comments on Macaulay’s famous “highfalutin” paper on Milton. “A disinterested reader,” says Arnold, “whose object is not to hear Puritanism and Milton glorified, but to get at the truth about them, will surely be dissatisfied. With what a heavy brush, he will say to himself, does this man lay on his colors! The Puritan’s Oromasdes and the Royalist’s Arimanes! What a different strain from Chillingworth’s in his sermon at Oxford, at the beginning of the Civil War! ‘Publicans and sinners on the one side,’ said Chillingworth, ‘scribes and Pharisees on the other.’ Not at all a conflict between Oromasdes and Arimanes, but a good deal of Arimanes on both sides. And, as human affairs go, Chillingworth’s version of the matter is likely to be nearer the truth than Macaulay’s.”

Our incorruptible Sam Adams does not come off unscathed at the hands of Professor Smith, and certainly Mr. Hosmer’s biography sustains him. He quotes a description of Patrick Henry from Professor Tyler, and coolly asks, “Is not this something like a philosophical description tinctured with poetry of the loafer?” And of the famous “give me liberty, or give me death!” scene, he remarks: “It is not pleasant to think that such stage-play as this had a material effect in bringing on a bloody revolution, and rending asunder the Anglo-Saxon race. . . . His sublime aspiration after liberty or death being over, Cato went out to bargain with Scævolà or Brutus for a slave.”

But our English critic reserves his severest censure for Jefferson. “In theory,” he says, “he was an anarchist.” . . . “He somewhat resembled Robespierre in his feline nature, his malignant egotism, and his intense suspiciousness, as well as in his bloody minded, possibly sincere philanthropy; though unlike Maximilian (Robespierre) he could ride.” He certainly quotes some sufficiently Jacobinical sentiments.

Professor Smith reserves his admiration for three leading figures, Washington, Hamilton,—whom he calls “the founder of the American nation,”—and our greatest Chief-Justice, Marshall. “The rupture having once taken place,” he says, “it was clearly desirable that the colonies should win their independence, and there should be no protraction or renewal of the fatal struggle. For this result we are indebted to Washington.”

In speaking of Hamilton’s protectionism, he tersely sums up one of the irrefragable free-trade arguments thus: “The light of Adam Smith had but just dawned, and had scarcely illuminated the minds of any statesman except those of Shelburne and the younger Pitt. When he decided in favor of moderate protection, neither he nor any one else had been taught by experience how hard it is to preserve moderation in protection, and how the infant industry, when it has been fostered into manhood, instead of gratefully recognizing the favor which it has enjoyed, and readily resigning the privilege which is no longer needed, takes you by the throat with its strong political grasp, and extorts a continuance, or perhaps an increased measure of protection for the future.”

He criticises Franklin and Randolph, and he admires sturdy old John Adams, “rugged and gnarled as an old oak, but not less firmly rooted in his patriotism.” “Republican institutions,” he says, “if they exclude hereditary title, admit family distinction. The Massachusetts house of Adams might, with some reason, call itself the first political family in the world. It has given in the direct line two Presidents to the Republic; it has produced an ambassador whose task was hardly less important, and certainly not less trying, than that of any President; and its fertility appears not yet to be exhausted, though the times are not propitious to its prominence so far as active politics are concerned.”

“O wad some power the giftie gie us, To see oursels as others see us!” sings Burns. Here is the way one of the most accomplished of living historical students, and one of the best friends of our Republic, sees us. I do not believe he is right in his implication that the rupture was a misfortune to either country. The conflict was “irrepressible,” though it might have come in a better way; but it certainly is not unpatriotic to heed his criticisms, even when they are unpalatable, so far as they are founded in truth.

The other papers must stand over for another number.

W. P. A.

It is positively overpowering, the attention which some of us have been receiving. At least three men whom we know of have received invitations to champagne dinners, provided they should get through in everything. Will they get the dinner? Alas! let us draw the curtain upon the harrowing scene.