

superintendent of the Queen's household, Mme. de Maintenon was appointed *dame d'atour* of the Dauphine. She thus became entirely independent of Mme. de Montespan. Her favor soon became apparent; the King entered with her into a new and unknown country, which Mme. de Sévigné calls "la commerce de l'amitié et de la conversation, sans contrainte et sans chicane." The courtiers whispered that Mme. de Maintenon's real name was Mme. de *Maintenant*. She spent all her evenings with the King, and how did she employ her new favor? First, in converting or trying to convert all the members of her family, who were still Protestants. She stopped at nothing, and employed means which were a sort of anticipation of the methods followed at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. She sent M. de Villette, who refused to be converted, on a long journey (Mme. de Villette was the favorite daughter of the famous Agrippa d'Aubigné, and an ardent Calvinist), and during his absence she procured the abjuration of his young son, and placed him in a military academy. She also took advantage of the absence of M. de Villette to get possession of Mlle. de Mursay, who became Mme. de Caylus. Mlle. de Mursay left her mother and arrived at Paris with some cousins—young Saint-Hermine, Mlle. de Saint-Hermine, and Mlle. de Caumont. "We arrived together in Paris," says Mme. de Caylus in her memoirs. "Mme. de Maintenon came immediately and took me to Saint-Germain. I wept much afterwards; but the next day I found the King's mass so beautiful that I consented to make myself a Catholic, on condition that I should hear mass every day and that I should never be whipped. This was the only controversy employed, and the only abjuration I made." The other cousins, being a little older, resisted a little longer, but finally they all gave in.

These conversions are not a glorious page in the history of Mme. de Maintenon, and her conduct towards the children of M. de Villette lends much probability to the opinion of Saint-Simon, who makes her afterwards chiefly responsible for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. It is well known that converts are often intolerant, and easily become persecutors. The religious intolerance of Mme. de Maintenon was a sort of self-justification. M. Geoffroy tries in vain to upset the theory of Saint-Simon; he finds no good arguments. It is true that in her letters she recommends to her brother, D'Aubigné, tolerance towards the Calvinists in his government, but she applauds constantly after 1685 the destruction of heresy, and even the massacres of the Camisards in Languedoc. In an answer to a memoir written in 1697, 'On the best manner of effecting the conversion of the Huguenots,' she declares that it would be dangerous to recall the Huguenots and to abolish the decrees published after 1685. We do not attach much importance, in this question, to the opinion of Voltaire, who wrote to Formey, on January 17, 1753, "Why do you say that Mme. de Maintenon had much part in the revocation of the Edict of Nantes? She had no part at all in it. This is a certain fact. She never dared to contradict Louis XIV." We may easily believe that she did not often contradict the King; but an artful woman has many ways of bringing her lover to her own opinion. Mme. de Maintenon was artful, though some writers would try to persuade us that she was a simple-minded person. She first used her increasing credit in trying to separate the King from his mistresses, and preached to him virtue and conjugal fidelity. Did she ever really work in the interest of the Queen? Would she have been contented, by the side of the Queen, with the part of a confidante and an adviser? She was older than Maria Theresa, older than Louis XIV.; but in

1680 she was only forty-five years old. She could not foresee that the Queen would die in 1683. She had already become indispensable: she had brought Louis XIV. to the point where he could refuse her nothing. She was married to him secretly, and D'Aubigné, her profligate brother, called Louis XIV. boldly, "my brother-in-law." Saint-Simon pretends that her ambition even then was not satisfied, that she wished to be declared Queen, that Louvois, the Archbishop of Paris, Harlay, Fénelon, the Duc de Beauvilliers, fell into disgrace for having determined the King to refuse her this last favor. M. Geoffroy tries to prove the contrary. There are mysteries which are never unravelled. Louis XIV. was weak as a man, but he had a very exalted idea of royalty. He could not live without his Maintenon; he did not wish to present her as the Queen to his own people and to his brother-kings in Europe.

## Correspondence.

### THE FRENCH FINANCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your issue of May 26, No. 1143, contains an article entitled "The French Crisis," which it is impossible for a Frenchman, and, I may add, for an impartial and well-informed reader, to let pass without a word of protest. Neglecting all minor errors—such as the bold assertion that popular sentiment demands Gen. Boulanger as a necessary member of the Cabinet—I willingly point to that most astonishing phrase: "The shrewdest financial heads in France, in fact, such men as Léon Say and Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, believe that a Treasury collapse of some kind is not far away." I have read with the greatest care for the past five years every book, every article, written by Say and Leroy-Beaulieu. I consider both of them to be clever, patriotic, and sincere men, not afraid to speak harshly when it is necessary to enforce a painful truth on public opinion. Now, I can declare that neither one nor the other ever wrote or spoke a word predicting a Treasury collapse in our country; further, I maintain that Leroy-Beaulieu, the only one who writes regularly in the *Économiste Français*, has not ceased to repeat that if the state of our Treasury is embarrassing, French finances and French public wealth are very far from being in danger. About six weeks ago Beaulieu, examining the returns of the taxes on donations and legacies, showed how steadily and speedily those taxes have increased for the last twenty years, and came to the conclusion, which is shared by all financial authorities, that the improvement of our finances would be a matter of no difficulty if only peace and interior tranquillity could be maintained. What must Americans think of French statesmen who are accused, without the slightest foundation, of having uttered words of treason such as the foretelling of a financial collapse would be? And what must American readers think of the French public which is mad enough to pay 82 francs for 3 per cent. funds, when those 3 per cents are in danger—according to your writer—of not being paid to-morrow or the day after?

I will not trespass upon your space by trying to give a correct idea of the state of French finances and of the real or unreal embarrassments of our exchequer. But two points I must briefly insist upon, (1) that Gen. Boulanger, whatever may be said against him, has not had the least influence on the French budget and deficit: any Parliament and any Minister of War would have felt the necessity of modifying our rifles when Germany had adopted a similar change in her armament, and this has been the only extraordinary

expense for the War Department during the last twelvemonth; (2) that people ought to reflect, before they speak about a possible, nay, a probable, collapse of the French Treasury, on the privileged and exceptional nature of the French public debt. Not only is the debt almost entirely in the hands of Frenchmen, so that the payment of the interest does not make the country a franc poorer, but—and I am afraid many Americans do not know this—all the French railways must become the property of the State a hundred years after their opening to traffic. In fact, as early as 1950 the greater part of our railways will already be State property, thus affording at once the means of repaying, if it be thought necessary, more than half of the public debt. A country which possesses the bare ownership of all the railways built on its soil is not in danger of a "Treasury collapse."—Truly yours,

SALOMON REINACH.

PARIS, June 5, 1887.

[We were thinking of going over M. Leroy-Beaulieu's articles on French finances in the *Économiste Français* during the last two or three years for the purpose of showing, by numerous quotations, how rash M. Reinach's assertions are, and how defective his memory is, when we took up the last number, of June 14, containing another discussion of the same subject by the same writer. In it M. Leroy-Beaulieu shows that the public debt of France is per head of population more than one-third greater than that of England, Austria, or Italy, and three times as great as that of Germany, and calls this a low estimate. He winds up by saying: "In spite of all these devices [imperfect statements of liability] of our budget, although we have been constantly taking pains to conceal its real amount by special accounts or occult methods (*quoique nous ayons eu une préoccupation constante d'en dissimuler, par des caisses spéciales ou des expédients occultes, la grosseur réelle*); it is, nevertheless, plain, from all the testimony, that the French budget largely (*d'une façon considérable*) surpasses in all its principal features the budgets of the other six great States of Europe. *This situation*," he adds, "cannot last without, in the long run, seriously affecting the national vitality (*sans que la vitalité nationale à la longue en soit profondément atteinte*)." It will be seen that this is a far more serious charge than the one we have ascribed to him, of thinking a "Treasury collapse of some kind not far away." If the latter be "words of treason," what must the former be? And let us add that there could not be, to our minds, a stronger illustration of the risky condition of French finances than the fact that a Frenchman of M. Reinach's intelligence thinks it treasonable to express alarm about them. Our assertion about what other "shrewd financial heads" thought of the situation was possibly indiscreet, because it was based on private information, which is—of course, without meaning to reflect in any way on M. Reinach's good faith—more valuable to us than his general denial can possibly be.

As to the condition of popular sentiment about Gen. Boulanger, that is, of course, a matter of opinion about which it is useless to bandy contradictions. All we can say is, that our view of it is shared by hundreds of excellent political observers, both in France and in foreign countries. That Gen. Boulanger himself shares it, may fairly be inferred from the

remarkable sentence in his farewell order to the army, in which he called attention to the fact that in going out of office he was "setting an example of both republican and military discipline." The only possible construction at all creditable to his intelligence one can place on this is, that under the circumstances less patriotic men than he might have felt justified in staying in office, even if the President or his colleagues wished him to go.

We may add in conclusion that we did not mean by the phrase "a Treasury collapse of some kind," the total repudiation of the public debt, as M. Reinach seems to imagine. There might be many a collapse damaging to French credit and humiliating to French pride before that pass was reached. In fact, some financiers would call attempts to conceal the real amount of the debt by cooked accounts, such as M. Leroy-Beaulieu describes, a collapse of a very painful nature. But the remedy never can be applied as long as earnest talk about the evil is considered traitorous or even unpatriotic.—  
ED. NATION.]

#### THE QUESTION OF CHURCH UNION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The only way a Protestant can experience the delights of the doctrine of infallibility is by having an infallible newspaper on which he wholly leans, and in which he heartily believes.

Such has been my belief in the *Nation* from the time when, as a college boy, I subscribed for it, since which time I have never been without it. When it has ruthlessly criticised my own books as they have appeared one by one, I have fallen back upon the wisdom of Irving's character in 'Sleepy Hollow,' Ichabod Crane, who, when he whipped the boys in his school, invariably remarked that they would thank him for that afternoon's performance the longest day they lived.

I have never addressed a letter to my lifelong friend, the *Nation*, through all these years until to-day, when, in all deference to the doctrine of editorial infallibility, I venture to suggest two or three fallacies in your editorial of June 9 on "The Question of Church Union."

First of all, no one enlisting in this enterprise of church unity expects that it is going to be a mere matter of ninety days, as Mr. Seward said of the War of the Rebellion. Obstacles are to be encountered; prejudices are to be aroused; the dark shadows of ecclesiastical and theological bias must be awakened. Our Lord said of the religion which he came to establish, "I come not to send peace but a sword." A movement like this drives men back to their definitions, and clearness of thought comes with clearness of definition. Men must ask to day what they mean by the church, and what they mean by church unity. Is it the mediæval idea of hierarchical organization, or the practical American idea of a national Federation?

Secondly, the Congress of Churches has held no meeting this year, simply because already the manufacture of the material of church unity has exceeded the available demand. We do not want to go on talking generalities when we are wide of the vital question before the house. Each church must settle its own details. The Congregationalists are driven back to the question of the authority of their mission work, or the problem of centralization cropping out in their polity. The Episcopal church is divided about the problem of its change of name. The prophetic sword has already pierced the fabric of the past, but

peace will come after the sword thrusts of the immediate present.

Thirdly, no meeting of the Congress of Churches was held this year for another reason. It was hoped that something definite and practical could be accomplished in the matter of Christian unity by the churches of our towns and villages meeting together for united service during Holy Week, and especially upon Good Friday. This was accomplished, and now, in addition to the theory of Christian federation, a practical precedent has been established in the matter of keeping the Christian year, which will serve for the second step forward when the time for the next meeting comes.

The chief fallacy of the editorial in the number of June 9, however, consists in this—that, as a matter of fact, it is the town which is the practical centre of Christian unity, and not the city. Churches and ministers are too busy, in their endless routine and in their crowded city life, to stop to see how this problem of unity can become practical. This movement of the Congress of Churches began in the felt needs of town life, and has been carried on by the convictions of many Christian workers who live in country, not city, life. Already in half-a-dozen towns in Massachusetts, steps have been taken towards realizing practical unity by keeping Holy Week as a Christian town—taking as the norm of unity the local church in a place, such as "the church which is in Corinth," or "the church which is in Amherst."

To sum up, then, the points in this case, we may say:

- (1) The question of church union means the work of a generation, not the work of a day.
- (2) The question of church union drives men back to their definitions, and inevitably draws the sword of discussion first, before peace comes.
- (3) The question of church union is one in which we must allow plenty of time and space and charity, and the happening of the unexpected, for the settlement of lesser local details.
- (4) As a matter of fact, it is city life, with its endless routine and its lack of bird's-eye view and perspective, which has, up to this point, presented the chief obstacles to the practical realization of Christian unity—not "the sweeping social revolution" which you seem to think would follow were church unity realized in the country.

I write thus as a country minister, and can name several towns in Massachusetts where the effort to realize practical church unity has been tried without incurring any "sweeping social revolution."—Very sincerely yours,

WM. WILBERFORCE NEWTON.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., JUNE 23, 1887.

#### AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A paragraph in your last number begins with these words: "We doubt if the people of this city realize fully the importance of the experiment which Mayor Hewitt is making in the City Hall." As this goes to the root of one of the strongest of my political hobbies, I ask your indulgence for a moment. If it should appear out of place for me to discuss New York city politics, you will perhaps remember that the experiments in government in every city are of the deepest and most direct interest to all the rest, and that New York is the most central and the most important of all.

New York and Brooklyn have taken a strong lead in the right direction in giving greater power to the Mayor, and especially in taking away from the Aldermen the right of confirming his appointments; and it seems as if the drift of

opinion was towards a still further extension of these powers. But while this system offers great advantages with a good Mayor, it involves serious risk with a bad one, and there is danger of losing sight of that which is the safeguard against bad and the encouragement in good use of power—the public enforcement of responsibility. I believe that the government of Brooklyn by Mayor Low was very satisfactory to the best citizens, but the mass of the people knew very little about it; and, perhaps for that very reason, he has a successor who is, I presume, much less satisfactory, while silence, so far as I can learn, has settled over the whole arena.

Perhaps the purest form of government in this country is the New England town-meeting. This may be true of other local governments, but I speak of that which I know best. The town government may sometimes be extravagant and sometimes foolish, but anything like systematic corruption or dishonesty among town officials is extremely rare. The reason is, that the whole responsibility for administration rests with the officials, and mainly with the selectmen. The town meeting assembles once or twice a year, the selectmen and officials being present; and individuals bring forward their grievances and discuss the conduct of their agents in their presence and before the company. The test is so severe that none but honest men can stand it.

When the town becomes so large that the meeting is too cumbersome, relief is sought in the form of the representative council of a city. In theory, this council should do the same thing as the town-meeting—that is, keep the people fully informed of the character and actions of their responsible servants. In practice, the council, by its system of committees, and by excluding the executive officials from its sessions and depriving them of all voice and initiative, gets hold of executive power, breaks up and diffuses responsibility, and carefully covers up not only its own tracks, but those of the executive power. In restoring power to the executive, the true function and power of the council should be kept in view. If a body of one or two hundred men from all New York city were to meet, say once a month, and if the Mayor and the chief officials were to appear before this body in public session; if the body were forbidden by law to interfere with the executive power, but limited to criticism and to the voting of money upon executive proposal—or, in other words, to a veto—then the character and actions of the officials would speedily and fully become known to the whole city, and then for the first time we should have the right to blame the people if things went wrong.

There is a curious symptom of the dim consciousness of this want in the provision which is running the rounds of the various city charters, that the Mayor shall at stated times call the various officials together for consultation. But they may consult just as little or just as much as they please. They are all interested on one side. Their tendency, like that of all officials, even if honest, is not to waste time on the public—to do their work rather than talk about it. It is not at all the same thing as to have a body whose interest lies in seeing that the public are well informed. G. B.

BOSTON, JUNE 25, 1887.

#### SENATOR HOAR OR CITIZEN HOAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the current issue of your paper I have read with great surprise an extract from the address of welcome delivered by Senator Hoar to the R. E. Lee Camp of Confederate Veterans upon their reception at Faneuil Hall. I cannot suppose that you invented or even "edited" the speech, which I therefore assume was delivered,

It is expressed in terse and elegant English, and it expresses the best thought of the time as to the war which "has led to the indissolubility of the American Union and the universality of American freedom."

But suppose this deliverance had been made, not by a Massachusetts Senator who, in his official capacity, gives a pet place in his wardrobe to the bloody shirt, but by a man, of what distinction soever, either in civil council or in loyal military service, who by political affiliation was a Democrat or by non-affiliation was a Mugwump—what then? Would it not have been accounted little short of treason, and would not he have been pilloried as a rebel at heart?

"Is it love the lying's for?" I ask with Hervé Riel; for there is a juggle with the truth somewhere. Is it Senator Hoar or Citizen Hoar, Senator Sherman or Citizen Sherman, who is speaking; or is Mr. Facing both-ways the best American type? JOSEPH PARRISH.

PHILADELPHIA, June 23, 1887.

#### THE FIRE AT THE OPÉRA COMIQUE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the account of the burning of the Opéra Comique printed on page 462 of your issue of June 2, it is said, ". . . the whole stage was immediately enveloped in flames. The fire soon spread to the rest of the house, although the iron curtain was lowered."

If uncorrected, this statement would tend to spread the belief that an iron curtain affords no protection to the audience of a theatre in which it is used. In fact, no attempt seems to have been made, on the occasion in question, to lower the iron curtain; at any rate, it was not lowered.

L. E. O.

PARIS, June 14, 1887.

#### AMERICAN ANCESTRY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In consequence of the notices in the *Nation*, both in December last and more recently in your review of our Albany volume, we are receiving a very large number of communications regarding our work. Will you, therefore, allow us to state through the same widely circulated medium that, while our *local series* merely publish lineages of persons residing in certain localities, our *standard series* will publish lineages sent from any part of our United States, and thus place on record for all time the ancestry of any living American whose ancestor resided in America at the time of the Revolution?—Yours respectfully,

JOEL MUNSELL'S SONS.

ALBANY, N. Y., June 25, 1887.

#### Notes.

TICKNOR & CO., Boston, publish immediately 'Penelope's Suitors,' a story of the old Colony days, by Edwin Lassetter Bynner; and 'Home Sanitation: a Manual for Housekeepers,' edited by Ellen H. Richards and Marion Talbot.

Mr. Frank D. Millet, the well-known artist, has translated into English Count Leo Tolstoi's powerful work entitled 'Scenes from the Siege of Sebastopol.' His intimate knowledge of the Russian people and Russian life should be a guarantee of his success in this task. The translation is introduced by a chapter on Tolstoi from the pen of W. D. Howells, and the book, which contains a portrait of the author, will be shortly issued by Harper & Brothers. They announce also 'Horsemanship for Women,' by Mr. Theodore H. Mead, with forty-one illustrations by Gray-Parker.

The Memoirs of the Margravine of Baireuth, eldest daughter of Frederick William I. of Prus-

sia, translated by the Princess Christian, will be published in this country by Scribner & Welford.

The Worthington Co. will be the American publishers of Swinburne's 'Select Poems.'

'The Republic of the Future,' a satirical anti-Socialistic brochure by Mrs. Anna Bowman Dodd, is announced by Cassell & Co.

Prof. Wm. G. Hale's address before the recent meeting of the Classical and High-School Teachers' Association of New England, entitled 'Aims and Methods of Classical Study,' is in the press of Ginn & Co.

A. D. F. Randolph & Co. announce 'The Bible History,' in six volumes, by Alfred Edersheim, D.D., author of 'The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.' Also, an edition of the 'Memorials of William E. Dodge,' the first edition of which was printed for private distribution.

'The Life and Times of Jesus, as related by Thomas Didymus,' by James Freeman Clarke, just published by Lee & Shepard of Boston, is a reissue of a book which appeared in 1881 with the title 'The Legend of Thomas Didymus, the Jewish Sceptic.' No notice is given in the book of the fact of its having formerly appeared with a different title.

We have already referred to the technical part of Prof. Angelo Heilprin's report on the expedition undertaken by the Wagner Institute of Philadelphia, with the assistance of Mr. Joseph Willcox, to southwest Florida during the winter of 1885-86. The complete report is now issued, with an introduction by Dr. Leidy, a narrative of the journey by Prof. Heilprin, some additional descriptions of new species, and eighteen plates of new fossils, etc., made by an apparently new phototypic and rather murky process called the Levytype. The report will be of much value to all interested in the geology and palæontology of the region, and is creditable alike to the Wagner Institute and to the exertions of Messrs. Heilprin and Willcox.

Mr. W. J. Loftie's literary-historical 'Windsor Castle,' which, after running through the *Portfolio*, appeared in book form some two years ago, was originally written in a vein of rather effusive "loyalty." To give the book a "Jubilee Edition" was therefore both natural and easy, and this Macmillan & Co. have just done. Bidding good-bye to the *Portfolio* form, which had been determined by etchings now abandoned, the publishers have chosen a duodecimo of fair dimensions, scarlet-covered, illustrated with numerous cuts in the text, and with a phototype copy of Boehm's sitting statue of the Queen for a frontispiece. The print is large, and the price much below that of the larger edition.

An opposite policy has been pursued by Macmillan & Co. in the case of the "Victoria Edition" of Shakspere's works. Here a smaller, one-volume edition, the "Globe," with the text of W. G. Clark and W. Aldis Wright, has been expanded into three volumes, 12mo—the Comedies in the first, the Histories in the second, and the Tragedies and Poems in the third. A simple binding in green cloth has been given them. The page is in double columns, and the letter-press is clear, if compact. There are no introductions or notes, the "Globe" having had none. The price is wonderfully cheap, and would hardly have been possible before the Victorian era.

We commend, as we have done their predecessors, the latest volumes, xiii to xvi, in the Library Edition of the Waverley Novels (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.). They are, in order, 'The Pirate,' 'The Fortunes of Nigel,' 'Peveril of the Peak,' and 'Quentin Durward.' The large and liberal style of this edition makes it very attractive to eyes that admire fine typography, or need to be favored with print that can safely be read by candlelight.

Prof. Franklin B. Dexter's 'Sketch of the History of Yale University' (Henry Holt & Co.) is a thin, neatly-printed volume of about 100 pages, compactly setting forth what needs to be known, in due sequence to the present administration. Those who wish for detail on the earlier periods can find it in Prof. Dexter's 'Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College,' of which the first volume appeared two years ago and the second is in preparation. Other sources are mentioned in the short bibliography which succeeds the curious statistics that follow the main narrative. What is true of Yale, that the graduates bearing the name of Smith lead in number, with Williamses in the second place, is true also of Harvard and perhaps of some other colleges.

"The Gentleman's Magazine Library, being a classified collection of the chief contents of the *Gentleman's Magazine* from 1731 to 1868, edited by George Laurence Gomme, F.S.A." (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.), has reached Part 1 of 'Romano-British Remains,' an octavo volume of 297 pages. It contains the accounts of local discoveries in England in the several counties, arranged alphabetically, as far as Somersetshire. The remaining counties of England, together with Wales and Scotland, stations, roads, etc., notes and index, are reserved for Part 2. This most useful compilation is introduced by a discussion by Mr. Gomme, in twenty-one pages, of the character of the Roman occupation of Britain, and the classification of the remains. Mr. Gomme takes issue with Mr. Coote and Mr. Seebohm on the question of the Romans in Britain, holding that their occupation was exclusively military: "that the Roman conquerors found the country occupied by tribes of more or less barbarous people, and they left it with the tribal organization still practically unbroken." This view, arrived at by the examination of classical and other sources of knowledge, appears to him to be sustained by the evidence of archaeology. Mr. Seebohm's argument from the fact that "our modern villages are very often on these old Roman, and sometimes probably pre-Roman sites," he holds to be neutralized by the facts that the Saxon cultivator often turned "the site of the Roman villa into arable lands," and "that Roman villas by no means implied Roman villages; that for the instances which Mr. Seebohm advances where continuity in the occupation of one site may be shown by archaeology, there are innumerable instances where archaeology shows no such continuity."

There comes to us the first number of *Spelling*, "a magazine devoted to the simplification of English orthography" (Boston: Library Bureau; London: Trübner & Co.). It is dated May, 1887. "Everything," we read, "that practically concerns spelling, and is worth printing, will be welcome to the pages of this periodical. The Spelling Reform Association, whose policy we shall follow, refers all theoretical and scientific alphabetic questions to the experts of the Philological Association. We shall set forth the views of the filologists. Articles in dissent from these views will be admitted, and will be answered." But the main object of this periodical is to popularize the reform. As our extract shows, the (partially) amended orthography is employed.

The June number of the *Antiquary* contains several interesting papers, but none of special importance, except the conclusion of Prof. Conway's 'Exercitium super Pater noster.' This article gives much interesting information with regard to early printing, and arrives at the conclusion that the book in question was printed before 1440. Of "Old Storied Houses" we have Harvington Hall in Worcestershire; of "London Theatres," Whitefriars. "The Early Custody of Domesday Book," by J. H. Round, is directed