, but they did not know that her victim was Sir Thomas Overbury, Rochester's favorite. Overbury had helped Rochester to write his love letters to the Countess, but had opposed his marriage. The agents of the Countess, who had administered the poison at her direction, were hanged; she was declared to have been led astray by "base persons," and James pardoned her, together with her husband, who was at the time believed to have been as guilty as his wife. It is well known that subsequently James chose another favorite more profligate than Somerset, and busied himself with more matchmaking. Only the fidelity of the wife whose affections he never succeeded in alienating, saved Buckingham from the consequences of his faithless conduct. Among the shameful matches made by his mother for her children and poor relations, the marriage of Frances Coke to Buckingham's half-witted brother John is adduced as comparing with that of Lady Essex in its tragic consequences.

II.

Intemperance had, in the reign of James I., reached such a point that men of Elizabeth's court, where there had been indecorum enough, were shocked to see the ladies and gentlemen of the Jacobean court rolling about in a state of intoxication. The Secretary of the Venetian Ambassadors observes that after a royal entertainment such a rush was made for the supper table that it was upset and all the food was scattered. Nor was it intemperance in drink alone that gave the Puritans ground for an attack on court abuses. It was often the pressing necessity for money to keep up the many extravagant entertainments and other aristocratic excesses that led men of otherwise exemplary life astray. To procure money the King, the Queen, and the courtiers used every device. James himself anxiously pressed his Queen to make her will, lest her favorite attendant should seize her jewels on her death; the event proved the soundness of the advice which she had not followed. While courtiers were reduced to pilfering, the King and Queen ran deeply into debt. The entertainments which Queen Elizabeth had made her courtiers provide for her they were generous enough to provide for their courtiers at the expense of their creditors. These entertainments took the form of masques and plays. The excessive bitterness shown in the Puritan attack on the drama was characteristic, also, of their attack on dancing, dicing, and card playing. In the days of Elizabeth, the Puritan Stubbes had held these amusements to be capable of a legitimate use, but the Puritans of New England deemed it impossible that they could ever be innocent recreations, and forbade them by law. Whatever amusement or sport James I. specially enjoyed incurred Puritan dislike. He was absurdly fond of hunting (with dogs, not with guns or bows), so much so that even his courtiers wearied of it. Cock fighting he also patronized, and bear and bull baiting, all which sports were opposed by the Puritans. Many sports also which they did not condemn had ceased to exist, because the Puritans denounced the use of them on Sunday, the only day on which working people could practise them regularly. The question of Sabbatarianism was, indeed, the first occasion of open conflict between the court and the Puritans on a social question. Just as religion drove the Puritans to social reform it drove them to dress reform. Pride in apparel is condemned by many Scriptural texts, and opposition to the excessive extravagance which characterized the court party, especially under James I., made the Puritan strictly utilitarian in his costume. The abrupt changes from the ridiculous, bombastic breeches and wheel farthingales of James I.'s reign to the simple, but rich and elegant dress associated with the portraits of Charles I. and Henrietta Maria is ascribed rather to one of the sudden reactions which ruled fashion, than to the influence of Puritan teaching, and perhaps, also, to Charles I.'s refined taste, which contrasted strongly with his father's carelessness. It is further to be noted that, under Charles I., the tone of the court greatly improved. He was "temperate, chaste, and serious" himself; and Mrs. Lucy Hutchinson adds that "the nobility and courtiers, who did not quite abandon their debaucheries, yet so reverenced the King as to retire into corners to practice them. Intemperance, incessant gambling, and dicing were no longer countenanced by the King's personal example, and a serious effort was made to put a stop to duelling, which James I. had tried to discourage by proclamation, but without result. Unfortunately the Queen, Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV. of France, was not of the opinion that moral offenders should be banished from her court, provided they were, like Henry Jermyn, gay and entertaining. Nor had she any eye for genuine merit. Hence it was that prudent women avoided the court. The author of these researches in social history has found nothing to show that the improvement in Charles I.'s court was due to puritanical influences. The Puritan party had not seized the opportunities afforded by the Essex divorce and the Overbury murder for an attack on court immorality, but had left the courtiers to go their own way to destruction. Nevertheless, the Puritans, though mainly bound together by religion, did act as a party of social reform, and whatever was in fashion they refused to wear. When ruffs were in vogue, for instance, a Puritan wore a large, falling band; when ruffs ceased to be in request and wide falling bands of delicate lawn, edged with fine lace, came in, he wore a very small band. Fashionable shoes were wide at the toes; the Puritan shoes were sharp. Fashionable stockings were, as a rule, of any color except black; his were black. His garters were short and, above all, his hair was short. Even at the end of Elizabeth's reign short hair was a mark of Puritanism. When "love locks" were worn, no form of hair dressing seemed to the Puritan mind more unlovely; in Prynne's eyes it was "that bush of vanity whereby the devil leads and holds men captive." In 1641 the term "Roundhead" came in after the first conflict between the Puritans and the mounted force of the court party, who henceforth were called Cavaliers. Of course, to speak only of the attitude of extremists in a social struggle is to caricature the history of social life. Nevertheless, it is true that the social, like the political history of the reign of James I. and Charles I. is the story of a struggle between opposing parties, a struggle so deadly that there could be no compromise. There was no hope that the one party could slowly influence the other, each taking the other's best; it was war to the knife. The non-combatants no doubt exceeded the combatants, as is usual in all times of strife; but it is the uncompromising, ruthless nature of the combat that gives the social life of the early Stuarts its peculiar character.

III.

In the times of Elizabeth and James I. sociality had seemed the be-all and end-all of society; under the Commonwealth, sociality in many of its lighter forms almost ceased to exist. The Puritan revolution taught that society could be held together, at least for a time, by a common, moral discipline, which enforced the rejection of all amusement as hitherto understood. That the time was short may be ascribed to the fact that the new standard of morality appeared as a discipline of negations to those whose moral standard was unchanged. The time would no doubt have been shorter had there not been many, even on the royalist side, who preferred a discipline of negations to none at all. The enthusiastic enjoyment which discipline affords to many natures is displayed in the history of the Parliamentary army. In 1642 each man was fighting for his share of plunder, but, two years later, a number of average Englishmen had learned the practical efficiency of long-trained soldiers, and they fought as if possessed by a common inspiration. The officers preached to the soldiers, and enforced the moral of their sermon by rigorous regulations. Every man was fined five shillings for drunkenness and three pence for an oath; as the wage of a foot soldier was only eight pence a day, these fines were not easily paid. Civilians were subjected to an equally severe discipline. In 1642 plays and bear baiting were forbidden. Cock matches were also stopped. In 1644 all May poles were ordered to be pulled down, and all games and sports or selling of wares on Sundays were prohibited. In 1643, when the Lord Mayor feasted both Houses of Parliament, no healths were drunk, and in 1644 an ordinance made swearing, gaming, and drunkenness punishable. When, in 1655, the Major-Generals began to exercise police functions the laws were rigorously executed. Horse races were suppressed, players were whipped as rogues, and a new ordinance for press licenses was issued, and was used especially against books containing scurrilities and gross jests. In 1657 any person betting at cards, dice, tables, tennis, bowls, shuffleboard, or any other game was ordered to forfeit twice his winnings.

Cut off from almost all other amusements, the discussion of religious, political, and social questions became the principal interest of the republicans, and formal debates began to be held in Rhenish wine houses, and, toward the end of the Commonwealth period, in coffee houses. The first coffee house was opened in 1652 by a Greek in St. Michael's alley, Cornhill. The popular interest in public events led to a great increase in the number of newspapers. In November, 1641, the first report of the proceedings in Parliament in the form of a newspaper was issued. During the civil war the competition between journalists was sharp, and each party had its recognized organ. At least one hundred and seventy weekly papers are said to have been started, chiefly in London, between 1642 and 1649. Most of the newspapers survived but a short time. Another movement which was to revolutionize society was the organization of a system of stage coaches in April, 1658. A newspaper advertisement announced that a coach would leave the "George Inn" without Aldersgate, every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, reaching Salisbury in two days, for the sum of £1. York or Exeter could be reached in four days for £2; the coach to Newcastle left every Monday, and cost £3. Other stage lines were advertised. In the year previously, the post had been reorganized and cheapened. The same age made hackney coaches popular. According to the "Character of England," 1659, children threw dirt at private coaches; "the carmen, who in London domineer over the streets, overthrow the hell-carts (for so they name the private coaches), cursing and reviling the nobles." Sir John Reresby, a contemporary diarist, records that "the citizens and common people of London had then so far imbibed the customs and manners of the Commonwealth that they could scarce endure the sight of a gentleman," and that the common salutation to a man well dressed was "French dog," and the like. On his return from travel, Reresby's valet was pelted in the street (1658), because he wore a feather in his hat. Similarly in 1659, Mrs. Thornton notes that Lambert wanted "to root out the very face of a clargieman or gentleman, or the civiler sort of the commonalty." The advanced republicans regretted that the social revolution, much as it had accomplished, had yet caused so little change in etiquette and social forms. Cromwell himself had said in 1644 that he "hoped to live to see never a nobleman in England," yet both in his first and second protectorate titles were used and knighthoods were conferred. "His Highness's household" and "his Highness's court" were kept up with full state ceremony. To Cromwell, the dignity of kingship was natural, and, inexperienced as he was, he never exposed himself to mockery by his behavior. Not all, however, who came to the front had the same gift of good manners which Cromwell and his children possessed.

IV.

We pass to the sudden and striking change in English manners which took place at the Restoration. The Puritans had swept away a court and its vices, but the result was the return of a court with worse vices. Nevertheless, they had set forces to work which led to an awakening of intelligence; men began to use their inventive powers and reasoning faculties; events outside the sphere of personal and family affairs began to arouse a new and general interest. This outcome of their movement had not been sought by the leaders of the commonwealth, but it was the natural consequence of their insistence on the religious side of man's nature in an age when questions of religion and politics were one; they made religion what it had not been before, an intellectual interest, and thereby opened the way to the multiplication of such interests. It became fashionable to be well informed on scientific, literary, artistic, and political matters. As to the degradation of English morals at this time, it was partly chargeable no doubt to the vicious example of Charles II. and his courtiers, but it was also due in some measure to their gifts. Their gifts made immorality appear a part of good breeding and essential to charm. Bishop Burnet, writing of the manners of Charles II., says they were "never enough to be commended; he was a perfectly well-bred man, easy of access, free in his discourse, and sweet in his whole deportment." His quickness of apprehension and observation gave him reputation as a wit, but, according to the Marquis of Halifax, "he was apter to make broad allusions upon anything that gave the least occasion than was altogether suitable with the very good breeding he showed in most other things. The hypocrisy of the former times inclined men to think they could not show too great an aversion to it, and that helped to encourage this unbounded liberty of talking without the restraints of decency which were before observed." The King's selfishness and duplicity led him to take a cynical view of the rest of the world, and, through his influence, cynicism became a mark of "fine gentlemanship." On the other hand, he did nothing to revive the big and varied oaths of the early Stuart period, his own exclamation being generally "odds fish;" moreover, neither he nor his brother was a drunkard or an inveterate gambler, though both drunkenness and gambling prevailed at their courts. Miss Bateson does not enlarge on the history of their many mistresses, but she recalls the significant fact that their existence was publicly acknowledged, and that the Queen was forced to appoint two of them ladies of her bedchamber.

Though it was an age in which the pleasures of life were keenly relished, there is no evidence of eager search after variety. Charles II., his courtiers, and their hangers-on went to the theatre day after day with unwearying persistence. The King kept himself in health by perfect regularity in his exercise, business hours, and amusements, illicit or legitimate. At Newmarket he went walking every morning, to horse races every afternoon after dinner, then to a cock fight, then to a play, and, after supper, to his mistress, the Duchess of Portsmouth. Two small theatres supplied the needs of Londoners, because only members and would-be members of the court circle were regular spectators. It was preëminently a time of fine actors and actresses, but spectacular effects and French ballet dancing excited as much interest as good acting. Night after night, Sundays not excepted, the Queen and the King's mistresses played either the Spanish ombre, which had sent "primero" out of fashion, or else basset, a simple gambling game resembling baccarat. Evelyn notes that the Queen of James II. was exceedingly concerned for the loss of eighty pounds at basset. For some time the old-fashioned brawl, or brantle, the coranto, and country dances were favorites at court, but, in 1666, Pepys notes the introduction of new French dances. The most fashionable outdoor exercises were tennis and pell-mell, in which latter game the object was to drive a ball through two hoops placed at the head and end of a long alley. Citizens and peasants were faithful to football; women of the lower orders were suffered to play ball in the public streets. Cock fighting was still a favorite sport of the gentry; bull and bear baiting, however, had become vulgar. No London pleasure ground was able to maintain a reputation for respectability for more than a short period. A new spring garden had been opened at Vauxhall, or Foxhall, with a beautiful pleasure house and numerous arbors in which people dined. Evelyn calls it in 1661 "a pretty contrived plantation," and fine people then walked there to hear the nightingales. In 1668, however, it was no longer respectable. To drive in the Ring or the Tour of Hyde Park after the play, toward evening, was as fashionable as ever. The royal party was generally to be seen there. The park was walled in, and refreshments in the form of cheese cake, tarts, and syllabub were sold at the entrance lodge. Lackeys and footmen were not admitted, but awaited the return of their masters at the entrance. In St. James's Park, opened to the public by Charles II., the chief interest was the flock of water fowl, especially if the King or Duke of York were feeding them. Pepys records that his wife, before making a new dress, walked in Gray's Inn Gardens to see the fashions.

V.

Even the most fashionable and dissipated persons kept very early hours, and began a "debauch" at the 1 o'clock dinner. It was an age of hospitality, and guests stayed playing cards, drinking tea or coffee and wine, smoking, seeing conjuring tricks, &c., till 7 or 8 o'clock, going to bed at sunset in summer. Little or no business was done in the afternoons. Merchants went to work about 6 or 7 A. M.; Pepys was sometimes at his desk by 4 or 5 A. M., and he was no exception. In spite of these early hours it is rare to find any mention of breakfast other than a "morning draught" of ale, with bread and butter and radishes. What Pepys calls "a pretty dinner," served in courses, after the new fashion, consisted of a brace of stewed carps, six roasted chickens, and a jowl of salmon, hot, for the first course; for the second, two neats' tongues and cheese, with a "tansy," as a pudding of eggs and cream, flavored with tansy, was called. He mentions, also, a lamprey pie, a dish of anchovies, a leg of veal, a leg of beef, bought for sixpence, and a boiled haunch of venison. Foreigners noted that the English had no soups or bisques, but the broth of boiled meat was often served in humble circles and in the universities. The town gallant at the French ordinary supped on "*le potage*," ate his "*bœuf à la mode*," and drank Burgundy. There was an endless variety of drinks. Of Spanish wines, the most favored were Canary, sack, tent, Malaga, muscatel, and sherry. Florence, Burgundy, Madeira, and Rhenish wines and claret are also often named. The only spirit in common use was brandy, but it was too costly to be popular. Of fancy beverages may be mentioned metheglin (mead); hypocras, which was red wine, sugared and spiced; and "aromatic," which was a sweet drink. Of ales, the most in request was "mun," brewed with wheat, and without hops; "buttered ale," which was beer brewed without hops, warmed and flavored with sugar and cinnamon, and with a lump of butter in it; "lamb's wool," which was ale mixed with the pulp of apples. It is said that in 1688 more than 12,000,000 barrels of beer were brewed to supply the needs of a population estimated at about 5,000,000. Water was scarcely ever drunk, not even by children, who imbibed small beer from their earliest years. In town coffee and chocolate were usual, tea somewhat rarer. On June 29, 1667, Pepys enters in his diary: "Home, and there find my wife making of tea, a drink which the pottecary tells her is good for her cold and defluctions." Early in the reign Charles II. issued a proclamation against drinking healths, but was himself the first to break it in Mulberry Garden. In his reign it is said the term "toast" was first introduced. Toast drinking began when the cloth had been removed. Many writers state that, during the troublous times of the civil war, it became unusual to take supper, and the poor or middle classes, after the Restoration, took only a hot drink of buttered ale or a light meal. Those who could afford it would have fish or a joint; undergraduates had roast meat at supper, except on fast days, Friday, Saturday, and Wednesday, when they had tansy pudding. Although it was commonly remarked that Charles II. introduced a politer way of living, foreign travellers observed a want of "gentility" in English conduct at meals. A French visitor reports: "They scarce ever make use of forks or ewers, for they wash their hands by dipping them into a basin of water," the same basin serving for all. An Italian prince, describing better company, says: "On the English table, there are no forks. A beaker was set before each person, and, at the end of the meal, each dips the end of his napkin therein, and, with this, they clean their teeth and wash their hands." Even at a royal feast, each guest had only one knife and fork, "tastefully arranged" before him. Pepys summoned a professional man to lay out his napkins in figures of all sorts the day before a dinner party. At table, the guests were all seated on chairs without backs, and wore their hats. The politer way of living did not check the habit of constant spitting. It will be remembered that in Chaucer's time it had been a mark of the finest breeding to spit delicately.

Though meals were fewer than in modern times, fashionable people found the waters and restricted diet of Bath and Tunbridge Wells conducive to health. At Bath, the arrangements for bathing were not more elaborate than those for sea bathing are now. In the Lepers' Bath, "poor people and lepers bathed themselves." Kings' and Queens' Bath, Pepys found full of a mixed sort of company, good and bad, and the Cross Bath only for gentry. He did not find even the Cross Bath clean, as the grand company all bathed in the same water. After two hours in the water, he was "carried away wrapped in a sheet, and so in a chair home." Tunbridge Wells was still a country spot. The waters of Epsom were for the humbler citizens who dwelt east of Temple Bar. Pepys found a very common set of people there. Northerners went to the "Spaws" at Harrowgate, Scarborough, and Buxton.

There was an increased desire to travel and some improvements in travelling facilities, but roads remained much as they had been. In the act of 1663 for the improvement of a part of the great North Road, the toll-bar system was first adopted. Stage coaching, begun at the end of the Commonwealth, now became usual, in spite of strenuous resistance from those who held that it made men effeminate, would destroy the breed of horses, and deprive thousands of the means of livelihood. The usual charge was one shilling for every five miles. The flying coaches, 1677, made between forty and fifty miles a day, and accomplished in twelve hours the journey from London to Oxford or Cambridge. Only a few of the nobility followed the old fashion of travelling with several private coaches and numbers of men servants on horseback, to protect the passengers and to heave the coaches out of the ruts. Private coaches, when used, had, as a rule, six horses; in wagons, six were harnessed, one before another. In travelling it was usual to take a guide. The quality of English inns at this time was generally praised by foreign travellers. At the George Inn, Salisbury, Pepys slept in a silk bed and had "very good diet, but very dear." With three ladies riding pillion, he went to Stonehenge, and had to sleep at a rustic inn, where they found the beds "lousy, which made us merry." Wicker and spring carriages and "glass coaches," namely, coaches with glass windows, were among the novelties of this period; so, too, was the calash, or two-wheeled wooden carriage, the ancestor of the "one-horse shay." A French traveller complained that the hackney coach was a disgrace, being no more than a cart or ordinary travelling wagon. The driver rode on the back of one of his horses. An Italian observer gives a more favorable account, and says that at every corner were decent coaches, in all about eight hundred hackneys, in London. Foot passengers could rarely cross London Bridge owing to the amount of traffic always passing that way, and the river was still constantly used. Pepys generally noted the fact when he made his expeditions "by land." After the great fire he felt uneasy if obliged to be out after dark, and sat in the coach with his sword drawn. This nervousness seems to have been justified, for, at a late hour, he "could hardly get a coach or a link willing to go through the ruins." After the rebuilding of the City, the streets were wider and better paved. The dangers of the streets were due not only to the prevalence of robbery, but to the "hectors," "nickers," or "scourers," gentlemen who assaulted and outraged passengers for their own amusement, and also to the hired bullies and nose slitters, who undertook private acts of vengeance for the King and others.

VI.

A word in conclusion should be said about the training of children in the England of the Restoration period. Davenant condemned English parents for their custom of bringing up their children to be strangers to them. They were at pains, he said, to teach them nothing but bashfulness. Locke, also, in his "Treatise on Education," indicates that parents were inclined to consider manners as all important. He urges them not to beat their children for "unfashionable carriage" and such merely childish ways as they will outgrow. From his account it appears that it was not unusual for parents to govern their children by a long code of rules which the child was expected to learn. In the letters written by children to their parents at this period there are traces of the formal and frigid relations which had been characteristic of an earlier age. It was usual to address one's father as "Honored father, sir," and to conclude with "Your faithful and obedient son." The mother, too, is "Honored mother," and this at a time when letter writers, as a rule, were studious to find tender terms of endearment. Young children were put to severe studies at an early age in the few families where learning was esteemed. In the correspondence of Locke an account is given of a friend's child who at five could perform the plainer problems of the globe, at six began Latin, and at nine understood "geography and chronology and the Copernican system of our vortex." He had seen some dogs dissected, and could furnish "some little account of the grand traces of anatomy." An unusual value was set on social accomplishments; the dancing master who taught a little child to "make a leg" received the largest share of the fees for tuition; and, in the desire for "good breeding," the mental education of boys of the upper class tended to become inefficient. As a rule, the younger sons of the aristocracy were taught the elements at home by a chaplain; they were then sent to a grammar school, or to a public school, and thence to the university. Eldest sons were rarely sent to school or to the university, but travelled with a tutor at the age of sixteen, when their brothers went to college. The comparative advantages of a home and a school education were much debated. Lord Cork sent one of his sons to Eton at the age of eight, and this child later in life gave as his opinion that "breeding up of great men's children at home tempts them to nicety, to pride, and idleness, and contributes much more to give them a good opinion of themselves than to deserve it." On the other hand, Locke, who was unhappy at Westminster, under Dr. Busby, says: "How any one's being put into a mixed herd of boys and there learning to wrangle at trap, or rook at span-farthing, fits him for conversation or business, I do not see." In his opinion, boys brought up at home always had the best manners. At Westminster the fines for talking English in hall or school were rigidly enforced, but the practice of teaching Latin by talking it was elsewhere dying out. It appears also that at Westminster scholars preparing for the university sent in Hebrew and Arabic as well as Latin and Greek themes. Evelyn was astonished at such work from boys of twelve or thirteen, and laments that so few of them retained their knowledge in later years. Both at Westminster and at Eton there were about three hundred boys, some staying to the age of twenty.

The desire to learn social accomplishments was especially preponderant in determining the course of girls' education. The household duties for which girls had been formerly trained were now neglected, and they were sent to Hackney or Chelsea boarding school to learn dancing, music, painting, and French, now "almost as fashionable among women of quality as among men." At home they were early provided with the fashionable romances, plays, and poems, and were early taken to pay calls with their mothers. A girl of 15 was considered as old as a boy of 21. It was unusual for girls to learn any classics, but Evelyn's daughter had read Homer and some Latin poets in translations, and Locke found as a governess for Lord Shaftesbury's son a woman who taught Latin and Greek.

M. W. H.

THE WHEEL OF FATE.

The Old Tack Puncturing Yarn in a Form of Startling and Thrilling Romance.

From Punch.

I.

"Grammercy!" quoth the Baron d'Agincourt, as he rolled off his bicycle into a potato bed, "'tis a full-mettled steed! Methinks those varlets have fed him with overmuch oil of late, so restive is he become. And, lack-a-day! My doublet is besmirched with mire! Thou smilest, I see, Agatha. There is but scant reason for merriment, shameless girl!"

"Nay," replied the beautiful Lady Agatha, as with exquisite skill she rode her dainty steed (a thoroughbred Coventry) up and down the terrace, "'twas not at thy mishap, dear father! Of a truth thou must be sorely bruised. Was not that thy seventh fall this afternoon? If I smile, 'tis but that I am happy."

"Humph!" said the Baron, as he hopped painfully behind his machine, vainly endeavoring to mount anew. "Happy, eh? And wherefore? Whom hast thou seen to change thy mood so since this morning? 'Twas but a few hours ago that thou wast weeping over some trifle of a spilt oil can. Ah, I am up at last!"

"I have seen none," said the lovely maiden, with blushing cheeks; "at least, save only——" She hesitated, doubtfully.

"Whom, girl?" insisted her father.

"Sir Algernon Fitzclarence."

With a desperate swerve the Baron rode toward her, his face purple with passion.

"What, thou hast chosen to disobey me again? Talking with him whom I had forbidden to come within twenty leagues of my castle! Now, by St. Humber, both thou and he shall rue this day! I say that——"

The Baron's skill failed him once more, and he was shot off into the gooseberry bushes.

"Nay, hear me, dear father——"

"Cease!" roared the angry Baron. "What ho, there! Lead the Lady Agatha," he commanded as twenty men rushed forward in answer to his summons, "into the upper dungeon. And, varlets, bring me the sticking plaster."

II.

'Twas midnight. Alone in the dismal cell to which her father's cruelty had consigned her the Lady Agatha wept unceasingly. Sleep came not to her weary eyes; she paced restlessly up and down or gazed through the narrow bars of the window over the moonlit landscape.

Suddenly she started! Was it fancy? Nay, 'twas a human voice, manly, resonant, and strong, that sang beneath her window. She could catch some of the words:

> O sweetest blossom of the lea,
> O daintiest flower of the field!
> For love, for hopeless love of thee
> My reason must her kingdom yield.

Good heavens! It was Algernon Fitzclarence!

> Across the land, across the main,
> A single steed shall bear us twain.

He was ascending by a ladder! His face appeared at the window!

"Ah, darling Agatha," he said, "news was brought me of thy parlous state! But dry thy tears, my sweet! See"—he snapped the massive bars with the little finger of his left hand—"the cage is broken. Two of the swiftest Singers are saddled for us at the castle gate. Let us fly together!"

* * * * * * *

Noiselessly the gallant steeds flitted along the road.

"Were't not best to light our lamps?" whispered Agatha. "Methinks that the sage councillors of the parish——"

"Nay, I fear them not," said the intrepid Fitzclarence. "Enough for me is the light of thine eyes."

Suddenly their steed slackened pace simultaneously, and a faint hissing sound was heard. They looked at one another and groaned.

"We are punctured!" cried Agatha. It was too true. At the foot of a steep hill they dismounted, their tires flabby, shapeless, useless. Fitzclarence passed his hand over the ground.

"As I thought!" he said bitterly, "'tis thy father that hath contrived this! He hath scattered tin tacks broadcast over the road to foil our attempt to escape! But we will baffle him."

For some minutes he worked his air pumps in silence. Suddenly a sound was heard at which Agatha grew deathly pale. It was the clear resonant note of a bicycle bell!

"We are pursued!" she cried. "Let us fly, Algernon."

"We cannot," said her practical lover, "the tires are almost empty. We can but meet our doom bravely!"

Louder and louder came the noise of whirring wheels. Then—a whir, and the Baron, breathless, pale with terror, went by them like a flash of lightning! Fitzclarence understood in a moment what had happened. The Baron was but an unskilful rider, and had allowed his machine to run away with him down the hill!

To stop him was impossible. He went along the highway for thirty-two and a half miles, and then, with a last despairing yell, he vanished over the cliff, still seated on his steed, and was buried beneath the waves of the English Channel. So Fitzclarence and Agatha returned to the castle and lived happily ever after.

"HE VANISHED OVER THE CLIFF."

Discouraging News from a Tough Town.

From the Boston Record.

I am told that the churches in South Boston are having rather hard times. Some of them have been obliged to cut down the salaries of their ministers, because of the lack of financial support. People on whom they have depended for liberal contributions have moved away, and none seem to be growing up to take their places. I am told that one church has been obliged to decrease its pastor's salary from $3,500 to $2,000, with other cases not perhaps so striking, but all along the same line.