

Italy and other personages Signor Barucco exhibited his skill as a painter of portraits, and Mr. Rémi van Haanen, with his landscapes of the English Lake district, of the shores of Lake Constance, near Bregenz, and of a mountain scene in the Carpathian province of Zips, including the ruined Castle of Käismark, showed himself not less a master in oils than in the admirable water-colours which he exhibited last season. Of sculpture there was but one example; it was, however, a good one, by Joseph Durham,—a life-size portrait statue of a boy (Basil E. Lawrence), represented in a reclining posture, with a cricket-bat under his arm, waiting for his innings. Perhaps it will interest sculptors to know that among the geological specimens exhibited there were some blocks of marble from Newfoundland, which, in texture and colour, have been pronounced by competent judges as equal to Carrara.

A novel feature in the proceedings of the evening was the explanation, by Mr. J. F. Bateman, of his project for supplying London with water from great reservoirs high up on the slopes of Plinlimmon and Cader Idris. It was listened to with marked attention by the Prince of Wales and a large number of the visitors who had assembled in the spacious meeting-room of the Royal Society; but as we have recently given an account of the whole scheme (*Athen.* No. 1997), we need not do more than state here that Mr. Bateman had hung on the walls maps, plans and sections showing the whole route, and some of the details of the proposed aqueduct, together with excellent photographs of various modern waterworks, ancient aqueducts, and a singularly instructive map showing the extent and growth of London in 1658, 1745, 1818, 1834 and 1866. The rapid increase of late years will ere long imperatively necessitate a corresponding increase in the water-supply.

ART-UNIONS.

Lord Robert Montagu's Committee will have, as we have said, an opportunity of considering how far Sir Robert Peel's assertion, that Art-Unions are wrong in principle, and unserviceable to good Art, is sustained by facts. We have had some experience. The London Art-Union has been in existence thirty years; and its subscriptions have amounted to 326,000*l.* We have high-class Unions and low-class Unions. We have guinea subscribers and shilling subscribers,—all doing a little private gambling for prints and busts; and all affecting an air of patronage which artists would indignantly refuse. What have been the results? That during these past thirty years Art has made a certain progress among us,—particularly Manufacturing Art,—no one will deny; but no man with true knowledge of the facts will attribute any part of this improvement to the Art-Unions. It has been the consequence of a gradual movement of ideas, of which the House of Commons has been no more than an intelligent witness and interpreter. See what the nation—as represented by its Chancellors of the Exchequer—has done for Art during the past twenty years. In 1846 the amount voted by Parliament for purposes connected with the Fine Arts was—

Schools of Design	£5,381
National Gallery	3,290
	—
	£8,771

In 1861 the amount voted for the same object was—

Science and Art Department ..	£77,415
National Gallery	11,670
Sollykoff Collection	3,600
Drawings by Old Masters	2,500
	—
	94,585
	8,771

Increase £85,814

Last year the total sum voted by Parliament for these purposes was upwards of 190,000*l.*; being more than twenty times the amount appropriated in 1846.

Here are the true grounds for the large prosperity of artists in the recent past, 190,000*l.* in one year! What other nation spends so much public money on Art? Since Art-Unions were established, the Vernon, Shepshanks, Turner, Bell,

and other collections of modern Art have been added to the great treasures of the nation. It is true that these collections are almost entirely gifts to the nation; it is also true that the nation had already inspired the donors with a confidence in its taste and wisdom. The State has also taken charge of erecting buildings for their reception, and of defraying the expense of their exhibition.

The number of pictures and works of art exhibited in the public galleries in London in the past year (1865) was about 7,000. What portion of these works were bought by the Art-Unions? A very near answer may be given. The number purchased on account of the London and Glasgow Art-Unions (the only two of these Associations which made purchases of any great extent) may be estimated at 200. What is this number among so many? If the best works were purchased, it would be something. But the truth is notoriously the other way. 200 is a small fraction of 7,000. Why, there are some six or eight private dealers in London whose collections are of far higher character and value than the works which have hitherto been purchased through the instrumentality of Art-Unions. The only people who benefit by these Unions are the picture-frame makers.

As regards the "encouragement of the highest Art," which was originally intended to be one of the most prominent objects of Art-Unions, it is only necessary, in order to show how far this object has been attained, or even attempted, to point out that this year the London Art-Union, with a subscription list of 11,743*l.*, gave only three prizes of a value exceeding 100*l.* each, the values of each prize being respectively one of 200*l.*, two of 150*l.* What sort of high-class picture can you buy in the open market for 150*l.*? A Faed, a Ward, a Frith, cannot be obtained under 700*l.* or 800*l.* But this is only in the highest region.

During the same year the average value of each picture prize was little over 32*l.* 10*s.*; and this may be estimated as a close general average of the ordinary value of the paintings distributed by the London Art-Union. This amount may be considered higher than the usual average value of the paintings obtained through other guinea Art-Unions. In the provincial Art-Unions the prizes average from 8*l.* to 15*l.*; but these Art-Unions have mostly 1*s.* shares, and the purchases are usually made from local Exhibitions, in which the field of selection is much smaller than that open to the Metropolitan Associations. These pictures, together with an occasional bronze cast, medal, a Parian statuette, or an engraving, form the prizes which, generally speaking, are the means by which the Art-Unions profess to accomplish the mission which they have assumed of encouraging Art in every branch, "especially the highest." It is obvious that the result is mediocre as regards the paintings, and positively inferior in other respects, whilst the engravings which are annually distributed with a view to develop that branch of Art, are generally in every way inferior to engravings which are issued through the ordinary channels of publication. The same truth must be stated with regard to the bronzes and Parian statuettes, which are not only brought out finer in character, but in greater variety, by the manufacturers of those articles. In fact, in such respects the contributions of the Art-Unions to the Art-Fund of the country are absolutely paltry, inferior in every respect to the articles which are supplied to the public through the ordinary medium of trade; whilst in many instances the objects selected have been actually published by the trade, and Art-Unions have been used as the means of getting rid of chromo-lithographs, and even photographs, which are to be had at all times through the ordinary channels of commerce. Sir Robert Peel's principle has met with a triumphant vindication.

Art has realized far more, standing on its own merits, than from the artificial encouragement afforded to it by the Art-Unions. The Committee on Arts of 1836 remarked in their Report that "it seems probable that the principle of free competition in Art, as in commerce, will ultimately triumph over all artificial institutions." This was, in fact, Sir Robert Peel's position.

As regards the social effect of Art-Unions, their

tendency is to encourage that propensity for gambling which it was the object of the Lottery Act to discourage. This is particularly attested by the rapid increase of shilling Art-Unions. The guinea Art-Unions make hardly any progress; for example, in 1848 the subscriptions to the London Art-Unions amounted to 12,857*l.*, whilst during the past season the amount was 11,743*l.*; the highest year's subscription having once only, in 1847, reached 17,871*l.* It is unquestionable that in many instances the right to choose a prize is bartered for a sum of money much less in value. The winner wants his stake, like any other gambler; he does not want a picture. Is that sort of transaction to be encouraged by the Legislature?

ORDNANCE MAP OF ENGLAND.

Brookwood Park, Alresford, April 28, 1866.

I beg one word more in reference to Sir Henry James's letter under this heading. Sir Henry to justify himself for calling the Weald Hill a valley, "refers" me "to Chap. XIX. of Lyell's 'Manual of Elementary Geology,'" by which I presume he means the sixth edition (1865) of Lyell's 'Elements of Geology.' I have referred to this chapter, and I find that Lyell gives (page 357, figure 357), "A section of the country from the confines of the basin of London to that of Hants with the principal heights† above the level of the sea on a true scale." This scale represents the Weald as what it is, a hill. And over this hill Lyell writes, "Anticlinal axis of the Weald. Crowborough Hill 804 feet." Which description in words *sounds* as much like a hill as the engraved section *looks* like one. In accounting for the denudation of this hill Lyell emphatically protests against debacle or "sudden diluvial rush of waters" or "transient and sudden agency." While among every species of theory, each contradicting the other, he does entertain the idea (page 372) that "the transverse valleys (of the hill, mind) may have originated at a very remote era by *fluvial erosion*." It is true that Lyell gives this "rain and river" theory to Mr. Jukes instead of to me. But what does Mr. Jukes himself say? In his excellent 'School Manual of Geology,' 1863, page 112, he says, "This chapter had been sent to the printer's some time before I became acquainted with an excellent little work called 'Rain and Rivers,' published in 1857, by Col. George Greenwood, in which the atmospheric origin of all river-valleys is advocated in the clearest and most convincing style. I would beg leave to recommend it to the perusal of all geologists."

GEORGE GREENWOOD, Col.

Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton,
May 1, 1866.

With my letter of the 16th of April before him, in which I wrote of the rhinoceroses found in the Arctic regions, I hardly expected to have been taken to task by Col. Greenwood for the slip of the pen I made in a previous letter, when I wrote rhinoceri. Prof. Owen always writes rhinoceroses; and I have been led to believe that the plural of os was oses; but I am not crochety about names, and have no objection to ocerotes, and hope those interesting youths we meet on race-courses will adopt this mode of spelling in their "correct cards of the running ocerotes."

As regards the woolly covering of the elephants being a proof that they "could not live in a warm climate," I suppose I must take this correction also, and hold henceforth that every bear or buffalo found in a warm climate has no more business to be there, if they have any regard for their health, than a hippopotamus has to be in the Arctic sea.

The passages for rivers through the escarpment of the chalk of the Weald valley were not formed by as many evagations of the poles as there are passages; but, to use the words of Elie de Beaumont, "d'un seul jet, et, pour ainsi dire, d'un seul coup," in the manner—to use a homely illustration—that fissures are made round a pellet of bread at one squeeze.

"Romney Marsh must have been growing ever

† The heights in my last letter were taken from the Physical Map of England, published by the National Society. They are apparently incorrect.

since the time of the Romans." Yes; and as certain as there is virtue in good old port, there were many good old ports where the marsh now is many thousands of years before the time of the Romans.

But what Col. Greenwood's verbal criticisms, or the ships or sheep of Romney Marsh have to do with any geological theory, is still an enigma to me.

HENRY JAMES, Col. R.E.

A QUESTION FOR THE DUBLIN EXHIBITION COMMITTEE.

Rome, April 21, 1866.

A Roman artist, who exhibited in Dublin last year, complains of a gross liberty which was taken with one of his statues in that city. Without assuming any responsibility for this statement, I send it translated from his own words:—

"The sculptor Antonio Bisetti, one of the exhibitors from Rome at the International Exhibition of Dublin, immediately on the removal from its case of the statue of 'Trust in God,' standing in height 0·980 m., discovered traces of clay (*creta*) on the entire figure, which evidently proved that a cast of it had been taken, in order to obtain models in plaster, or in other materials. The sculptor, however, in order to assure himself better of the fact, caused the statue to be examined by two distinguished *formatori* of Rome, the Signori Malpieri, and both declared that on this statue they found traces of a model (*calco*) made in white clay. In consequence of such proofs of the fact, the author declares that in sending his statue to the International Exhibition of Dublin he never intended, nor does he now intend, to renounce the right of property in his work. Wherefore he is much surprised at seeing it returned unsold, and with the evident proofs that some amateur has appropriated it to himself without the inconvenience of many years' study to create it, and without incurring the expense either of its execution or transport.—Rome, April 17, 1866. Studio, Vicolo del Vantaggio, 45, 46."

The charge is a very grave one, and deserves to be thoroughly examined, not merely for the honour of our country, but for the security of future contributors to International Exhibitions.

H. W.

SHAKSPEARE'S SONNETS AND HIS PRIVATE FRIENDS.

April 30, 1866.

It would be exceedingly unjust to my theory of Shakspeare's Sonnets for it to be saddled with all the difficulties that may arise at first sight in the minds of readers. You say that I do not feel your difficulties, and I pronounce on my subject with an "enviable confidence." I have lived face to face mentally with this mystery of the Sonnets for three years, and have studied their difficulties in every light, inner or outer, that has touched the darkness for me or others. Familiarity has made less formidable some of the obstacles that looked large at a distance. But one or two of the difficulties out of which you see "no issue" are quite imaginary, as I trust you will permit me to explain.

You have taken my version of "Elizabeth Vernon's jealousy" altogether too seriously. I have nowhere implied that Southampton was *really* in love with Lady Rich, nor that she was "old enough to be his mother," for the difference in their ages was just ten years. I have nowhere said that he "approached her with any speech of love," or any "avowal of guilty love, so openly as to have caused a family and public scandal," or that Southampton had done this and then asked Shakspeare "to endow his sin with poetic life." I should have been very shallow to have suggested anything so absurd. I have said on p. 224 there was only matter enough in this "jealousy" to supply one of the subjects for Shakspeare's Sonnets among his "private friends." I have treated it all through as only a case of suspicion, natural and pardonable, on the part of Elizabeth Vernon, considering the fascinating influence of her cousin; and I state that the most desperate Sonnet of all (cxliv) was only tragic in terms, and expresses nothing more than a doubt after all. Nor do I say that Southampton set the poet writing this group.

According to Sonnet xxxviii, I find that Southampton is about to supply his "own sweet argument" for future Sonnets, and give "invention light." Now if the Earl is going to supply his own argument in his own way, as the Sonnet says, the result cannot be personal to Shakspeare. This, you know, is one of my arguments for the dramatic theory! This new argument of the Earl's is also

too excellent

For every vulgar paper to rehearse.

That is, according to my view, our poet is to write in a book provided for the purpose and no longer commit his Sonnets to common writing paper.

This book I trace through Sonnets lxxvii (where the poet is writing in it) and cxvii (in which Southampton has given it away). This Sonnet (cxvii) shows me that the book was a gift from Elizabeth Vernon to the Earl, and had been devoted to *retain* her image, and was a sort of log-book of their love; "*talties*," the speaker calls it. Well then, if the book was a present from Elizabeth Vernon to Southampton, and he supplied his own "sweet argument," I see no great difficulty in supposing that the lady may also have given a subject to the poet and supplied her own argument. Not that the subject in this case was matter of public scandal. I cannot charge the Earl with any guilty love for Lady Rich when I hold him in Sonnet cxx to tell his mistress that she wronged him by her unjust suspicions in this particular affair of the "jealousy." But I see no difficulty in supposing Shakspeare may have cautioned and pleaded with Southampton and "pitched into" him, dramatically, when I find that he has done the same things directly in the Personal Sonnets. One of two things: either the story told in this group of Sonnets is personal to Shakspeare or it is not. If it be a woman speaker, and that it is so there is abundant proof, it cannot be the corrupt married man supposed, therefore it cannot be Shakspeare. The old story is opposed by every Personal Sonnet of the long series. My new version, when rightly apprehended, has every argument in its favour. I think it a far less difficulty to believe that our poet wrote this group, as I say, with his powers at play than that he was the vile sinner assumed who wrote a dark and damning story in grim earnest. Anyway, the world has now a choice of beliefs on the subject. In studying the Sonnets we have especially to guard against bringing in the "public" as an element in the matter. Shakspeare's only public for his Sonnets was these private friends. Also I have tried (p. 269) to guard against the Dramatic Sonnets being treated too seriously by saying that the "personal rendering has deepened and darkened the impression of things which, when applied to the Earl and his Mistress, do not mean much, and are merely matter for a Sonnet, not for the saddest of all Shakspearean tragedies."

Again, with regard to my interpretation of the latter Sonnets, you say, before accepting the passion of William Herbert as a key to them, "we must convince ourselves that Shakspeare lent himself to its glorification; not in his youth and in the time of his poverty, but in his ripest years and after he had become a gentleman at Stratford." Here are two most important errors.† Why, I have dated the Herbert Sonnets for the year 1599, and have stated, at p. 590, that they may have been partly written in 1598. Sonnet cxxxviii certainly appeared in 1599, printed in the 'Passionate Pilgrim.' And so far from my holding that our Poet wrote for the "glorification" of Herbert's passion, I have expressly said (p. 344) that Shakspeare has imaged the Lady Rich "not as an object of worship, but for the purpose of disparagement and deprecation." And at p. 336 my account of the matter is, that "the Poet enters into the humour of the thing so far as to laugh at the disparity of their ages (when Sonnet cxxxviii was first printed Lady Rich was thirty-six and Herbert in his twentieth year). He rallies his friend on the absurdity of his passion; fights all he may against his infatuation; renders with all possible plainness the lady's well-known character, and once or twice

† Where? In 1599 Shakspeare was thirty-five years old; he had been married seventeen years; he had a daughter of sixteen; he had already bought New Place at Stratford.—Ed.

grows very serious on the subject, and, as in Sonnets cxxix and clxvi, administers a tonic to the frantic innamorata, wraps up and gilds in the gold-leaf of the poetry." Here also we have our choice of beliefs. Either Shakspeare wrote the Sonnets for himself or for some one else whose name was "Will." And, as the old Scottish servant reminded the laird who dashed his wig out of the coach-window, "that there was no a wall o' wigs on Russiemuir" I would remind you that there is no great choice of "Wills." Either Shakspeare was so far guilty of writing these Sonnets for "Will" Herbert, or he was doubly and trebly guilty of writing them on an "abominable love" of his own. I much prefer my own horn of the dilemma to the one apparently chosen by yourself. I am sure that all the evidence of character, of the speaker's age, of the whole internal proof and outer circumstance, is overwhelmingly in favour of my interpretation, which is infinitely less dishonouring to Shakspeare than is the reading hitherto accepted.

GERALD MASSEY.

OUR WEEKLY GOSSIP.

At the meeting of the Royal Society, on Thursday last, the list of selected candidates, recommended by the Council for election into the Society, was read. The names are as follows:—J. C. Bucknill, M.D., Rev. F. W. Farrar, W. A. Guy, M.B., J. Hector, M.D., J. W. Kaye, Hugo Müller, Ph.D., C. Murchison, M.D., W. H. Perkin, The Ven. Archdeacon Pratt, Capt. G. H. Richards, R.N., T. Richardson, W. H. L. Russell, Rev. Dr. Selwyn, Rev. R. Townsend, and H. Watts, B.A. Three of the fifteen are mathematicians, four are of the medical profession, and three are chemists. Dr. Hector is Director of the Geological Survey in New Zealand, and Archdeacon Pratt resides at Calcutta. The election is fixed for the 7th of June.

The appearance of Mr. Darwin at General Sabine's evening reception on Saturday last was an incident that should be made a note of by his friends, who will rejoice in the recovery of the eminent naturalist from the state of pain and weakness with which he has long been afflicted. We unite with them in wishing that the recovery may be permanent.

Mr. Dion Bouicault has submitted a statement to the Foreign Office, calling on the Government to make certain alterations in our copyright convention with France, with a view to the better protection of French dramatic authors against the piracy of their works in England. Mr. Bouicault should lay his statement before the public.

Among the welcome books of the season will be Lord De Ros's 'Memorials of the Tower of London,' a subject of the greatest interest, which has, however, been very much neglected by antiquaries and historians. Bailey's book, though very pretentious, is exceedingly poor.

The Marquess Camden presided at the Annual Meeting of the Camden Society on Wednesday, when E. Foss, Esq., S. R. Gardiner, Esq., and M. Van de Weyer (the Belgian Minister) were elected on the Council for the next year. The Report announced that two books would be immediately delivered to the members, namely, 'Letters illustrative of the Relations between England and Germany at the Commencement of the Thirty Years' War,' edited by Mr. Gardiner, and 'The Registry of the Priory of St. Mary's, Worcester,' edited by the Venerable Archdeacon Hale. The Camden has, it appears, joined the Early English Text Society in a scheme for the publication of two interesting early dictionaries—Levins's 'Manipulus Vocabulorum,' and 'The Catholicon,' a work which is understood to be of equal, if not greater interest than the 'Promptorium,' of which latter work, by-the-by, the report announces that a small extra edition has been printed for the use of scholars who are not members of the Camden Society. We were glad to learn, too, that the question of literary searches at the Court of Probate and District Registries still engages the attention of the Council, and has the favourable consideration of Sir James Wilde.

‡ We have not chosen this horn; and we refuse to be impaled upon it.—Ed.