SOME NEW BOOKS.

George Clinton.

We are indebted to the New York State Historian, HUGH HASTINGS, for the first volume of the *Public Papers of George Clinton*, many times Governor of New York, and twice Vice-President of the United States. As the editor reminds us in an introduction, George Clinton was unquestionably one of the men who made the independence of the Thirteen Colonies possible. It was his patriotism, his ability and his dogged tenacity that exerted a preponderant influence in the creation and maintenance of the sovereignty of the State of New York. Whether he be considered as a soldier during the period when he commanded the defences in the Highlands, or as Military Governor of the infant Commonwealth, or as Vice-President of the Federal Republic reorganized in 1789, the same sagacity, the same straightforwardness and the same sturdy self-reliance are everywhere apparent. The four epochs into which his career may be divided cover forty of the most important years of our national existence, to wit: the colonial period, the military period from the outbreak of hostilities to the close of the Revolutionary War, the period of Clinton's Governorship of New York, which embraces the years from the peace to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and, finally, the period which exhibits the services rendered by him as Vice-President of the United States from 1805 to his death in 1812.

The papers here printed are preceded by a careful biographical sketch comprising upward of one hundred and seventy pages, and carrying us to the evacuation of the city of New York by the British troops on Nov. 25, 1783. We avail ourselves of the data collected to present an outline of the principal incidents in this part of the subject's life.

I.

George Clinton was descended from a family of soldiers. One of his ancestors, William Clinton, a follower of Charles I., who held a commission in the Royalist army, sought refuge on the Continent after the death of that sovereign. After remaining in France for awhile he went to Scotland, where he married, but, his life being in jeopardy, he crossed over to the north of Ireland, where he died, leaving an orphan boy, James, then but 2 years old. Upon reaching his majority, James Clinton endeavored to recover the patrimonial estate in England, but failed because of the statute of limitations. His son, Charles Clinton, had been born in the county of Longford, Ireland, in 1690. In his fortieth year Charles Clinton organized a colony consisting of seventy persons, and chartered a ship, "George and Anne," which left Ireland May 20, 1729, for Philadelphia. The ship eventually put in at Cape Cod, where Clinton and his colony remained until the spring of 1731, when they set out for Ulster county, N. Y., and formed the settlement now known as Little Britain, six miles south of Newburgh. Charles Clinton proved to be not only a proficient civil engineer, but also a good lawyer. He was appointed a justice of the peace, and afterward a judge of Ulster county. In 1756 the Governor, Sir Charles Hardy, made him a Lieutenant-Colonel of the Second Regiment of Ulster county, and, two years later, retaining his rank, he was transferred to Oliver De Lancey's regiment. Two of Charles's sons, George and James Clinton, became conspicuous during the War of the Revolution, in the course of which they established creditable reputations as soldiers. One of them, and the son of the other, became distinguished Governors of the State of New York. Col. Clinton's youngest and most distinguished son, George, was born at Little Britain, in what was then Ulster, but is now Orange county, N. Y., on July 26, 1739. We hear nothing about his early opportunities of education. When but 16 years of age, he sailed from the port of New York on a privateer and suffered many hardships. Like his older brother James, however, he preferred a military life, and, in 1758, was appointed a subaltern in his father's regiment, and, with his older brother James, who was then a captain, accompanied Col. John Bradstreet's expedition against Fort Frontenac, near Lake Ontario. At the head of a small force, the Clinton brothers distinguished themselves by capturing a French sloop-of-war on that inland basin.

On his return from the expedition against Fort Frontenac, George Clinton entered the office of William Smith in New York city, but, in a short time, returned to Ulster county, where Admiral George Clinton, then Governor of New York, and father of Sir Henry Clinton, appointed him by letters patent clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, Clerk of the Peace and of the Court of Sessions of Ulster county. Christopher Tappen, whose sister he subsequently married, was his deputy. On Sept. 12, 1764, George Clinton was admitted by Gov. Cadwallader Colden to practise as an attorney-at-law at the Mayor's Court at Albany and the inferior courts of common pleas in the counties of the province, except in the Mayor's Court of the city of New York. About a twelvemonth afterward he was appointed Surrogate of Ulster county, and, in the following year, he took his seat as a member of the General Assembly from Ulster. He continued a member of that body until its dissolution nine years later. After an existence of nearly ninety-two years, the General Assembly of the Province adjourned on April 3, 1775, and never again assembled.

From the time of his appearance in political life, George Clinton was recognized as a leader of the embryo American party inflexibly opposed to British encroachments upon American liberties. He was chosen a member of the Provincial Convention, which by a call from the city and county of New York, assembled on April 20, 1775, at the Exchange to choose delegates to represent the New York Colony in the Second Continental Congress. This Congress assembled on May 5, 1775, at Smith's Tavern in Philadelphia, and afterward at Carpenter's Hall. Clinton took his seat on May 15, 1775, the day fixed by the Congress for the consideration of the situation in New York. The delegates from that province had applied to Congress for advice as to their conduct in regard to the British troops that were expected. The following resolution was adopted: "That it be recommended for the present to the inhabitants of New York that, if the troops that are expected should arrive, the Colony act on the defensive, so long as may be consistent with safety and security; that the troops be permitted to remain in the barracks so long as they act peaceably and quietly, but that they be not suffered to erect fortifications or take any steps for cutting off the communications between the town and country; and that, if they commit hostilities or invade private property, the inhabitants should defend themselves and their property, and repel force by force; that the warlike stores be removed from the town, that places of retreat in case of necessity be provided for the women and children of New York, and that a sufficient number of men be embodied and kept in constant readiness for protecting the inhabitants from insult and injury."

In the following December, the second New York Provincial Congress appointed George Clinton Brigadier-General of Militia. He attended the session of the Continental Congress in 1776, and voted for the resolutions introduced in that body on the 7th of June, which were to result on the 4th of July in the Declaration of Independence. As his State, however, had been invaded by the British, he returned hurriedly to New York on an imperative order from Gen. Washington, and thus lost the opportunity of attaching his name to that instrument. In the course of the same year, he was appointed a deputy to the Fourth New York Provincial Congress, which assembled on July 9, at White Plains, Westchester county. Upon receiving and adopting the Declaration of Independence, this Assembly on July 10 changed its name to the "Convention of Representatives of the State of New York," and continued to hold sessions until May 13, 1777. It was this convention that framed and adopted the first Constitution of the State of New York. As his letters indicate, George Clinton's military command was enlarged on Aug. 8, 1776, so as to embrace the counties of Ulster, Orange and Westchester. In the following January, he was directed to raise one thousand men from the counties of Ulster, Orange, Westchester and Dutchess. He had been appointed General in command of the Highlands in the previous March, and had been commissioned Brigadier-General in the Continental service. On the last day of the session of the New York Convention, he received its thanks for "long and faithful service as a delegate in the Continental Congress to the Colony of New York and to the State."

In the meantime the Council of Safety, which had been invested by the Convention with powers to carry on the government of the State until the new Legislature should convene, declared that the poll lists and ballots returned by the sheriffs of the respective counties indicated that Gen. George Clinton was elected Governor and Lieutenant-Governor of the State. The Constitution having failed to specify the date when the Governor should enter upon the duties of his office Gen. Clinton qualified on the day of his election, and took the oath of office on July 30, 1777, the oath being administered to him by Pierre Van Cortlandt, President of the Council, who discharged the duties of Lieutenant-Governor. The date of the Governor's inauguration was not fixed by statute until 1787, when, by act of the Legislature, the first day of July after election was designated. The first Legislature of the State of New York assembled at Kingston on Sept. 9, 1777. On the following day the members met the Governor in the "Court Room," where he delivered his message orally, confining himself almost exclusively to questions relating to the war. On Oct. 1, 1778, in pursuance of the Governor's proclamation, the Legislature convened at Poughkeepsie, and on the 30th day of October it met the Governor in the Senate Chamber, where he made a speech dwelling on the military situation in the country at large and in the State of New York in particular. On July 17, 1779, the Governor, by proclamation, required the Legislature to meet at Kingston on the following 9th of August. Only a few members appeared, however, a number of the Representatives having meanwhile joined the army in the field, and adjournment was made from day to day until Aug. 24, when the Governor again addressed them. This third session of the Legislature was migratory. Up to Oct. 25, 1779, its sessions were held at Kingston; from Jan. 27 to March 14, 1780, they were held at Albany, and from April 22 to July 21 at Kingston again, where an adjournment took place. On Sept. 4, 1780, the Governor convoked the Legislature at Poughkeepsie. The Legislature of New York had empowered its delegates in Congress to cede a portion of the western territory belonging to the State, for the common benefit, and, in the previous May, Lafayette had returned from a visit to France, bringing from the French Government a commission to Washington as Lieutenant-General and Vice-Admiral of France, in order that no dispute could be raised as to his authority as Commander-in-Chief of the united forces of France and the United States. A month before the Legislature convened for its fourth session the command at West Point had been bestowed upon Benedict Arnold; while the session was in progress Arnold's infamy was disclosed and, eight days before its adjournment, namely, on Oct. 2, 1780, the unfortunate André was hanged as a spy.

II.

It is well known that Gov. George Clinton was the most resolute and powerful of the opponents of the Constitution framed at Philadelphia in 1783. He had revealed much earlier his unwillingness to surrender any of the rights of the State of New York. On March 19, 1781, the New York Legislature, in conformity with the request of the Congress of the Confederation, passed an act providing that the duties granted to Congress "should be levied and collected in such manner and form, and under such pains, penalties and regulations, and by such officers as Congress should, from time to time, make, order, direct and appiont." Gov. Clinton strongly objected to this measure, and refused to surrender the revenues collected under it on the ground that New York, as an independent colony, had associated with the other colonies merely for the purpose of mutual assistance and protection, and should not be expected to give up this source of wealth to the nation at large. He was severely criticized by the Federalists for his course, and denounced as a demagogue. He was largely instrumental in securing the repeal of the law. Subsequently, the Congress of the Confederation devised a new system of imposts which was agreed upon on April 18, 1783. By way of compromise, Congress now gave to the States the power to appoint the collecting officers, but this proviso was subsequently annulled by bestowing the power of removal upon the Federal authorities. All the States, however, except New York, accepted the new scheme. New York, in deference to Clinton's opinions, withheld its assent. In 1786, the State Legislature passed an act conceding the customs revenue to the Federal Government, but reserving "the sole power of levying and collecting the duties." Gov. Clinton was now recognized as an important personage throughout the thirteen colonies. By virtue of his position as Governor, and of the stand which he had taken as an Anti-Federalist, his influence not only prevailed in his own State, but reached far beyond its boundaries. He was a far more important individuality than any of his successors have been in the eyes of the Confederacy at large, because he was an ardent advocate of the doctrine of States' Rights, a doctrine then steadily expanding, and because the power of the State was then recognized by a large proportion of the people as superior to that of any Federal Government, for the reason that the States, by withdrawing from the Confederation, could destroy the Federal Government, whereas the latter lacked the power to destroy a single State. The Congress of the Confederation refused to recognize the act passed by the New York Legislature in 1786, and, by a resolution, requested Gov. Clinton to call the Legislature together in extra session for the purpose of reconsidering the subject. The Governor refused to listen to the "pressing and repeated supplications of Congress," on the ground that, under the Constitution, he had no authority to convoke the Legislature except on extraordinary occasions, and that the present juncture did not seem to him to justify such a course.

Not content with snapping his fingers at the Federal Government, Clinton proceeded to act independently against Great Britain. In the ninth decade of the last century, the United States could build ships for one-third of the money which they cost in England. Before the war, the profits derived by Great Britain from the use of American shipyards had been enormous. Now that the war was over, the extensive trade established between the United States and the West Indies aroused the covetousness of the British shipowner. In July, 1783, an order in Council declared that, thereafter, all traffic between the United States and the British West Indies must be conducted in British-built ships owned and navigated by British subjects. Even in direct commerce with England, American ships were restricted to those articles that were produced in the States of which the owners were citizens, a limitation that weighed heavily upon our exporters. Many Americans clamored for reprisals against England, but the Congress, governed by the Articles of Confederation, were powerless. It remained for the State of New York to take the lead. Under Gov. Clinton's direction, that State retaliated by laying a double duty upon all goods imported in British vessels. Other States favored legislation of a retaliatory sort, but, for want of coöperation, no uniform plan could be agreed upon. Some favored a new non-importation agreement, and a few desired to strengthen the powers of Congress; Massachusetts went so far as to suggest the calling of a convention of all the States to amend the Articles of Confederation. During the year 1785, ten States passed acts granting to Congress the power of regulating commerce for the following thirteen years, but these laws were so incongruous in purpose and so divergent in scope that Congress found itself no better off than it had been before.

It is a matter of history that Martin Van Buren held more public offices, State and National, than any other man who has ever lived in this country. No man, however, has been more honored by his own State and the people thereof than was George Clinton. Not only was he chosen the first Governor under the first State Constitution, and, at the same time, Lieutenant-Governor, but he held continuously the Chief Magistracy of the State from 1777 to 1795. In 1780, in 1783 and in 1786, he had no opponent. Three years later, Robert Yates, the "Rough Hewer," whose essays, written before the outbreak of hostilities between England and the Colonies, had given him a more than local reputation, ran against Clinton and was defeated. In 1792, Gen. George Clinton was for the sixth time a candidate, but failed to obtain a majority over his competitor, John Jay. Six Senators and six members of Assembly, selected by their respective houses, constituted the canvassing committee. Objections having been made to the returns from Clinton, Otsego and Tioga counties, on the score of alleged informalities, the two United States Senators from New York, Rufus King and Col. Aaron Burr, were chosen as referees. But they failed to agree. The majority of the canvassers thereupon decided to reject the votes from the three counties named, and awarded to Clinton a certificate of election. Subsequently, it was learned that, in the county of Otsego, a number of illegal votes had been cast for Judge Jay, through the influence of distinguished official persons, who, without Judge Jay's knowledge, had used their personal ascendancy to terrorize voters, who, if left to themselves, would have supported Clinton. On Jan. 22, 1795, Gen. George Clinton, in a public address to the freeholders of the State, declined a seventh renomination for Governor, on the ground that, for nearly thirty years he had held elective offices, and now desired to retire from public life. Nevertheless, in 1800, he was persuaded to run for the Assembly in the city and county of New York. In the following year, he came forward a seventh time for the office of Governor, and was elected over Gen. Stephen Van Rensselaer. From 1789, George Clinton received at each Presidential election up to 1808 a number of votes for the office of President of the United States as a champion of the States Rights or Anti-Federalist party. It was not until 1805, however, that he was elected Vice-President, on the same ticket with Thomas Jefferson. In 1808, he was reëlected Vice-President on the ticket with James Madison, and, while holding this office, he died at Washington on April 20, 1812.

When the striking political record of George Clinton is considered, it is surprising that not a word is devoted to him in the latest edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, which allots a considerable space to De Witt Clinton, his nephew. M. W. H.

St. Peter in Rome.

Was St. Peter ever in Rome? The latest discussion of this long-controverted question will be found in a book by Arthur Stapleton Barnes, a graduate of University College, Oxford, and now a priest in the diocese of Westminster (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.). It is well known that, up to a recent date, many Protestant writers denied that St. Peter ever set foot in the Eternal City. This assertion was based on the silence of the writers of the New Testament concerning the alleged visit. All other evidence, whether literary or monumental, was discarded; the Bible, and the Bible only, was to be held decisive of the question; and, inasmuch as the Bible does not explicitly record either the coming of St. Peter to Rome or his martyrdom in that city, it was maintained that the narratives of these events could not be deemed historical. Some writers added that certain passages in Paul's Epistle to the Romans and other Pauline Epistles made it virtually certain that St. Peter could not have been in Rome at the time when these Epistles were written, and, on the strength of these passages, it was assumed that St. Peter was never in Rome at all.

The author of this book submits that the mere silence of the New Testament upon such a matter proves nothing, for we can learn hardly anything from it of the doings of any one of the apostles, except only St. Paul himself, after A. D. 50. It is, therefore impossible to found any conclusive argument upon a basis so purely negative. Mr. Barnes further contends that the passages cited from St. Paul's Epistles are not strong enough to bear the weight placed upon them. The most that they can be alleged to prove is that St. Peter had not as yet visited Rome at the time when the Epistles were written; a fact which, however fatal to any theory of a twenty-five years' episcopate and continuous residence of the Apostle at Rome, is quite consistent with a visit made by him at some date after the Epistles had been written, with a martyrdom undergone by him in the city, and even with his occupation of the episcopal throne during the closing years of his life. Neither will it be denied that a historical question of this kind ought to be decided by a careful review of all the evidence which is available, whether literary, monumental or archæological, and that no case can be fairly made out for restricting the argument to the testimony contained in the New Testament.

I.

Catholic writers have, from the first, declined to admit that the New Testament itself is really silent on the matter. On the contrary, they have appealed to the absolutely unanimous testimony of ancient authorities that the "Babylon" from which St. Peter dated his first Epistle was really Rome, thus described under a title which no Jew or Christian of the first century would have failed to recognize. They had on their side also a tradition which, for 1,400 years, no one had ventured to dispute, and the fact that no city or country except Rome could be adduced which had ever laid claim to be the scene of the labors or of the death of the Chief of the Apostles; so that, if the Roman claims were rejected, it would follow that no trace whatever had survived of St. Peter's life or work after the date of the First Council of Jerusalem, which took place about A. D. 50. Such a position was manifestly too strong to be set aside by evidence that was merely negative, and, accordingly, even amid the heat of the controversies of the sixteenth century, the more learned and cool-headed among the reformers were very slow to commit themselves to any definite opinon on the matter. Their moderation, however, was not imitated by their followers, and a large number of books were written on the subject, the most noteworthy of which was by a German Protestant named Frederick Spanheim. The next century saw a reaction, especially in England, among the Laudian divines, who had no love for the principle that "the Bible, and the Bible only," was to be taken as the sole authority in historical questions. Bishop Pearson, Cave, Grotius and Ussher were but some among many who wrote to the effect that the testimony of the ancient authorities on the subject could not be set aside, and Whiston, the translator of Josephus, was so impressed with the discreditable character of the methods of disputation which had been employed that he declared with indignation: "The thing is so clear in Christian antiquity that it is a shame for any Protestant to confess that any Protestant ever denied it."

It is not the intention of the author of this book to go at any length into the details of this controversy. For this purpose, it seems to him sufficient to recapitulate the heads of the evidence, which, in his judgment, places the residence and martyrdom of St. Peter at Rome among the facts of history so well substantiated that no room for serious doubt is left. The evidence falls in three main divisions, that, namely, derived from Scripture, that furnished by ancient writers and that forthcoming from archæological monuments. To begin with Scripture, we are reminded that there are but two books of the New Testament in which we could reasonably expect to find a record of St. Peter's death, or any allusion to it. These two are the Gospel according to St. John and the Apocalypse, attributed to the same Apostle. All the other books were probably written before the martyrdom occurred. A consideration of this fact reduces the argument of the alleged silence of the New Testament to its true value, especially if it can be shown that there is a tolerably clear allusion to the martyrdom in each of the two books wherein alone it could be looked for.

There are three points to be proved: First, that St. Peter was at Rome. Secondly, that he was martyred by crucifixion. Thirdly, that his crucifixion took place in the Eternal City. For all these assertions there is abundant evidence from sources outside of the Scriptures. Mr. Barnes, however, undertakes to show that there is also a certain amount of testimony bearing on each of the three points to be found in the Bible itself, which testimony, though it might scarcely be sufficient in itself to establish any of the three assertions, is by no means without value when it is considered as affirming what is already known from other sources of authority. That St. Peter was at Rome in the course of his ministry is proved by the fact that he dates his first Epistle from that city under the name of Babylon. That Babylon in this place must be taken to denote the Imperial City, and cannot be referred either to the ancient Babylon in Chaldea, or to the fortress of that name in Egypt, is a matter on which all scholars are now agreed, and which may be taken as settled beyond all controversy. Ancient writers were unanimous upon this point. Catholic writers in all ages have taken the same view, and, of late years, all other scholars, whether Protestant or rationalistic, have adhered to it; so that it is now unlikely that any conspicuous student of the subject will be ever again found to maintain the opposite opinion on a point the Catholic and traditional interpretation of which is held by such Anglicans as Lightfoot, Ellicott, Farrar, Westcott and Gore, and by the Speaker's Commentary, and also by Wieseler, Harnack, Hilgenfeld, Renan, Thiersch and Ewald, with many others among the non-Catholic writers of the Continent, to be thoroughly settled and outside the field of controversy. Mr. Barnes makes but one quotation, and that is from the Speaker's Commentary, wherein the debate upon the point is summed up as follows: "The foregoing arguments seem to leave us no alternative but to accept the old, unvarying testimony of the Fathers, who must have known the sense in which the statement was understood throughout Asia Minor, the statement, namely, that St. Peter designated Rome by the title of Babylon."

We come to the second point. That St. Peter was put to death by crucifixion is asserted almost in so many words in the Gospel of St. John. The Apostle is obviously speaking of a fact known to all when he tells how Jesus's prophecy about St. Peter's death, the prophecy, namely, that his hands should be stretched out upon the cross, had been literally fulfilled: "This He said, signifying the death by which he [St. Peter] should glorify God," (St. John xxi., 19). To "stretch out the hands" is used in this sense of crucifixion by heathen writers, and, no doubt, even at the time when they were uttered, and before their fulfilment, the words of Jesus had been commonly understood to mean that St. Peter would pass to his reward by a death upon the cross. In the Apocalypse also, there is a sentence which M. Renan interprets as an allusion to St. Peter's crucifixion. In the judgment pronounced upon heathen Rome under the name of Babylon, occur the following words: "Rejoice over her, thou Heaven and ye holy apostles and prophets: for God hath judged your judgment upon her." (Apoc. xviii., 20). Mr. Barnes suggests that, if the Apostles for whose murder Rome was to be judged were not St. Peter and St. Paul, it is difficult to assign any intelligible meaning to the passage. This is all the evidence forthcoming from Scripture, and the author of this book does not deny that it is scanty, though he holds it to be more explicit than *a priori* we had a right to expect, so far, at least, as the martyrdom of the Apostle is concerned. Turning to tradition, he finds the evidence full and uniform. Here again, the facts are summed up by the Speaker's Commentary: "The testimony of early Christian writers is unvarying. From whatever quarter their voices reach us, they affirm that Babylon in I. St. Peter was a recognized appellation of Rome, the city which occupied the place of that ancient Chaldean metropolis as the central world-power, and the headquarters of anti-Christian influences. In fact, no other view of the passage was ever entertained before the time of Calvin. Papias, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Œcumenius and Eusebius all state this as a well-known fact needing no defence. Œcumenius gives the true account of the matter. 'He calls Rome Babylon on account of the preeminence which of old belonged to Babylon.'" In view of the unanimity of the patristic evidence, Mr. Barnes deems it not surprising that there should be now but few scholars willing to attack its validity, but that the marvel rather is that there should have been any "so hardily sceptical" as Bishop Ellicott has put it, "as to reject altogether evidence as strong, early and wide as that on which we believe that Hannibal invaded Italy."

II.

Corroborative evidence is drawn from archæology. The argument from this source is here set forth at considerable length. It has been almost entirely neglected hitherto by English writers, but will be found condensed by Prof. Lanciani, the well-known authority on Roman antiquities, in his book on "Pagan and Christian Rome." Lanciani says: "I write about the monuments of Rome from a strictly archæological point of view, avoiding questions which pertain, or are supposed to pertain, to religious controversies. For the archæologist the presence and execution of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome are facts established beyond a shadow of doubt by purely monumental evidence. There is no event of the Imperial Age and of Imperial Rome which is attested by so many noble structures, all of which point to the same conclusion—the presence and execution of the Apostles in the capital of the Empire. When Constantine rasied the monumental basilicas over their tombs on the Via Cornelia and the Via Ostiensis; when Eudoxia built the church 'ad Vincula;' when Damasus put a memorial tablet in the Platonia ad Catacumbas; when the houses of Pudens and of Prisca and Aquilla were turned into oratories; when the name of Nymphæ Sancti Petri was given to the springs in the Catacombs of the Via Nomentana; when the 29th of June was accepted as the anniversary of St. Peter's execution; when Christians and Pagans alike named their children Peter and Paul; when sculptors, painters, medallists, goldsmiths, workers in brass and enamel and engravers of precious stones all began to reproduce in Rome the likenesses of the two Apostles at the beginning of the second century and continued to do so until the fall of the Empire: must we consider them all as laboring under a delusion or as conspiring in the commission of a gigantic fraud? Why were such proceedings accepted without protest from any other city or any other community, if there were any other which claimed to own the genuine tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul?" Lanciani goes on to point out that these arguments gain more strength from the fact that the arguments on the other side are purely negative. "It is one thing to write of these controversies at a distance from the scene of events in the seclusion of one's own library; but quite another to study them on the spot and to follow the events where they took place. If my readers had the opportunity of witnessing the discoveries lately made in the Cemeterium Ostrianum and the Platonia ad Catacumbas, or of examining Grimaldi's manuscripts and drawings relating to the old basilicas of Constantine, or Carrara's account of the discoveries made in 1776, they would surely banish from their minds the last shade of doubt."

Mr. Barnes draws attention to the fact that, in the above extract from Lanciani, there is an allusion to a branch of evidence almost wholly overlooked in England, which, nevertheless, goes far to confirm the conclusions supported by other testimony. This branch of evidence is derived from the traditional portraits of St. Peter and St. Paul, which have been preserved at Rome. "There is no doubt," writes Lanciani in another place, "that the likenesses of St. Peter and St. Paul have been carefully handed down in Rome ever since their life time, and that they were familiar to every one, even to school children. These portraits have come down to us by scores. They are painted in the cubiculi of the Catacombs, engraved in gold leaf in the so-called *vetri cemeteriali*, cast in bronze, hammered in silver or copper and designed in mosaic. The type never varies. St. Peter's face is full and strong, with short curly hair and beard, while St. Paul appears more wiry and thin, slightly bald, with a long, pointed beard. The antiquity and the genuineness of both types cannot be doubted." The author of this book makes clear the significance of this fact by reminding us that it is only of these two particular apostles that anything of the kind can be said. There are authentic portraits in existence of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of no other member of the Christian Church who lived in the apostolic age. Moreover, even in the case of these two apostles, the portraits are confined to Rome, and are not found to exist elsewhere. "Is not," queries Mr. Barnes, "the conclusion unavoidable that we have portraits of these two, and of no one else, because they alone were the apostles of Rome, the only place where the art of portrait-painting was in full vigor?" In his opinion the existence of these portraits is by itself enough to prove, even if all documentary evidence and all tradition had perished, that these two apostles had visited Rome, and were both of them in some way connected with the Imperial City. On page 10 of this book will be found a medallion of the second century, discovered in the catacombs of St. Domitilla, and presenting portraits of St. Peter and St. Paul. We have ancient authorities to prove that likenesses regarded as authentic existed in the fourth century. Eusebius has recorded in his history that there had come down to his time the actual original portraits of these two apostles made by Gentiles who had been converted to the faith by their preachings. St. Augustine and St. Ambrose also speak of authentic portraits in their time.

What has happened to these original portraits it is now impossible to say. Mr. Barnes does not assert that any has survived which can be considered actually contemporary. There are, however, several which belong to the second century, and probably were copied from the original, and so may be taken as transmitting the true likeness. The most important of these is the medallion to which we have just referred. The medallion is in a state of excellent preservation, and the workmanship is admirable. It would have been impossible for such a masterpiece to be produced in the fourth century, or even in the third, when the decadence of art was already advanced. The second century is the latest period to which it can be assigned, and it belongs probably to the earlier half. In this medallion it is St. Paul, and not St. Peter, who occupies the right-hand side, which, according to our modern views, is the place of honor. In the early centuries of our era, however, no rule of this kind existed, and the left-hand side was frequently occupied by the person of greater dignity. Thus in one of the sepulchral glasses of this period Jesus Himself is placed on the left of St. Paul, and in another the Virgin occupies a similar position with regard to St. Agnes. Indeed, the uniform use of the right-hand side as the place of dignity cannot be said to date back further than the middle of the tenth century, and no dispute about the matter seems to have arisen until the time of St. Peter Damian. The seal of the Papal bulls to this day represents St. Peter on the left hand.

Several descriptions of the appearance of the two great Apostles are to be found in early writers, as, for example, in Nicephorus and in Malalas. Mr. Barnes suggests that his readers should compare with the facsimile of the medallion the account compiled by Conybeare and Howson from these literary sources: "St. Paul is set before us as having the strongly marked and prominent features of a Jew, yet not without some of the finer lines indicative of Greek thought. His stature was diminutive, which may have provoked the contemptuous expressions of his enemies. His beard was long and thin, his head was bald, the characteristics of his face were a transparent complexion which visibly betrayed the quick changes of his feelings, a bright gray eye under thickly overhanging, united eyebrows, a cheerful and winning expression of countenance which invited the approach and inspired the confidence of strangers. St. Peter is represented to us as a man of larger and stronger form, as his character was harsher and more abrupt. The quick impulses of his soul revealed themselves in the flashes of a dark eye. The complexion of his face was pale and sallow, and his short hair, which is described as entirely gray at the time of his death, curled thickly round his temples and his chin."

We have outlined the evidence collected by Mr. Barnes in favor of the fact of St. Peter having visited Rome, and of having suffered martyrdom there. The consequences which have flowed from that visit lie outside the scope of the book before us. The author is not concerned with the exact sense in which St. Peter may be said to have been Bishop of Rome, or with the extent of the power which he handed down to his successors. For Mr. Barnes, it suffices to prove that the Apostle did come to the Eternal City, and that he was there martyred and laid in the grave. This is now generally conceded by scholars as being demonstrated by an amount of testimony available for hardly any similar fact in history. The controversy, therefore, being regarded as closed, the author puts it away, and, in the rest of his book, confines his efforts to piecing together the various traditions which have come down to us, and comparing them with the evidence obtainable from the monuments relating to the Apostle in the hope of recovering some forgotten details of St. Peter's life at Rome and of the history of his tomb. For the ingenious, and, to a certain extent, successful attempt at the restoration of these details, we must refer the reader to the book itself. We merely note the conclusion that, after innumerable vicissitudes, the bones of St. Peter lie buried somewhere beneath the dome of the greatest church known to Christendom, and that the precise spot of their interment may be yet identified and visited by the pilgrims of the twentieth century.

Chopin.

We have received from the Messrs. Scribner an admirable account of *Chopin*, considered both as a man and an artist, by JAMES HUNEKER. There is no doubt that this volume embodies the most adequate treatment of the subject that has yet appeared, though it is true that Franz Liszt wrote an attractive sketch of Chopin's life and art soon after his death, and that an appreciative analysis of the Polish composer's work appeared anonymously in his lifetime. It has been well said that Chopin is in nineteenth-century music what Heine is in nineteenth-century poetry. That may be described as the text of which Mr. Huneker's book furnishes the proof and supplies the commentary. In this notice, we shall confine ourselves to that part of the biographical and critical estimate which deals with the man rather than the composer and the pianist. It is not easy to understand his artistic achievement without a knowledge of his life; indeed, it is doubtful whether the work of any man of genius has been more deeply affected by his personal experience. There is no doubt, for instance, that his connection with Mme. Dudevant, better known by her literary pseudonym of George Sand, played a preponderant part in his career.

I.

About the date of the birth of Frederic François Chopin there is some dispute, but Mr. Huneker concurs with those authorities who assert that he was born in Zelazowa-Wola, six miles from Warsaw, on March 1, 1809. Regarding Chopin's ancestry, also, there is a trace of doubt. His father, Nicholas, was born in August, 1770, at Nancy, in Lorraine. Some aver that he had Polish blood in his veins. Szulc asserts that he was the natural son of a Polish nobleman, who had followed King Stanislas Leszcynski to Lorraine, dropping his patronymic Szopen for the more Gallic Chopin. When his son, the composer, went to Paris, he also changed his name from Szopen to Chopin, which is common in France. Whatever his origin may have been, Chopin's father emigrated from Lorraine to Warsaw in 1787; he joined the National Guard during the Kosciuszko revolution in 1794. He taught for a time in the family of the Leszczynskis; Mary of that name, one of his pupils, after her marriage to a Polish nobleman, became the mother, by Napoleon I, of Count Walewski, the well known Minister under the Second French Empire. In 1806, Nicholas Szopen married Justina Krzyzanowska, a daughter of "poor but noble parents." She bore him four children: three girls and the boy Frederic François. According to the present biographer, Frederic was by no means a moon-struck, pale and sentimental lad, but, on the contrary, a merry, pleasure-loving fellow, fond of practical jokes. Although his father was never rich, yet, after he became a professor in the Warsaw Lyceum, his family lived at ease. The researches of Frederick Niecks have demolished all the fairy tales about Chopin's early poverty and sufferings. As a matter of fact, Chopin's parents had plenty of common sense, and, when his love for music revealed itself they engaged a competent teacher, named Zwyny, to instruct him in the violin and the piano. He first played in public at the age of 9. His musical precocity, though not so marked as Mozart's, was yet phenomenal, and brought him early into intimacy with the Polish aristocracy. The lessons in composition which he presently received from Joseph Elsner proved of great value. "From Zwyny and Elsner, even the greatest ass must learn something," he is quoted as having said.

In 1827, being then 18 years old, he gave up his studies at the Warsaw Lyceum, and devoted the whole of his time to music. In the autumn of 1828 he went to Berlin, and thus got a foretaste of the outer world. In 1829 Hummel and Paganini visited Warsaw. The former Chopin met and admired, the latter he worshipped. In July of the same year Chopin started for Vienna. There he gave two concerts, by neither of which, however, did he gain any money. His mode of playing the piano was voted original, but a lady remarked, "It's a pity his appearance is so insignificant." By September he was back in Warsaw, and in March, 1830, he gave two concerts there, by which he cleared $600. In November, 1830, he went to Vienna again, but failed to repeat his former *succès d'estime*, and in 1831 he secured a passport for London by way of Paris. When he reached the French capital he was 22 years old. He appeared at concerts in the early part of 1832, and the criticisms were favorable; Mendelssohn, we are told, applauded furiously. He was presently lionized in society, and wrote to a friend that his heart beat in syncopation, so agitating was the adulation and social excitement. Unfortunately Chopin's letters from Paris to his parents have been destroyed. In spite of his artistic triumph, Chopin needed money, and projected a trip to America. As it happened, he met Prince Valentine Radziwill, and was persuaded to play at a Rothschild soirée. From that moment, his prospects brightened, and he secured remunerative pupils. This, at least, is a stock anecdote, though, according to Niecks, there is no foundation for it. It is certain that during 1832-33 Chopin played frequently in public with Hiller, Liszt, Herz and Osborne, and much in private. He delighted in mimicking his colleagues, Thalberg especially. Thalberg took his revenge whenever he could. After a concert by Chopin he astonished Hiller by shouting all the way home. In reply to questions, Thalberg answered that he needed a *forte*, as he had heard nothing but *pianissimo* the whole evening. After 1834-35 Chopin's activity as a public pianist began to wane, and he devoted himself mainly to composition. In 1837 he visited England for the first time, staying there, however, but eleven days. He played at the house of James Broadwood, the piano manufacturer. His music was already admired by amateurs, but the English critics, with few exceptions, were unfavorable to him.

II.

We come now to the George Sand affair, the duration of which seems extraordinary, when one learns that Chopin had disliked "the woman with the sombre eye" before he had met her. Of course, her reputation was not good, although George Eliot, Matthew Arnold, Elizabeth Barrett Browning and some others chose to believe her an injured saint. They alleged that the affair was not a *liaison*, and, perhaps, it was not in one sense. There are several kinds of liaisons, some more carnal and vulgar than others. Idealists may see in the relation of the composer and the novelist a union of souls, but realists, of whom there was no lack in Paris from 1837 to 1847, took a different view of the matter. According to the present biographer, the truth lies midway, and he would put it as follows: "Chopin, a neurotic being, met the polyandrous Sand, a trampler on all the social and ethical standards, albeit a woman of great gifts. Repelled at first, he gave way to the ardent passion she manifested toward him. She was the elder, so could veil the situation with the maternal mask, and she was the stronger and more celebrated intellect, Chopin being only a pianist in the eyes of the many." At all events, by her magnetism she won the man she desired. Artistic Paris was full of such relationships. Liszt protected the Countess d'Agoult, who bore him children, among the rest Cosima, who was to marry successively Von Bülow and Wagner. Balzac was ostensibly leading the life of a saint, but his best-informed biographer tells a different story; even the ascetic Flaubert had a romance with Mme. Louise Colet that lasted from 1846 to 1854. Frederic Chopin was comparatively a rigorous moralist; with the exception of the Sand episode, his life was not an irregular one, and he tried to conceal that infatuation from his parents. In Mr. Huneker's opinion, the intimacy did the pair no harm artistically, notwithstanding the sorrow and heartburnings that attended its close. Chopin needed some one to look after him, and in the society of the brilliant French woman he throve. His best achievements may be traced to Nohant and Majorca, where he was her companion. She, on her side, profited as well. After the bitterness of her separation from Alfred de Musset, about 1833, she had been lonely, for the *Pagello intermezzo* was of short duration.

It is the present biographer's opinion that George Sand left Chopin because she was bored by him. In her love affairs she was always the man. She treated Chopin as a child, a toy, used him for literary copy, and threw him over after she had wrung all the emotional possibilities out of the relationship. "If I do not believe any more in tears, it is because I saw thee crying!" exclaimed Chopin. She dominated the Polish composer as she had dominated Jules Sandeau; Calmatta, the mezzotinter; De Musset; Franz Liszt; Delacroix; Michel de Bourges and, later, Flaubert. There is no doubt that her old-age affair with Flaubert was purely platonic. The correspondence shows her to have been in this case "maternal" to the last.

Chopin met Sand at a musical matinée in 1837. She was antipathetic to him, but her technique for overcoming masculine coyness was as masterly in its way as was Chopin's proficiency at the keyboard. They were soon seen together and everywhere. She was not musical in the sense of being a trained musician, but her appreciation for all art forms was keen. She was not a beautiful woman, being swarthy and rather heavy-set in figure, but our author quotes Edouard Grenier's description to show precisely the impression she produced: "She was short and stout, but her face compelled my attention, the eyes especially. They were wonderful eyes, a little too close together, it may be, large with full eyelids, black, very black, but by no means lustrous; they reminded me of polished marble, or rather of velvet, and this gave a strange, dull, even cold expression to her countenance. Her fine eyebrows and these great placid eyes gave her an air of strength and dignity which was not borne out by the lower part of her face. Her nose was rather thick, and not overshapely. Her mouth, also, was rather coarse, and her chin small. She spoke with great simplicity, and her manners were very quiet." There is no doubt, however, that she attracted with imperious power all the men she met.

In 1838, Sand's boy, Maurice, being ill, she proposed a visit to Majorca. Chopin went with the party in November, and full accounts of the trip, its discomforts and Chopin's illness may be found in Sand's *Histoire de Ma Vie*. "Chopin is a detestable invalid," she said, and so they returned to Nohant in June, 1839. They saw Genoa for a few days in May on their way to France, but that is as far as Chopin ever penetrated into Italy. Sand there enjoyed the truly feminine pleasure of again entering the city which, six years before, she had visited in company with another man. Chopin's health in 1839 was a source of alarm to himself and his friends. He had been, in truth, dangerously ill at Majorca and Marseilles. Fever and severe coughing proved the forerunners of the disease that killed him ten years later. He was forced to be very careful in his habits, resting more, giving fewer lessons, playing but little in private or public, and becoming frugal of his emotions. Now Sand began to cool, though her lively imagination never ceased making graceful and touching pictures of herself in the rôles of sister of mercy, mother and discreet friend, all merged into one sentimental composite. For an active mind and body like hers, it must have been, no doubt, irksome to submit to the caprices of a moody, ailing man.

The breach which had been perceptibly widening became impassable in 1847, when Sand and Chopin parted forever. Mr. Huneker points out that a literature has grown up on the subject. "Chopin never had much to say, but Sand did; so did Chopin's pupils, who were quite virulent in their assertions that she killed their master. The break had to come. It was the inevitable end of such a friendship. The dynamics of free love have yet to be formulated. This much we know; two such natures could never entirely cohere. When the novelty wore off, the stronger of the two, or the one the least in love, took the initial step. It was George Sand who took it with Chopin. He would never have had the courage nor the will." The present biographer does not find the causes of the final rupture very interesting. Niecks has sifted all the evidence adduced before the court and jury of scandalmongers. The main quarrel was about the marriage of Solange Sand with Clésinger, the sculptor. Her mother did not oppose the match, but later resented Clésinger's conduct. He was coarse and violent, she said, and, when after a terrible scene at Nohant, Chopin saw fit to receive the young woman and her husband, she broke with him. The excuse was sufficiently specious. He had ennuyéd her for several years, and, as he had completed his artistic work on this planet and there was nothing more in him to be studied, the psychological portrait of the composer being presumably completed, Mme. George got rid of him. The author of this book rejects as silly the recent gossip to the effect that Sand was jealous of Chopin's friendships for other women.

Chopin gave his last concert in Paris in February, 1848. He was ill, but played beautifully. It is said that he fainted in the artist's room. Sand and Chopin met but once again. She took his hand, which was "trembling and cold," but he escaped without saying a word. In a letter dated November, 1848, he permitted himself to speak of Sand as follows: "I have never cursed any one, but now I am so weary of life that I am near cursing Lucrezia. [It is well known that Sand had depicted the Chopin episode in 'Lucrezia Floriana'.] But she suffers, too, and suffers more, because she grows older in wickedness. What a pity about Soli [Solange Sand]! Alas! Everything goes wrong with the world!"

III.

In April, 1848, Chopin went to London for the second and last time. War was declared upon Chopin by a part of the English musical world, but, according to the present biographer, the criticism was compounded of malice and stupidity. The composer was too ill to care much about it. At Edinburgh he was so ill that he had to be carried up and downstairs. To the wife of his doctor who asked him if George Sand was his particular friend, he answered: "Not even George Sand." He confessed that his excessive thinness had caused Sand to address him as "my dear corpse." There seems to be no doubt, however, that at this very time his pupil, Miss Sterling, was in love with him, and Princess Czartoryska followed him to Scotland to see if his health was better. He was not, therefore, altogether deserted by the women; indeed, he could not live without their little flatteries and agreeable attentions. Our biographer deems it safe to say that a woman was always within Chopin's call.

When he left England in January, 1849, he was heartily glad to go. "Do you see the cattle in that meadow?" he asked on his way to Paris: "*Ça a plus d'intelligence que les Anglais.*" He certainly disliked the English, and yet, when in his last days, his purse was empty, Miss Sterling sent him twenty-five thousand francs. According to Jules Janin, he had "lived, ten miraculous years, with a breath ready to fly away." It is certain that his servant Daniel had long been obliged to carry him to bed. He had been reported dead so often that, when death came, the real news was doubted. In 1847, his legs had begun to bother him by swelling, and he was described as "a painful spectacle, the picture of exhaustion, the back bent, the head bowed, but always amiable and full of distinction." Thanks to Miss Sterling, and to a Russian lady, the Countess Obreskoff, he was moved to comfortable lodgings in the Place Vendôme, and there, on Oct. 14, 1849, he died. Turgenev has written of the half hundred countesses in Europe who claimed to have held the dying Chopin in their arms. As a matter of fact, he died in the arms of his pupil, Gutmann. Solange Sand was there, but not her mother. Tarnowski relates that Chopin was perfectly conscious when he gave his last orders. He begged his sister to burn all his inferior compositions. "I owe it to the public," he said, "and to myself, to publish only good things. I kept to this resolution all my life; I wish to keep to it now." Unhappily, the wish was not respected. He was buried from the Madeleine on Oct. 30, with the ceremony befitting a man of genius. The B Flat Minor Funeral March, orchestrated by Henri Reber, was given, and, during the ceremony, Lefebre-Wely played on the organ the E and B Minor Preludes. The pallbearers were Meyerbeer, Delacroix, Pleyel and Franchomme. He was interred in evening clothes, in concert dress, but not at his own request. According to Liszt, his face looked beautiful and young in the flower-covered coffin.

At the close of an extended study of Chopin's compositions, the author of this book arrives at the following conclusions: "Nearing his end, Chopin discerned, with ever-widening and ever-brightening prevision, the great heart-throb of the universe. Master of his material, if not of his mortal tenement, he passionately strove to shape his dreams into abiding sounds. He did not always succeed, but his victories are among the precious prizes of mankind. One is loath to believe that the echo of Chopin's magic music can ever fall upon unheeding ears. He may become old-fashioned, but, like Mozart, he will remain eternally beautiful." It is, at the same time, admitted that "Chopin seldom compasses sublimity. His arrows are tipped with fire, yet they do not fly far. But in some of his music, he skirts the region where abide the gods."

English "I" Is Selfish.

In the opinion of one Frenchman, English ortography furnishes a clue to "the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon." He is successful, the Frenchman says, because he is selfish, and a proof of his selfishness is that he writes of himself with a capital I. Frenchmen and Germans are content with the small letter. The Spaniard uses a small y in yo, but honors the person he addresses with a capital. The Japanese have no word for I at all.

Genuine Optimism.

From the Indianapolis Press.

The Pessimist—That waiter is awfully slow with those cheese sandwiches.

The Optimist—Oh, never mind. The longer we wait the better grows the cheese.