

pockets of the Hispano-Americans in the name of their patriotism.

THE ENGLISH EXCHEQUER OF THE JEWS.

A LEARNED and interesting lecture on "The Exchequer of the Jews of England," which Dr. Charles Gross, a young American scholar, delivered in London last June, is published from the office of the (London) *Jewish Chronicle*. The Exchequer of the Jews was a branch of the great Exchequer of England, and was wholly devoted to the affairs of the Jews. It is referred to by Green, who mentions that Richard I. organized a mixed court of Jews and Christians for the registration of their contracts; and by Hume, who says that the revenue arising from exactions upon the Jews was so considerable that there was a particular court of exchequer set apart for managing it. Not quite so scant a notice may be found in an elaborate treatise on the modern history of the Jews, contributed in 1850 by Selig Cassel to Ersch and Gruber's 'Encyklopädie' (section 2, vol. xxvii, p. 117).

Dr. Gross derives his materials at first hand from researches in the Public Record Office, and even one of his printed authorities, Prynne's 'Demurrer,' is not mentioned at all by the writers named above. He is thus able to present many details which are not otherwise easily accessible, and which are full of interest to the student of history. He is led by his investigations to infer that the Jewish Exchequer was not established until nearly the end of the twelfth century, which would limit its existence to a hundred years, as the Jews were expelled from England in 1290, and were not permitted to return until the time of Cromwell. The position of the Jews in England in the Middle Ages was much the same as on the Continent. They had no legal status. As Green says, they were simply the king's chattels, and their lives and goods were at the king's mercy. Dr. Gross makes the surprising statement that the kings of England possessed greater power in this regard than the rulers of France and Germany. We read in Hallam that the policy of the kings of France was to employ the Jews as a sponge to suck their subjects' money, which they might afterwards express with less odium than direct taxation would incur. In like manner the German emperors, particularly Louis the Bavarian, and Charles IV., in public rescripts expressly declared that the lives and property of the Jews were theirs, to dispose of as to them seemed good. Any pretext was good enough to justify this pretension; but, however the pretexts may have varied in various countries, the practice was everywhere the same. The actual fact was, that the Jews needed the royal protection from indiscriminate spoliation, and had to accept the comparatively discriminating spoliation of the kings as the lesser of two evils. Whatever little was thus left to them was so much clear gain.

Although they were grievously oppressed and robbed, there was occasionally a monarch who took a little pity on their distress and showed that he felt some slight qualms of conscience. Hume relates that in 1255 the Jews, worn out with their sufferings, besought Henry III. for permission to retire with their effects out of the kingdom. The King replied, "How can I remedy the oppressions you complain of? I am myself a beggar. I owe above 200,000 marks; and if I had said 300,000, I should not exceed the truth; I am obliged to pay my son, Prince Edward, 15,000 marks a year; I have not a farthing, and I must have money, no matter where

it comes from or how." He then sold the Jews to his brother Richard, Earl of Cornwall, in order, as Matthew of Paris says, that those whom the one brother had flayed the other might embowel. It is gratifying to know that Richard took compassion on their poverty.

The Exchequer of the Jews was an ingenious device for enabling the kings of England to levy contributions upon the property of the Jews. Its principal officials were stationed at Westminster, and were known as "Justices of the Jews," or "Wardens of the Jews." They varied in number from two to five. They were barons of the Exchequer, and were appointed by the king. There were also subordinate officers, such as a keeper of the rolls and writs, an escheator, and clerks. The "Presbyter of all the Jews of England," who seems to have held his office for life, was also an officer of the Jewish Exchequer. Dr. Gross conjectures that he scrutinized and verified doubtful Hebrew contracts, and would be appealed to by the Justices for information concerning disputed points of Jewish usage. All contracts between Jews and Christians had to be made in writing in the presence of two Jews, two Christians, (these being the four chirographers), two scribes and two clerks. The charters or acknowledgments of debt were in the form of a chirograph, *i. e.*, two duplicate deeds written upon one membrane, afterwards severed into two parts along an indented line, dividing horizontally the word *chirographum*. The part with the seal of the debtor remained in the hands of the Jew; the counterpart was deposited in the common chest or ark, which had three locks, the two Christians keeping one key, the two Jews a second, and the two clerks a third. There were also three seals distributed in like manner. When the debt was paid, the Jew wrote out a release or quitclaim, on presenting which to the custodian of the chest the debtor received the counter-chirograph duly cancelled. If the counter-foil of an obligation was not deposited in a chest of the chirograph, the Jew could not lawfully claim the money due him; if he released the debtor privily, *i. e.*, without giving notice to the chirographers or to the Justices of the Jews, the debtor could be called upon to pay a second time. In order to sell or transfer a debt, it was necessary for the Jews to secure permission from the King.

It will be seen that this system has some resemblance to our present system of recording deeds and mortgages and satisfactions of mortgages; and it may be that it was originally designed to serve a similar purpose, and to prevent Jewish creditors from claiming more than was justly due them, or Christians from evading the payment of their just debts. So far as it performed this function it was perhaps beneficial to both parties, and particularly to the Jews. But it developed two other very important functions: it enabled the kings to gauge the wealth of the Jews, and, secondly, to collect the contributions which they did not pay willingly.

The chief source of crown revenue from the Jewry consisted of tallages, which were arbitrary taxes levied at the pleasure of the king, and sometimes amounted to enormous sums. It is generally said that King John once wrested from the Jews a sum equal to a year's revenue of his realm. If any one refused to pay his tallage, or perhaps only the last instalment of it, it was the custom of the Exchequer functionaries to confiscate the debts that were due him. When a tallage was contemplated, delegates of the Exchequer went to the various towns where chests of chirographs were kept, and made an inventory of all the obligations found therein, which were

afterwards entered in the rolls of the Justices of the Jews. Occasionally even the chests themselves were brought to Westminster. These lists served to give the King a clue as to the tallageability of the Jews, and afforded him a means of compensation in case they did not pay the impost. The chirographs of confiscated debts were sent from the local chests to Westminster, where the debtors came to liquidate them and to secure the cancelled obligation. A similar proceeding is not entirely unknown to a generation still upon the stage. In 1860 the Confederate States Government declared all debts due by Southern merchants to their Northern creditors confiscated, and called upon the debtors to pay the money into the public treasury, thus taking a leaf out of the book of the English kings of the thirteenth century.

Besides its fiscal functions, the Jewish Exchequer was the court that tried all civil and criminal actions in which a Jew was concerned. Its jurisdiction was exclusive, other courts being warned not to interfere with pleas belonging to the Justices of the Jews. Dr. Gross declares that on the whole it redounded to their benefit, and was the agis of Israel against excessive popular and baronial violence. It accorded them more justice than they could have expected from the local civil and ecclesiastical courts. On the other hand, he says (and his view seems a correct one) that the constant confiscations by the Royal Exchequer of debts due to the Jews added greatly to the hatred of the Jews that culminated in their expulsion. It seems very likely, indeed, that the great barons who owed money to the Jews, much preferred to deal with a class of creditors whom they could browbeat or cajole by turns, and placate by a payment on account, rather than face the monarch whose need of money was pressing, and who had the means of enforcing his demands. In Magna Charta, King John agreed that, if a debt should happen to fall into his hands, he would not take more than the property pledged in payment of the debt. In 1257 the petition of the barons prays Henry III. to remedy the grievance that the lands of wards, pledged to the Jews for debts, fall into the hands of the great men of the realm, who will not give them up again, even when payment of the debts is offered.

Dr. Gross concludes with an appeal to the Jews of England to give to the world the still unpublished records of their past by printing a selected portion of the rolls of parchments in the Public Record Office containing the memoranda and transactions of the Justices of the Jews. Of these there are some 122 rolls, consisting of about 720 membranes, of which the average size is about two feet long and eight inches wide. His testimony to their great value as affording material for Anglo-Jewish history will be readily accepted by his readers, and it is to be hoped that his suggestion will be followed up. If an occasion of this kind presented itself to the public-spirited and wealthy Jews of New York, it would be improved without delay.

THE PAPAL RESCRIPT.

DUBLIN, May 11, 1888.

FOR many months it has been felt that some definite expression of opinion on Irish affairs was impending from the Vatican. British influence was evidently being exercised to this end. Few, however, were prepared for the rescript that has reached us, containing such a complete condemnation of the Plan of Campaign and boycotting, untempered by any expression of sympathy, which would have seemed so natural,

towards the Irish movement in its general drift and character. So momentous a step was not taken without full consideration. Monsignor Persico, on whose impressions the rescript was probably formulated, was in Ireland for some time; he associated with all classes, consulted men of every shade of opinion, and, I believe, made every effort to arrive at fair conclusions. Yet, if we are to judge by the rescript, he has not grasped the salient points of the situation, a failure which would not be surprising in any stranger after a few months of personal inquiry into the affairs of any country. A bare condemnation of some of the means used to advance the cause is a poor result of studying the enigmatical Irish question by an authority so deeply interested in its solution as the Vatican. This is but another, added to the innumerable instances that might be cited, of the mistakes made in supposing that difficult political and social problems can be best studied on the spot. Carried away by individual cases and experiences, the inquirer loses sight of those general principles and considerations which afford the only clue to a just estimate. Prof. Cairnes's conclusions regarding the principles really at stake in your war of the Rebellion, arrived at in the seclusion of Trinity College, Dublin, after consulting those who had devoted their attention to American affairs, and studying writers and thinkers on both sides, were far more correct than they would have been if derived from a brief sojourn at the seat of war.

The rescript virtually requires the Irish people to surrender at discretion. The Plan of Campaign might be abandoned—it never had Mr. Parnell's full approval, and has always been somewhat doubtfully accepted by thoughtful men; but to receive into Christian fellowship those "who in the exercise of their right take vacant farms," and those who support the Government in the present conflict, would be to abandon the very key of the position. That Monsignor Persico should arrive at any other conclusion was not likely. The envoy is an ecclesiastic. The Vatican regards everything from an ecclesiastical point of view. Men and nations are important to it only in so far as they affect the supremacy of the Church. Leaving his own country covered with the wrecks of suppressed monastic institutions, a country where ecclesiastics are fettered in many ways; where, if we are to judge by such books as Garibaldi's 'Memorie,' hatred of his order has deeply penetrated large classes in the community—Monsignor Persico comes to Ireland to be fêted by high and low; to find the progress of that order entirely unimpeded; to see splendid monastic institutions rising on all hands; to find industrial and reformatory establishments managed by ecclesiastics enjoying large and increasing Government grants, practically uncontrolled in their application; to find the Government, the representatives of the class in England hitherto most opposed to Catholicism, ready to promise anything if only agrarian and political turmoil were subdued; to find also the Irish people as Catholic as possible, and Catholicism in the dominant country—largely through the influence of men like Cardinals Newman and Manning—more respected than ever before since the Reformation. Perceiving all this, could he conclude otherwise than that a cessation of the present struggle would be desirable?

Probably neither he nor the Vatican was prepared for the spirit in which the rescript has been received. The bishops have not yet spoken, but, whatever attitude they take up, can hardly materially influence the situation. The Unionists have performed a complete volte-face regarding the Papal supremacy. "I am

beginning to think that we Protestant home-rulers are the only Protestants left in Ireland," writes an Episcopal clergyman from the south. "Where am I at all?" said another of the same cloth in my hearing. "Am I a Catholic or am I a Protestant? Where am I to go to seek spiritual consolation—to Rome, to my Primate, or to the Presbyterians? I wonder could the Quakers give me any?" A portrait of his Holiness is advertised as exhibited by the chief Conservative print-seller in town. A Unionist comic paper has a cartoon this week in which Erin is depicted taking refuge on a chair from a swarm of cockroaches, "Dillon," "Davitt," "Parnell," "Gladstone," "Home Rule," etc., while his Holiness as St. Patrick, an aureole round his head, deluges them with scalding "Pope's decree vermin-killer," and comforts her with the words: "Have patience, Erin, and I will rid you of the wretched vermin."

On the other hand, the Catholic representatives of public opinion meet the rescript in a spirit of most determined opposition, which, in any other cause, would have the sympathy of all Protestants, supposed lovers of liberty and independence. The *Freeman's Journal*, after an elaborate inquiry into "What the decree really is," concludes that it is binding only in so far as the supposed facts on which it is based are true; that the Plan of Campaign is condemned by the rescript only where the rent objected to "has been fixed by mutual consent," and where the law courts have afforded an opportunity of their being fixed "within the limits of equity"; and that boycotting is unjustifiable only where it has proved "a new form of persecution and proscription, ruthlessly put in force against persons who are satisfied with, and are prepared to pay, the rent agreed on with their landlord." *United Ireland* is more emphatic:

"Their position [that of the Irish people] now is simple. They will regard this pronouncement of the Fathers of the Inquisition as a pious opinion founded upon grotesquely fallacious premises, and draw a salutary warning from it of the dangers of coming to conclusions upon imperfect and misleading information. . . . This circular will pass, like the one six years ago [that culminated in vain against the testimonial to Mr. Parnell], without making more than a momentary ripple on the consciences of the Irish people, and yet without impairing in the faintest degree their respect for the authority and wisdom of the princes of the Church."

The last reservation is as puzzling to some Protestant minds as are the sentiments with which the paper begins the consideration of the subject:

"Divine it [the Church] is, and perfect, informed with the Wisdom and the Spirit of its Founder, the Rock of Ages, the Lamp of Truth, the Refuge and the Ark of fallen human kind. The Church never makes mistakes; its human engineers sometimes do. The Divine Inspiration cannot err; the clerks, the secretaries, the dignitaries, the individual human beings who man its bureaus, can err just as freely as any other men."

John Dillon is clearer:

"It does seem to me a curious thing that one of the great grounds on which we decline—and I think justly decline—to be ruled from Westminster is that we object, as every people in the world who have ever tasted of liberty, or who have any self-respect, object, to be ruled by men in temporal concerns who don't understand the circumstances under which they live. And are we to be told that while we struggle and make sacrifices, and have maintained for years the desperate strife against a foreign rule at Westminster, we are to submit or accept the foreign rule of a number of Italians in Rome, no matter how holy they may be? It is a monstrous doctrine; it is a doctrine which, I venture to say, the authorities in Rome will never attempt to maintain, and which, if they did attempt to maintain to-morrow, the Irish race would stand up like one man and refuse to sub-

mit to it. No, the Irish people have shown, as I contend, in the face of almost unparalleled difficulties and sufferings and dangers, that the sacred cause of liberty is as dear to them at least as to any other race of men who inhabit this earth. They have shown that they will submit to no foreign domination on the soil of Ireland. And while we have shown in the past, and shall show in the future, a devotion to the Head of the Church in whose doctrines we have been reared, and our fathers before us, which will compare favorably with the devotion of any of the great Powers of Europe, or of our friends the English Catholics, we will show also, I trust and believe, that we know what liberty means, and we know how to draw the distinction between devoted obedience to the Church in spiritual matters and absolute independence of everybody except the Irish people in temporal matters. . . . The people of Ireland would be idiots if they dropped these weapons. No one who has not lived among the people of Ireland, no one who has not Irish blood in his veins, and who has not been born and bred up among the circumstances in which we are placed, is fit to judge of the policy which the Irish people should follow and adopt."

These, and similar pronouncements from other leading Catholic speakers, have been received with vociferous applause by the assemblages addressed. They show the spirit in which the rescript will probably be regarded by the Irish people in the main, while there are, of course, many Catholics outside or on the borders of the National ranks inclined to say, "We told you so," and who will accept it much more literally and obediently. On the whole, the incident will be beneficial. William O'Brien and John Dillon meant only what was right and just in promulgating the Plan of Campaign; as worked by them directly it was used only in cases where a desperate remedy was needed for a desperate position. But the promulgation established a dangerous principle, and conduced to aggravate the tendency, already too rife here, to harry all landlords, good and bad, and to render as difficult as possible the collection of all rents, however moderate. So with boycotting. There is every difference between the social ostracism of those who take farms from which have been evicted tenants willing to pay just rent, and "boycotting" as practised in Kerry, where harmless men are shot down in the midst of their agonized families by cold-blooded ruffians, and where those who have helped in the slightest degree to convict the criminals are shunned like lepers. The rescript will compel the people at large to consider their ways more narrowly than they have heretofore done, and will prevent the clergy from following too blindly and invariably the prejudices and passions of their flocks. Moreover, it will further the cause of Home Rule in England, by tending to dissociate from it the idea of Rome rule. In the interests of liberty and independence of judgment all the world over, it will have good effects. While not rendering the Irish less Catholic in all that is best in Catholicism, it must help to undermine their theoretically implicit submission to the Vatican as a power in the ordinary affairs of life. John Dillon's indignant denunciation of foreign domination cannot be taken to apply only within the four seas of Ireland.

Seldom were the Irish people calmer, more resolute and determined than they now are. Their national cause has shed much that was base, and is being urged upon a distinctly higher plane, which facilitates its being further joined and influenced by the noblest and purest minds in the United Kingdom. This tendency was strikingly illustrated by the proceedings at the Eighty Club the other evening, and especially by Mr. Parnell's speech. D. B.

—Since the foregoing was written, a letter

has appeared from Archbishop Walsh, the most responsible Irish ecclesiastical politician. It is dated from Rome last Monday. In it he says (the italics are his own):

"The Irish people, whether at home or abroad, will, I trust, accept my assurance that neither the Nationalist movement nor the National League is in the smallest degree injuriously affected by the recent decree. Beyond this I do not wish to go. As no one would be justified in supposing that the Irish cause is even indirectly censured by the recent act of the Holy See, so neither should we be justified in asserting that the Holy See was influenced in it by a desire to hasten on the triumph of our great constitutional movement. *But that this will be the necessary result of what has taken place, I, for my part, have not the shadow of a doubt.*"

THE NEW GALLERY.

LONDON, May 11.

THE opening of the New Gallery on the 8th inst. by invitation to a very crowded private view, and on the 9th to the general public, has been anxiously expected by artists and lovers of art as an event of the greatest importance. All doubts and fears as to the success of this undertaking are now at rest, and have given place to the unlimited satisfaction of artists, critics, and society in general.

All praise is due to Messrs. Hallé and Comyns Carr, the directors, who, in the incredibly short space of three months, have erected the most delightful picture gallery we have yet seen in London, and they are to be congratulated on their courage in carrying on their work in the face of so many difficulties and doubts and such half-hearted support from many of the artists themselves. It is true that they had the entire sympathy of Burne-Jones, Watts, and Alma-Tadema, and the certainty of their sending all the work they could have ready and could dispose of to the new exhibition, although the latter two were under the obligation to send to the Academy also. J. E. Millais, Holman Hunt, W. B. Richmond, A. Parsons, Onslow Ford, Giovanni Costa, M. R. Corbett, H. Herkomer, and A. Legros also promised pictures, although they determined at the same time to give some of their work to the Grosvenor and to the Royal Academy. It was feared by the pusillanimous that the three exhibitions could not flourish at the same time, and that to compete with the well-established Grosvenor Gallery would be more than rash. Perhaps under better management the Grosvenor might have been a formidable rival, but now that the three exhibitions are open, the artists who chose to remain faithful to Sir Coutts Lindsay are very indignant at the want of courtesy and discrimination shown them in the hanging of their works, and also at the exclusion of certain pictures at the last minute which had been personally chosen and solicited by the director himself. Complaints are very general on those grounds, and not a little surprise is expressed at the lack of management and of common politeness, in such strong contrast with the treatment received in former years.

The entrance of the New Gallery is in Regent Street through a narrow passage (which we hear is to be converted into a more appropriate entrance), to a beautiful marble hall of *giallo antico*, round which runs a gallery supported by columns of cipollino marble; a fountain plays in the centre, and shrubs and plants in groups serve to set off the sculptures in marble and bronze here displayed. This hall is of very charming effect, both in color and arrangement: the balustrade running round it, at present gilt and ordinary in design, is to be

changed for small columns of alabaster ornamented with gold. From below, one sees the water-color drawings, pastels, and silverpoint studies in the balcony, hung on a background of gold Japanese paper.

The chief pieces of sculpture are Prof. Legros's "Young Satyr," exquisitely modelled and executed with great knowledge and ease; Mr. Swynnerton's large design for a fountain; Mr. Bates's "Peace and War"; a dead Christ bas-relief in bronze by Miss Elinor Hallé; and a small statuette of the "Mower," by H. Thornycroft, with many interesting busts and medals.

On entering the west gallery the work of Burne-Jones faces us. Those who are in sympathy with his pictures are unanimous in declaring that he has surpassed himself in producing the most exquisite piece of pure bright color in his "Danaë and the Tower of Brass"; the most powerful of all his designs in "The Doom Fulfilled," besides the most perfect drawing of the nude in both the figures of Andromeda. In the first of the series, "The Rock of Doom," the maiden is chained to the rock near the shore, expecting her death, while Perseus, passing in the air with his winged sandals and helmet of darkness, first sees her. The action of Perseus exactly expresses that he is independent of any firm footing; he just skims above rock and sea, his feet nearly touching them—his handsome face full of surprise and devotion as he gazes at the maiden whose timid, resigned look answers his. Joppa is the background—very gray, with sober bits of green cliff between; the sea is blue-green; Perseus, in sombre armor beautifully designed, serves as a foil to the ivory pallor of the naked Andromeda. The idealization of the female form is very successful, and a study for this figure in the gallery above, and others for Perseus's armor, show how thoroughly this master prepares himself for every part of his design. There is no bright color anywhere, and yet the whole work is quite powerful and harmonious. In the companion picture, "The Doom Fulfilled," Perseus is slaying the monster after having fought with it. The long, dark-green, slimy dragon is a wonderful invention. In its coils Perseus is balancing himself while he is prepared to strike the cruel head still hissing defiance at him. The maiden, seen from behind, chained to her rock, which makes the background to the coils of the dragon, is anxiously watching the combat. The design and carrying out of every detail leave nothing to be desired, and the sombre color harmonizes perfectly with the character of the subject. Between these two Perseus subjects is placed the taller picture of "Danaë and the Tower of Brass." The slim, fair-haired maiden, clad in a closely pleated inner garment of purple, with a drapery of bright crimson wrapped round her, stands beside a dark cypress tree. Her pale face looks startled and full of foreboding of a disastrous future, as through an open bronze door she sees past the cool courtyard a troop of workmen erecting a brazen tower, already well advanced. King Acrisius stands among them urging them to activity. It is in this picture that we have all the magic power and intensity of color of the earlier work of this great painter, combined with all the delicate, sensitive workmanship of these later years. Every inch of canvas is exquisitely finished: the deep-blue flags in the foreground, the paving-stones of the yard beyond, the cypress tree, and the blue-green bronze door—all are treated with minute skill, forming as a whole a delightful harmony.

Immediately opposite to Burne-Jones is Legros's "Femmes en Prière," a very perfect work, and we greet with delight the appearance

of this painter after several years of absence from exhibitions. Here we have austere tints of gray, black, white, and flesh-color in the kneeling figures of the praying women, of whom the one in front holds a lighted taper. Their faces, framed in white caps, have the innocent, healthful charm of village life. The painting is throughout very masterly, especially in the treatment of the masses of warm black in the women's cloaks. There is also a "Dead Christ" by Legros in this same room, less interesting as a subject, but, for its knowledge of anatomy and in its appropriate realization, equally fine. Holman Hunt exhibits a portrait of a gentleman, careful and hard and metallic in execution, as most of his recent work is. In G. F. Watts's "Angel of Death," No. 30, we see a grand, powerful figure in slaty gray, with head swathed in white, the figure encircled by strong black wings, holding in her lap a dead baby, whose face her hand hides from our view. The angel, in her whole attitude, expresses consolation and tenderness rather than relentless power. The execution is in Watts's best manner, with the peculiar charm of suggestiveness which he considers appropriate for allegorical subjects, though the baby seems scarcely enough carried out, its hands being hidden in the angel's lap without sufficient reason for their disappearance. Although not one of his best works as a whole, this is a very characteristic one, and bears the magic touch of true genius.

Among the imaginative works must be mentioned Mr. J. M. Strudwick's little picture of "Acrasia." The knight, in beautifully designed armor, sleeps in the "bower of bliss." He has been pelted with roses, and is lying in the shade of an apple-tree, through whose branches beautiful girls, in closely pleated white draperies, are seen watching his slumbers. One, who plays on a lute, is probably intended for Acrasia, the "false enchantress" of Spenser's tale. This work of Strudwick's carries perfection of finish and design to the very highest point, and yet, although each leaf of the apple-tree is most carefully drawn and studied, as also each plant among the grass, the whole is perfectly in keeping, and has a misty feeling of dreamland in its wan color, a perfume of romance and the ideal world, strongly differing from its impressionist neighbor, "Homewards," by E. Stott of Oldham. Nothing could illustrate better the unsatisfactory nature of exhibitions than the proximity of these two works, as different in aim as in manner. Mr. Stott's early spring-green landscape, with a rosy-cheeked ploughboy driving calves beside a stream, makes Strudwick's work look colorless, while Mr. Stott's study looks too crude and sketchy beside this highly finished picture. Even the best intentions to hang everything most advantageously must fail somewhere, and I only mention this instance as an example of the disappointment a painter feels at an accident which lessens for the time the value of his work.

Sir John Millais sends two female studies, the one, No. 99, "Forlorn," very garish in color. A maiden, leaning on a balcony on which is thrown a Persian rug, looks far away towards an evening sky, with distant country. Her dress is red, and hastily painted in streaks; her face is of a chalky white, with carmine cheeks, quite out of harmony with the background. "The Last Rose of Summer" (No. 157), in the same room, is more carefully painted, though lacking any definite intention, as do most of the works of this master of late years. A girl in a dark-red cloak over an orange-colored skirt, with a broad-brimmed black hat, stands before us, holding a rose; the background is distant