

the policy of repression, when it was plain that the Irish vote would be thrown against them, and that the best thing to play for was a reputation for vigor in the eyes of the English. The weakness, however, of their counsels during the previous week has been little redeemed by this death-bed resolution; and the comparative quiet of Ireland, where outrages have been few, and convictions generally obtained at the assizes, has made the proposal of a coercion bill seem more like a party stroke than a dictate of firm policy. Yet whoever considers the whole difficulties of the Irish problem will not judge, harshly the faults of any English Government. Mr. Gladstone's Ministry also erred, every ministry is sure to err, in dealing with such a tangle. There is so much to be said against every course and so little for any course, that one cannot be surprised that fourteen men should find it hard to hold to the same course even for a week. This is the first and chief moral of the short but eventful annals of the departed Administration. It came in by Irish help, it lived so long as it kept aloof from Irish questions, it fell so soon as it was forced to touch them. The same Serbonian bog will probably engulf other English ministries before at last some one drains it off or fills it up.

The other moral is that Conservatism in its old sense, in the sense of Sir Robert Peel's days, has almost vanished from England. There was little or nothing, except their defence of the Established Church at the general election, to distinguish the Salisbury Government from a Liberal Government. It never took its stand on Conservative principles. It never talked Conservative language. Three of the measures which it passed in the closing weeks of the last Parliament savored of State Socialism at least as much as any that passed under Mr. Gladstone's auspices. Even when it was resisting the amendment (to the address) about allotments for agricultural laborers last week, it left the economic and Conservative view to be stated by Mr. Goschen and Lord Hartington, and declared itself willing to go in for an allotment scheme. Electoral power has now so completely passed to the working classes that no ministry, on either side, ventures to oppose what the working classes are believed to desire, and few are the politicians who have the courage even to tell the working classes that they are wrong in any wish they express.

Since their fall, little has been said or thought about the outgoing Cabinet, nor will any of their doings, except the annexation of Burmah, be long remembered. All eyes are turned toward the rising sun; and since the question whether Mr. Gladstone would form a Cabinet has been settled, curiosity is at work on the direction its Irish policy will take. The Tory party has this consolation for its defeat, that it marches out in good order, loyal to its leaders, unpledged to any particular Irish or English measures, full of fighting spirit, and hopeful of improving its position at that general election which every one believes to be not far distant. Y.

PAUL BAUDRY.

PARIS, January 28, 1886.

THE funeral of Paul Baudry took place yesterday at the Church of Notre Dame des Champs, not far from the house which was long the home of the man who may well be called the first artist of our modern French school. It was some consolation for those who had known him to see the immense concourse of people which was attracted by this funeral. There were not only the usual deputations from the Institute, from the Beaux-Arts, the official representatives of art; there were all the young *rapins* who live in the studios of the Latin quarter; there were workmen mingled with men and women of

the best society; there were models, and even small Italian children in their picturesque rags. Baudry was beloved by all those who knew him, and he will be regretted as a man as well as an artist.

His origin was of the most humble sort. His father made wooden shoes at Bourbon-Vendée, where Paul was born November 7, 1828. He entered the School of the Beaux-Arts in 1845, as one of the pupils of that great establishment. The young Vendean obtained a prize as the result of his three years' study, and this prize gave him entrance to the French School of Painting at Rome. It was certainly curious, in an ethnological point of view, to see a young Breton, a Celt, find himself so immediately at home in Rome and in Italy. Baudry was made, as it were, for Italy, and he found himself, at the age of twenty, in his own element, among the great works of art of Raphael and Michael Angelo. No painter of our time can be said to have assimilated so well, without being a mere copyist, Italian art, its color, its methods, its noble simplicity, its idealism. Baudry was completely seduced by Rome, and not only seduced, transformed. His first master had been Drolling, a classic of the classic, but one of those classics who had never understood the Italian genius, its elegance and its liberty. Drolling belonged to the school of David, a school which had rehabilitated the study of the nude, but which had, so to speak, no soul and no life. Baudry found masters in Rome who taught him new lessons, and his genius was all ready to receive them. A sort of preëstablished harmony placed him in direct communication with the greatest masters.

While he was at Rome (the pupils of the School of the Villa Medici remain there five years, at the expense of the state), he sent a few pictures to Paris. The best of them, the "Torture of a Vestal," is now at the Museum of Lille; it is dated 1857. There is every year an official report on these remittances from Rome. Speaking of this work of Baudry's, the reporter expressed the fear lest the painter should abandon too much the traditions of art—a singular judgment, as nobody has been, in one sense, more faithful to tradition than Baudry; only he found it where it really was, not with David, but with the great masters of the old times.

Besides his "Vestal," Baudry had sent, for his first public exhibition, a picture which is now in the Museum of the Luxembourg, and which is a true revelation of his own peculiar genius. It was "Fortune and the Child." It is a charming picture; the sleeping infant, the goddess in her chaste nudity, the landscape, all remind the spectator forcibly of the Venetian masters, of Palma Vecchio, of Giorgione, of Titian himself. Baudry had assimilated the grace, the golden color, the easy and harmonious lines, the *je ne sais quoi* of the school of Venice. He had sent also some smaller pictures—"Saint John the Baptist in his childhood," a lovely picture: the portrait of the young son of Mme. S—; and a "Leda." To this first period belong also the "Magdalene," painted in 1858 (which is now in the Museum of Nantes), and the "Toilet of Venus" (which is in the Museum of Bordeaux). These indications show that Baudry's pictures were bought, as an encouragement, by the state, and presented to the provincial museums; the public was not yet acquainted with him, though he had risen as it were almost immediately to the highest regions of art.

The Milanese and the Venetian painters were the first masters of Baudry. While he inspired himself with their works, he did not forget that nature is the greatest master after all, and he made portraits. I have sometimes heard people lament over the necessity under which some painters were placed to produce portraits in order

to make a living. I cannot sympathize with this sentiment. I am convinced that the greatest painters lose nothing and can gain much by portrait making. Nothing is really so rare as a good portrait, one which shows not only the physical man, but the intellectual, the moral man. Raphael made portraits; those of Van Dyck, of Rembrandt, of Rubens are among the highest works of art. The portraits of Baudry are also worthy of all attention. He exhibited in the Salon of 1857 his portrait of Beulé, who was a professor and a member of the French Academy, the author of a life of Augustus and of the Cæsars. It is impossible to forget this picture, full of realism and of life, which gave all the character of the personage. We can see in it the essential characteristics of the talent of Baudry. Why is it that he was in the end equally admired and beloved by the disciples of the old classic schools and by the most advanced realists and impressionists? It is because he always copied life, he painted what he saw; but he saw it not only with his optic nerve, he saw it also with his mind. He was able to choose in nature what suited him best, and what could take a place in some preconceived harmony of form and of color, but he did not create in his mind a factitious nature, he was at the same time a realist and an idealist.

Baudry painted portraits, among other persons, of M. Guizot (and this may be considered a masterpiece), of Guillaume, the sculptor, of Charles Garnier, the architect of the new Opéra, of Edmond About. Curiously enough, his portraits of men are more admired and are perhaps better than his portraits of women, though he was essentially the painter of feminine grace and beauty. There was perhaps something in the modern fashions which offended or crossed his taste. He made his portraits of men somewhat in the Flemish style, generally on dark grounds; he adopted, however, the Clouet style in the portraits of small dimensions, such as those of About, of Garnier, with their bluish or greenish background. The portrait of About is a marvel. It is not a miniature—it has more life, more independence; it is a concentrated form of art. Baudry, who was disdainful of money, often refused to make portraits; he always wished to have interesting models—interesting to him for some reason or other.

While he painted portraits, he never forgot the form of art for which he was peculiarly fitted. His "Pearl and Wave," which was exhibited in 1863 and was bought by Mr. Stewart, is a conception of exquisite charm. The Pearl is a woman who has been rolled by the waves, the color of which is opaline and pearly. The atmosphere is clear; the color has the blueness, the transparency which characterizes what may be called the decorative part of this artist's work.

We now arrive at the great work of Baudry—the decorative painting of the foyer of the Opéra. He had tried his hand, in the decorative style, in the small hôtel of Mme. de Païva, in the Champs Élysées, where he had treated some ceilings. He had also painted two panels, "Cybele" and "Amphitrite," for Mme. de Nadaillac's house. He had made some figures, symbolizing the towns of Italy, for the Duchess of Galliera. From the year 1865 Baudry disappears, as it were, for eight years; he devotes himself completely to the largest decorative work of our time. He first went to Rome again, and shut himself up in the Sistine Chapel; he made some copies of the Sibyls and of other figures, which, though they are copies, are masterpieces in their way. They are now in the Palace of the Beaux-Arts. It was not possible, of course, to recommence the Sistine Chapel, or the famous Hall of the Ten of the Ducal Palace of Venice in a modern opera-house. Baudry had to make a new and complete programme: it was a sort of apotheosis of the fine

arts, personified, deified, and placed in ideal and mythological regions. Baudry first made all his drawings with nude figures (these drawings are truly admirable and have all been preserved), in order to have as much truth and harmony as possible in the movements, the attitudes, the groups. He had to treat three immense ceilings, on which he glorified the arts, and to tell in twelve irregular surfaces the whole history of music, and of the art of dancing from Apollo to Salomé. He painted the muses on great panels, and finally on ten medallions placed before the gigantic doors. He made groups of children, representing the instrumental music of all nations.

The cartoons of this gigantic work ought to be preserved in the Louvre. As for the pictures, which excited an immense movement of enthusiasm when they were first shown to the public, they were slowly blackened by the gas till they became almost indistinct. Lately they have been washed with much care, and they have recovered now all their beauty. Electric light has been substituted for gas light, and it is to be hoped that the electric light will do them no harm. Still, many people think that copies ought to be left in place of the original pictures, and that these ought to be transferred to the Louvre, as they are certainly the greatest monument of modern French art.

This immense work of the Opéra occupied eight entire years of the life of Baudry. During all this time he worked merely for glory, and not for money. The journeys, the studies for the paintings of the Opéra, absorbed completely the sum which was given him by the state. Baudry now began to make portraits again, but he always returned with much pleasure to his favorite decorative subjects. Among his works of the latter period we must cite the "Wedding of Psyche," a charming ceiling which was painted for the house of Mr. Vanderbilt in New York, and was exhibited in 1882 at the Orangerie of the Tuileries.

Baudry showed much originality in the ceiling of the great hall of the Court of Cassation, the "Glorification of Law." It is one of the boldest decorative pictures I know, as bold as a Tiepolo, but with a much higher and nobler feeling. The coloration is extraordinary: the red gown of the judge shines wonderfully on the clear blues and greens of the allegorical figures. The composition is extremely fine: there is a child worthy of Raphael. We can pass the same eulogy on the ceiling painted for Chantilly, representing Mercury carrying Psyche to heaven. There is an exquisite idealism in this scene—in the blue sky, the light clouds, the purity of Psyche, the despair of Cupid. It may be called the *chant du cygne*. Alas! Baudry had promised to come to Chantilly to put his name on the ceiling with his own hand, and now his hand is cold. But if his name is not there, his genius is visible in every detail of this masterpiece. Those who visit Chantilly will do well to look, also, on the "Saint Hubert," by Baudry, an extraordinary picture, which has been the subject of much discussion; and the little cupids playing with the emblems of the gods, which were transported by the Duc d'Aumale to Chantilly from the Hôtel Fould.

Correspondence.

THE PRESIDENT'S TREATMENT OF MARYLAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Maryland we find it impossible to comprehend civil-service reform as practised in this State by the Administration.

We understand and agree perfectly with the views expressed by the President in his message,

but the practice is incomprehensible. He was elected on the distinct pledge, made by the Democratic party and reiterated by him, that "public office is a public trust," and yet, as far as Maryland is concerned, the Federal patronage has been used to maintain the most corrupt and offensive spoils system that exists in the Union. It is announced in our press that the President has notified the Democratic Senators and members of Congress from this State that they must agree upon the principal Federal appointments, and that he will surrender his Constitutional prerogative of appointment and let them appoint whomever they agree upon. Our senior Senator Gorman has taken open and public ground against the civil-service principles of the President; and his friend, Representative Compton, in a public speech two days ago, declared his hostility to the existing law and his willingness to vote for its repeal. These two gentlemen daily frequent the departments in search of offices for their friends, and get them too. During the recent exciting canvass in this State, Senator Gorman's avowed advocacy of the spoils system, and the distinct understanding that he commanded the Federal patronage to secure his reelection, did in fact secure his reelection. And to-day the whole power of the Federal patronage is as thoroughly used in support of the spoils system as that of New York ever was under Tweed.

There has been for years a body of Democrats here who have kept up a constant protest against the corrupt methods of Machine politics by which the party has been and is controlled. In 1881, while the President was Mayor of Buffalo, and in 1883, when he was Governor of New York, Governor Hamilton, of this State, appealed to the Democratic party against the bosses, to reform the grievous and corrupt practices then prevailing. For instance, in a General Assembly of 111 members, there were 105 employees whose wages exceeded those of the members. Of the sinking fund established by the Constitution, taxes to raise which were regularly collected, over three millions had been squandered, and no substantial part set aside in a sinking fund. The registration lists of the city of Baltimore contained 30,000 spurious names of voters, who had died, removed, or were fictitious or illegal. Governor Hamilton's appeal was backed by a strong body of brave and honest sentiment, but accomplished nothing against the Machine. A new registration was provided, which its sponsors confess is fraudulent, and the ballot-box produces results at command of the bosses. There is no fair election here, and the voice of the people is actually stifled. In the Legislature now in session violent resolutions are introduced denouncing civil-service reform and instructing our representatives to vote for the repeal of the law. They are received with great applause.

With these facts notorious, the Administration appoints Higgins, Thomas, and "lots of the boys." The Civil-Service Association, Governor Hamilton, and a large number of the leading Democrats of the State have besought the assistance of the Administration in favor of good government. They have explained to the President and Cabinet the real question in Maryland, which is between corrupt Machine politics and decent methods, between bad and good government. They are utterly ignored, and every appointment up to this time has been made in the interest of the spoils system. Workers, henchmen, and heelers are alone considered, and the whole *morale* of a civil-service-reform Administration is exerted against civil-service reform.

No man in Maryland will deny this. The cause of good government is prostrate before the patronage power of the Federal Government. I have been a reform Democrat, with positive

ideas against the spoils system, before the President entered public life. I supported him earnestly in the canvass of 1884. But I cannot understand how he and his Cabinet delegate the appointing power to members of Congress, support the people who are hostile to his ideas, and ignore those who maintain his declared principles.

O. L. D.

BALTIMORE, February 6, 1886.

THE OHIO IMBROGLIO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your current issue you have something to say about the Ohio legislative imbroglio. Permit me to say that you share the misunderstanding of the facts involved which is common among outside observers, and which is not to be wondered at, as Ohio political affairs are perplexingly complicated.

The Cincinnati election frauds last October were of two kinds—(1) frauds at the polls and in the count, and (2) forgeries in the official returns after they had been signed by the judges. Republicans claim that but for the frauds they would have carried the county (Hamilton) by at least 5,000, and at this date there is little denial by the Democrats that the entire Republican ticket was legally elected by a large majority. But the Republicans go further—they claim that even on the face of the returns (minus the proved and, indeed, admitted forgeries) nine Republican candidates for the House of Representatives and two of the Republican Senatorial candidates were shown to have been elected. The County Clerk, who is a "gang" Democrat, insisted on counting the known forged additions to the returns. In the case of one Democratic candidate for the Senate, the forgers forgot to change the figure 7 into a 9 (as was done for all the other Democratic candidates, by putting a cipher on top of the 7); but the County Clerk was equal to the occasion; and of his own motion added the extra 200 necessary to elect this particular candidate.

Before the returns were certified to the Secretary of State, the Republicans sought by mandamus and injunction to compel the County Clerk to count only the legal returns—that is, to prevent his counting the known and confessed forgeries in the returns, made after they had been signed by the election judges. The Circuit Court decided in favor of the Republicans. A divided decision was given by the Supreme Court, the majority holding, however, that the courts could not interfere with the County Clerk—that he could count what he pleased; but the Court unanimously recognized that there had been forged additions to the returns. Thereupon the County Clerk issued his certificates to all the Democratic candidates, and the Secretary of State (a Republican) admitted those gentlemen on the *prima-facie* evidence of their certificates.

As in other States, each branch of the Legislature is the judge of "the election, return, and qualification of its members." In the House the question was raised that the Democratic delegation from Hamilton County were not entitled to their seats *on the face of the returns*. An investigation was held, and the Committee on Privileges and Elections reported that, on the face of the returns, nine of the Democrats holding certificates were defeated. Hence the ousting of nine Democrats and the seating of as many Republicans. On the face of the returns the tenth Republican candidate to the House was certainly defeated, but he is now contesting on the ground of fraud at the election.

Now as to the Senate. With the aid of the four holding seats by virtue of certificates from the Clerk of Hamilton County, the Democrats had just a majority. The first business they did, after electing Democratic clerks and sergeants-at-