

testing culture in the open and against walls, devoting thought to his trenches, substituting lawns in certain spots for plantations of trees, grafting his vines with scions of rare sorts from beyond the sea (*vites transmarinas*), possibly from Greece or Sicily, and procuring seeds and plants from various friends in other regions. He displays a familiar knowledge of many herbs and vegetables—rosemary, hyssop, beets, parsley, spinach, fennel—and studies the varieties of the olive (of which he gets a better sort from Bergamo), the willow, and the laurel—to which last, as the tree sacred to poets, he devotes much time and care. At Milan, with no garden of his own, he labors in those of various convents—St. Valeria at one time, and then St. Ambrose, which latter lay close to his house.

It was in the garden of St. Valeria that an incident occurred, here carefully narrated, which determines the date of one of Boccaccio's visits to him, and shows us two of the great figures of the Renaissance side by side. Petrarch had received, he tells us, five specimens of laurel, two of a delicate character and three of a hardier variety (*due tenere, tres duriores*) from his friend Thaddeus (*lauros Como*—which M. de Nolhac takes to be Como—*transmissas per Taddeum nostrum*), and on Saturday, March 16, 1359, he proceeds to plant them. After a preliminary note about the weather and condition of the soil, he says: *Inter cetera multum prodesse debet ad profectum sacrarum arbuscularum, quod insignis vir d. [= dominus] Io. Boccaccio de Certaldo, ipsis amicissimus et mihi, casu in has horas tunc aduectus, sationi interfuit.* Perhaps no prettier compliment was ever paid by one famous poet to another; certainly no happier conceit was ever recorded in the note-book of a gardener. But Petrarch, even in the memorable presence of such a friend, doesn't lose his horticultural interest; and immediately sets down his comments on the state of the roots of the laurels and the lingering coldness of the season. A month later he notes the condition of the shrubs: *Iam nunc circa medium aprilis due maiores crescunt; alie uero non letos successus spondent. Credo firmiter terram hanc huic arbori inimicam.*

In 1369 Petrarch maintained gardens both in Padua and Arquà, and records some experiences connected with both. One spring day in that year Lombardo da Serico, the companion of his old age, the executor named in his will, and the continuator of his unfinished *Epitome vitarum virorum illustrium*, brings him "two huge laurels with immense roots;" and out of respect, doubtless, to their extraordinary size, the two friends plant the sacred shrubs with much ceremony (*solemnissime*). The concluding note refers to some fruit trees and a solitary laurel, sent as a gift to Petrarch. Receiving them in Padua, Lombardo hastens to gratify his distinguished friend by conveying them to him at Arquà, but in going by water across the plain to the base of the Euganean Hills, he is detained by contrary winds, and the plants doubtless suffer in the December cold. (Petrarch does not say, as M. de Nolhac incautiously quotes in his French summary, that "Lombardo va da Padoue à Arquà en bateau," since that feat would have been as difficult of performance in the fourteenth century as now, considering that Arquà, though so near to Padua, lies not much less than a thousand feet above it.) No proper precaution is neglected in the planting of the fruit trees, and the final note closes, appositely enough: *Ego nescio quid sperem; operiemus finem.*

M. de Nolhac, by these "finds," both those of Paris and those of Rome, establishes, as has already been hinted, many new and important dates for the benefit of Petrarch's future bio-

graphers; but his services in exhuming the pleasant records of Petrarch's constant devotion to his garden, and of his eager desire to test the varying influences of nature, are of even a higher value.

Now that the autographic codex (Vat. 3195), containing Petrarch's final copy of his Italian lyrics, has been reidentified, new data in regard to the past history of this remarkable literary monument are rapidly accumulating. An unnoticed passage in Vellutello's preface to his long commentary on the 'Rime' makes it more than probable that the Padovan owner from whom Cardinal Bembo borrowed the codex in 1501, in order to use it as the text of the first Aldine edition, was one Messer Daniello di Santa Sofia, who was still living in 1525, but of whom nothing further is yet known. If there were any doubt about the subsequent ownership of the manuscript by Bembo himself, it would be dissipated by a statement of G. V. Pinelli, unearthed by Professor Pio Rajna—author of that sterling work, 'Le Origini dell' Epopea francese'—among the manuscript collections of the Ambrosian library. Pinelli, in one of his bibliographical note-books, puts down a list of various interesting objects which he saw during a visit to the Cardinal's library (*studio*) at Padova, made some time before 1581. Among these he cites: "Versi volgari del Petrarca di mano dell'autore in bella lettera in perg."—which can be none other than the autograph codex. In the same place Pinelli also finds the detached paper folios containing the rough drafts, with corrections, of several of the lyrics (Vat. 3196), which, as will be remembered, likewise passed from Bembo's collection into that of Fulvio Orsini. He thus describes them: "Alcuni fogli di rime del Petrarca corrette e mutate da lui med". le quali cita il bembò nelle sue prose," to which he adds in parenthesis: "furonò ritrovate in mano d'un pizzicarolo"—but whether it was Bembo himself or some one else who rescued them from the hands of the groceryman (*pizzicarolo*), Pinelli does not say.

Another Petrarchan discovery, of quite a different character, has been lately communicated to the public by Dr. Johannes Uebinger of Münster, a scholar long engaged on a new edition of the works of Cusanus (Nicholas of Cusa)—that prelate who, long before the days of Luther, believed in the necessity of a Reformation, and, long before the days of Copernicus and Galileo, believed in the theory of the earth's motion, and the very cardinal who, as has been seen, is supposed to have been, at an early period, the possessor of Petrarch's Virgil. Dr. Uebinger's essay, "Die angeblichen Dialoge Petrarca's über die wahre Weisheit," is printed in *Geiger's Vierteljahrsschrift für die Kultur und Litteratur der Renaissance* (vol. ii, No. 1), and relates to the dialogues 'De vera sapientia,' so long ascribed to Petrarch. This tractate has always occupied an anomalous position; it is nowhere alluded to in Petrarch's letters, as are all his other works, and is mentioned by none of his contemporaries; nor is there any manuscript of it in existence as old even as the earlier part of the fifteenth century; yet it has been included in all the five editions of the collected writings from 1496 to 1581. Buhle, the historian of modern philosophy, was the earliest to notice its resemblance to some dialogues by Cusanus bearing nearly the same title; but he took it for granted that Cusanus had copied from Petrarch. Körting, Petrarch's ablest biographer, indicated clearly (1878) that a portion of the work was identical with certain passages in Petrarch's 'De remediis utriusque fortunæ'—and Petrarch was hardly the man to repeat himself. Dr. Uebinger now demonstrates that the bulk of the book (nearly one-half of the first dialogue

and all of the second) is, with various alterations and corruptions, from the treatise 'De sapientia' of Cusanus, in which has been interpolated (in the middle of dialogue i.) excerpts from Petrarch's 'De remediis,' followed by an extract from some still unrecognized author; and infers that the work, in its existing state, is a compilation by some scribe of the fifteenth century. But, strangely enough, the treatise of Cusanus (written in 1450) was not published until 1478, while the earliest edition of the 'De vera sapientia,' under Petrarch's name, was printed at Utrecht some five years before, or less than a decade after the death of Cusanus (1464). There are thus some doubtful points still to be cleared up, but it seems fair to conclude, with Dr. Uebinger, that the 'De vera sapientia' must be erased from the list of Petrarch's productions.

## Correspondence.

### AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: My attention has been called to your recent article on "State Interference with Railways," in which you take the opportunity to criticise the American Economic Association, and to place its members in a false position. As Secretary of the Association it seems proper for me to tell your readers that this society embraces men of the most diverse opinions, some of whom go as far as you in the direction of *laissez-faire*. When you comment upon the American Economic Association, you are simply speaking of the economists of the country, for I know of no economic tendency which is not represented in its membership. In fact, it includes at the present time the majority of economists of prominence in this country, and a considerable proportion of the better-known economists of England. Our last monograph is by a lecturer in Lincoln and Corpus Christi Colleges, Oxford. The governing body of the Association is the Council, and if you will look in our annual report when it appears, you will find in it more than one name of those whom you delight to honor in your editorial columns; no one of them has, however, so far as I know, observed this "serious danger" to which we seem exposed.

While there is a wide difference of opinion among us, and while I have no authority to speak for others, to prevent misunderstanding I think I ought to say that I know of no one who interprets the declaration in regard to the State as an agency of progress to mean that "in doubtful cases the presumption is in favor of State action." One of our monographs, indeed, takes strong ground against any such doctrine.

In conclusion, allow me to call your attention to another declaration in our constitution. The object of the Association is "the encouragement of perfect freedom in all economic discussion."

As much as we differ in other points, I think we all agree in this.

RICHARD T. ELY.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,  
BALTIMORE, MD., November 9, 1887.

### WATERWAYS VS. RAILWAYS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial, "State Interference with Railways," of November 3 (No. 1166), speaking of water-routes competing with railways, you take a position which will be disputed by no one who is familiar with the subject. The advocates of projected canals admit, without evasion, that canals in most cases do

not, or would not, if constructed, yield interest on the investment. They claim that water-routes serve in bringing down freight charges over a wide territory, and save the shipper as well as the consumer vast sums of money through competition. This view is advocated largely in Western newspapers, and its most conspicuous exponent was the late Gov. Horatio Seymour. In numerous papers and addresses he endeavored to prove that the visible effects of artificial waterways, *i. e.*, freight actually moved and the financial statements of its operations, are insignificant compared with the pressure it exerts on competing railways. If this view is correct, your argument is incomplete unless it disposes of this phase of the question.

GUSTAV WIEMER.

CARROLLTON, ILL., November 7, 1887.

[If the United States Government should choose to build a railroad from Chicago to New York, and habitually run it at a heavy loss, it might thereby reduce charges much below their present figure. But a permanently bankrupt-road of this kind would not be a useful thing for the country. It would give an artificial stimulus to trade at some points, and check the natural growth of railroad enterprise at others. If a community, however large, asked the Government to build such a railroad, not because they could pay for it, but because it was going to reduce the profits of somebody else whom they did not like, it would be class legislation of the worst sort. And when the Government is asked to spend money for unprofitable waterways because railroad profits will thereby be reduced, it is a case of the same kind.

If the community can make a canal pay, it is evidence that they need it. If they cannot make it pay, it is at least strong *prima facie* evidence that they do not need it. If they claim that it will pay indirectly, by reducing railroad profits, they overlook the fact that such reduction will prevent railroad facilities from being extended as fast as they otherwise would be. If the Government gives A a canal which he cannot pay for, it deprives B of railroad facilities for which he could pay his share. If it were a case of subsidizing one railroad route against another, people would see the fallacy. There is a glamour of apparent free competition about a waterway which blinds them to the facts in the case. But the number of people who can make direct use of an internal waterway is not large; and the history of certain rings at Buffalo and Cincinnati shows how water traffic may be practically monopolized in a few hands.—ED. NATION.]

THE RAINFALL AT LOS ANGELES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: In a very interesting letter to the *Nation*, from Henry T. Finck, which shows him to be a very accurate observer, and which, as a whole, gives a very true picture of us as we appear when seen with loving eyes, the following statement is made :

"The general irrigation now resorted to, and the numerous green oases which have in consequence sprung up amid the deserts of prickly cactus, have already exerted some influence on the climate, and there is reason to believe that rain will be more abundant in the future than in the past."

One frequently hears this opinion expressed, not only by the oldest native, but also by the latest "tenderfoot." As accurately observed facts do not seem to justify the theory, I trust you will print the enclosed table, which is taken from the "Annual Meteorological Review" collected and compiled by Sergeant James A. Barwick of the Signal Corps, United States Army, in Sacramento, Cal. Since our rain comes at any time from the first of November to April inclusive, and not during the summer months, the best way is to judge by the rainfall during the "rainy" season, and not by the year. Both are given, however, as they show some interesting variations when taken together in the time of the rainfall. Thus, in 1884, there was 40.39 inches of rainfall, but in the season of 1884 and 1885 only 9.29 inches.

LOS ANGELES, L. A. CO., CAL.

Year.	Rainfall in inches.	Season of	Rainfall in inches.
1873.....	16.86	1873-4	24.78
1874.....	21.20	1874-5	21.68
1875.....	26.10	1875-6	26.74
1876.....	18.75	1876-7	5.28
1877.....	16.12	1877-8	21.20
1878.....	20.83	1878-9	11.35
1879.....	17.41	1879-80	20.34
1880.....	18.65	1880-1	13.13
1881.....	5.53	1881-2	10.40
1882.....	10.74	1882-3	12.11
1883.....	14.14	1883-4	38.22
1884.....	40.39	1884-5	9.29
1885.....	10.39	1885-6	22.72
1886.....	17.22	1886-7	*14.15

Very truly yours, H. B. WING.  
LOS ANGELES, November 4, 1887.

THE PRIVATE BOMB-MAKER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Cannot some public attention be called to the extreme necessity for making the private manufacture of bombs criminal to such an extent as to merit very severe punishment? Hitherto we have not seen, or heard that their possession by any one was treated as a crime. The ease with which they can be manufactured, the secrecy with which they can be successfully carried about and used, and the fact that nobody needs them except for criminal purposes, ought to make their private manufacture and possession at least as criminal as carrying concealed weapons. We think they should be more severely treated. The events which have occurred so recently in connection with the Chicago Anarchists ought to emphasize this. Let the penalty be a severe penitentiary punishment for the manufacture, use, or possession of them in any way not carefully prescribed by law. We see very little legitimate use for dynamite in the private purposes of life, and no reason for tolerating such an abuse of power as it puts into men like the Anarchists. It is too late to wait until they have done something destructive to punish them. As for ourselves, we know of no case in which the mere possession of it is not surrounded with something like criminal intentions. Cannot the public be awakened to some action in this matter?

J. H. HYSLOP.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,  
BALTIMORE, MD., November 11, 1887.

THE LEIF ERIKSON MONUMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In reading the Boston *Transcript's* long account of the exercises attending the unveiling of the Leif Erikson monument in Boston on October 29, I was somewhat surprised to find that no mention was made of the origin of the agitation which has just culminated in the completion of the monument. The orator of the

occasion, Professor E. N. Horsford, entered into the discussion of details in almost every other branch of his subject, but, strange to say, had only one single sentence that has any reference to the origin of this movement. That sentence is: "This is the statue Ole Bull, earliest of all, conceived and dreamed of, worked and sang for." It seems to me, Mr. Editor, that something more than this barren sentence might very appropriately have been said in this direction.

The idea of erecting a monument in honor of the Norse discoverer was conceived in the State of Wisconsin among a few patriotic Norsemen, with Ole Bull as the central figure. Ole Bull and Professor Rasmus B. Anderson, now United States Minister to Denmark, were very intimate friends. They first met in January, 1868. Professor Anderson was at this time much interested in the study of the Norse discoveries, and had lectured on the subject. Ole Bull was also an enthusiastic vindicator of the claims of the Norsemen, and the first time they were together the subject was discussed by them. In Ole Bull's response to an address of welcome on the occasion of his first visit to this city, January 19, 1868, he spoke of the discovery of America by the Northmen. On May 17, 1872, he gave a concert in this city for the purpose of raising funds for purchasing Scandinavian books for the library of the University of Wisconsin, and after the concert was over a State reception was given in honor of Mr. Bull, presided over by Gov. C. C. Washburn. Various speeches were made on this occasion, and I find in the report of the speech made by Professor Anderson these words: "And right here allow me to say that when you have assisted Norway in erecting a monument on the grave of Harald Haarfager, we earnestly hope that you will return hither and assist us in erecting a monument in honor of Leif Erikson." In his response Ole Bull dwelt on the same theme.

This, so far as I can ascertain, is the first public mention of a monument for Leif Erikson. It had, however, often been talked of before by Ole Bull and Professor Anderson among their friends.

Ole Bull returned to this city in the fall of 1872; and on May 27 succeeding, at a meeting of the Scandinavians of this city, at which he was present, the plans for the erection of a monument were discussed. Ole Bull was soon to depart for Norway, but offered his services in giving, before his departure, a few concerts, for the purpose of starting a fund. The first one was given at Cambridge, Wis., on the evening of May 31, 1873. At this and the other concerts held for the same purpose, Professor Anderson was with Mr. Bull, and spoke in the intervals on the Norse discoveries and of the plans for a Leif Erikson monument. Ole Bull, too, often became so enthusiastic in the cause that he was not content to act as a virtuoso merely, but assumed the rôle of an orator as well. I was present at the first of this series of concerts, and distinctly remember the interest he succeeded in arousing among his countrymen.

Ole Bull was, indeed, full of enthusiasm on this subject. His original plans for the unveiling of the monument were, too, somewhat different from those which have recently been carried out. His were to have been on a much grander scale, and it is interesting to recall them at this time. The following is from Madison daily of May, 1873:

"Ole Bull, Professor R. B. Anderson, Senator J. A. Johnson, and other prominent Norwegians are raising money to build a monument to Leif Erikson. The first-named gentleman has already given some concerts, and will give some more before leaving for Nor-

\* Up to May 1, 1887.

way, the entire proceeds to be devoted to the monument fund. Professor Anderson, a linguist thoroughly versed in Scandinavian literature, is to lecture for the benefit of the fund. The total amount to be raised is \$10,000. The monument is to be erected in Madison, and dedicated with great ceremony on the hundredth anniversary of American independence. Ole Bull, Björnson, the famous Norwegian author and poet, and other celebrities will be present on the occasion, together with such a host of enthusiastic Norwegians from this and adjoining States as were never before seen together outside of the borders of Norway."

In June, 1873, Professor Anderson accompanied Ole Bull to Norway, where they agitated the same question. Björnson was summoned from Christiania to Ole Bull's villa near Bergen, where a conference was held to discuss the subject. After his return, Professor Anderson published a small work entitled: 'America Not Discovered by Columbus.' From a note in this work concerning the monument scheme I find the following:

"For the realization of this object Ole Bull has contributed his eminent services. He has already given several concerts, both in this country and in Norway, the proceeds of which go to the monument fund. . . . Norway's famous poet and orator, Björnstjerne Björnson, has promised to write, for the dedication of the monument, a cantata, to which the eminent Norse composer, Edward Grieg, will write the music. Björnson has also promised to come to America in person and deliver the dedication oration."

These were Ole Bull's original plans.

As a result of this initiatory work, about \$2,000 were raised, but for various reasons, into the details of which I cannot here enter, the work of raising money progressed very slowly in the West, and hence, in order to gain the cooperation of men of means, a committee, consisting of over fifty prominent Eastern men, was appointed December 8, 1876, on the occasion of a concert given by Ole Bull in Boston, and to this committee the funds raised in the West were ultimately transferred.

Hoping that I have contributed a few facts that may be of interest in the history of this monument, I am,

Yours respectfully, JULIUS E. OLSON.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, October 7, 1887.

#### SOME THINGS ABOUT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: At the recent meeting of the bar commemorative of the late Justice Woods of that court, one of the senior lawyers made some statements, concerning the bench itself, which have been brought to mind by your paragraph referring to the vacancy caused by Judge Woods's demise. They may be of some interest:

"Its centennial was near, and it was a curious thing in its history that no associate justice of the court had ever fully become its head. One (John Rutledge) had been nominated for Chief Justice, but failed to pass the Senate. One Chief Justice (R. B. Taney) had been nominated for an associate justice, and also failed in the Senate."

A still more curious thing was the fact that no full Chief Justice had, before his elevation, filled any judicial position whatever.

"It was perhaps a law of the court that no associate should be promoted, and the Chief Justice should never serve any judicial apprenticeship—a thing to be remembered when estimating their success as the head of this court. It was also true, as a rule, that the associate justices were taken untried from the ranks of the bar. And what a comment, that for near a hundred years there had not been a poor lawyer, a weak or a bad man on that bench—never had been! The personnel of the court had always been so high, the court had so well performed its functions, so well borne its dignity and sustained itself, that conscious weakness, infirmity of character, deficiency of learning

had never reached the bench—dared not seek it."

This last was eulogium. Taking the matter up at the point that usually all the members of the court have come fresh from the bar, something may be added. Justice Woods himself was taken from the Circuit Court, and he left upon the bench Blatchford from the Federal Court of New York, and Gray from the Supreme Court of Massachusetts.

The whole number of associates, from its first session ninety-seven years ago, is forty-three. Of these but fourteen or fifteen had previously filled judicial positions, and the most of these were in the earlier years of the court. Obviously, whatever may be the fitness of men already invested with judicial functions, that condition renders them inconspicuous—more so than a high position at the bar; while he to whom it falls to place a new incumbent upon the national bench knows many at the bar fit for the place. Possibly the consideration that men in judicial places are provided for, has a small percentage of influence, as has the wish, to provide for a deserving Cabinet officer.

It is curious to observe how the high honors of the Supreme Court have been distributed among the States. Six have fallen to New York—a chief and five associates—Jay, Livingston, Thompson, Nelson, Hunt, and Blatchford. Of these the second, third and fourth had served on her bench. The last was taken from the Federal bench.

Massachusetts contributed four—Cushing, Story, Curtis, and Gray. The first and last were her Chief Justices when taken. Was it stepping down or up for these? Story and Curtis were from the bar direct.

Virginia has furnished five—John Marshall and Bushrod Washington from her bar, John Blair, P. P. Barbour, and Peter V. Daniel from her bench.

Pennsylvania has been honored with four places—James Wilson, Henry Baldwin, R. C. Grier, and William Strong. Grier was a State judge; Baldwin, Strong, and Wilson were not.

From Maryland came Taney, R. H. Harrison, Thomas Johnson, Samuel Chase, and Gabriel Duval. Chase, when transferred to the Federal Court, was Chief Justice, and Duval went from the Maryland bench.

North Carolina furnished Iredell from her bench and Alfred Moore from her bar.

John Rutledge, as everybody knows, was a South Carolinian, first appointed an associate justice, nominated Chief Justice, presided in a single short term as Chief Justice, was rejected by the Senate, and retired. This in 1795. He was born in 1739, and died in 1800. William Johnson was also from South Carolina. Neither Rutledge nor Johnson had previously been a judge.

New Jersey contributed William Paterson and the present Justice Bradley, both from the bar direct.

Connecticut has had the single honor of furnishing the third Chief Justice, Ellsworth.

Kentucky has received three of the high places—Thomas Todd, Robert Trimble, and our present Justice Harlan. They were all Kentucky lawyers.

Ohio has been conspicuously remembered. President Jackson took John McLean from her Supreme Court. Chief-Justices Chase and Waite, Justices Swayne and Matthews, came from her bar direct.

Georgia has had two seats—one for her Wayne; and Woods was from Georgia.

Tennessee relinquished her Judge Catron to the national tribunal.

From Alabama came John McKinley; and

John A. Campbell, who went out with the South: Born in 1811, by many years the senior of most of the justices, two years older than Judge Bradley, he is often before the court, in seeming undiminished vigor.

Maine has the single honor of her Clifford. Iowa has her Miller; Illinois, her Davis; California, her Field, all of whom came fresh from their several bars; while New Hampshire rejoices in the memory of her Woodbury.

One-half in number of the present States have thus furnished the forty-nine judges (reckoning together chief justices and associates), twelve States have been honored with forty-two, while the court has in fact been the product of eight—New York, Massachusetts, Virginia, Maryland, Ohio, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. New York has had six, while, of the old States, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Delaware have been neglected. Ohio has had two of her sons at the same time on this bench for the past twenty-five years, and twice crowned with the Chief Justiceship, while Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and several of her other young sisters have had no citizen called to this high position.

These are at the least curious facts in our history, and might warrant a study. Should President Cleveland transfer the Secretary of the Interior to the Supreme Court, Mississippi would be added to the favored States; the bench, so far from losing, would preserve its full measure of strength. It may be doubted whether in brilliancy of intellect it has ever had his equal, nor in any, except Story, perhaps, his peer in culture. R.

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 13, 1887.

#### Notes.

THOSE who have followed Dr. Holmes with pleasure in his recollections of his trip to Europe in the *Atlantic* can now possess themselves of the whole story in book form, as it has been very handsomely published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston. 'Our Hundred Days in Europe' will be a lasting, and perhaps an historical, illustration of the sort of relation which has grown up between the kin on both sides the sea in our times, largely through Boston, and very largely through literature.

A few months ago we noticed the first volume of Mr. Gomme's 'Romano-British Remains,' in the "Gentleman's Magazine Library." The second part, just published (with continuous paging) by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., contains the rest of the counties (from Staffordshire to Yorkshire), as well as Wales and Scotland, and supplementary notices to the whole. It contains also a series of short papers, occupying nearly one hundred pages, upon the Roman roads in Britain, and some valuable "Historical Notes" upon Cæsar's campaigns in Britain. These are: "A Visit to the Portus Itius," "The Time of Cæsar's Invasion," "Cæsar's Cantian Campaigns," "Samian Ware," and "On Helms Worn by the Romans." There are two indices—one general; the other, "a place-name index of Roman remains."

A volume of selections from the *Spectator*, edited by Alex. Charles Ewald, F. S. A. (Frederick Warne & Co.), has been added to the 'Chandos Classics.' Upwards of one hundred of the essays have been included. The character sketches are grouped at the beginning, and the papers on general topics, exclusive of the critical and religious disquisitions, which are altogether discarded, fill up the remaining and larger portion of the volume. A good biographical introduction concerning Steele and