

list of Acadian patronymics.* Like other members of their race at a later epoch in Canadian history, they became completely merged in the French community, all traces of their nationality, their religion, and their speech being lost before the lapse of the second generation. M. Rameau says that they intermarried with the French of Port Royal, and thus formed a fresh nucleus of population. It is to Latour and his companions especially that the same writer attributes the infusion of Indian blood among the people of Acadia.

In his earlier work, *La France aux Colonies*, M. Rameau ventures on the statement that there are few Acadian families that have not some drops of Indian blood in their veins. He also more than once expresses his conviction that the three-fourths, if not four-fifths, of the Acadian people are descended from the forty-seven families enumerated in the census of 1671. In a series of articles, contributed in 1874 and 1875 to *La Revue Canadienne*, M. Pascal Poirier, himself a native Acadian, has undertaken to refute M. Rameau's assertions. He insists that, instead of only forty-seven family stocks, there are no less than 430 distinct gentes, each having its own name, to which the Acadians of the present trace their origin. Of these at least 380 made their appearance in the country after the census of 1671. M. Poirier also denies that the Acadians of 1671 were to any appreciable extent of Indian extraction, and, after producing a mass of statistics bearing on the question, he reaches the conclusion that the Acadians of to-day are not only free from any intermixture of Micmac or other Indian blood, but are French *pur sang*, without any alien ingredient whatever. In a later volume, *Une Colonie Féodale en Amérique*, published at Paris in 1877—that is, two years after the issue of M. Poirier's criticism of his former book—M. Rameau repeats again and again the statements made years before as to the comparative frequency in early colonial times of marriages or unions between the Acadian settlers and the Indian women. He treats the whole subject in an unimpassioned and philosophic manner, and certainly without the slightest thought of making it the medium for insults or reproaches. Writing of the life of the *capitaines des sauvages* and *coureurs des bois*, he suggests that their experience may furnish the key to the course of civilisation as it spread from its prehistoric centres among the ruder nations of the early world, and he seems to regret that a usage which had in it the promise of a new race and a new society, and might have borne fruits so precious for ethnology, should not have been systematically encouraged.

Mr. James Hannay, whose excellent *History of Acadia* is the result of conscientious and impartial examination of original documents, thus refers to the controversy just summarised: "Probably it was the scarcity of white women that caused some of the Acadians to marry Indian females." M. Rameau, the talented author of *La France aux Colonies*, has been fiercely attacked for ascribing the great friendship which existed between the Acadians and Indians to these marriages. Nevertheless, that such unions took place is susceptible of as clear proof as any fact in Acadian history. Mr. Hannay then adduces proof that at least three such marriages took place and that children were born of them. Of such unions after 1714 the census contains no evidence, but passages in letters of Colonel Vetch and Lieutenant-Governor Mascarene give it to be understood that half-breeds were not only not unknown but were in considerable number down to 1745. On the other hand, La Mothe Cadillac describes the Acadians in 1692 as having, generally, light hair, which, as Mr. Hannay says, "certainly is not a description of a people who had Indian blood in their veins." His conclusion is thus stated: "The percentage of Indian blood in the veins of the Acadians is too small to be worthy to be taken into account, and in modern times marriages between Acadians and Indians have been exceedingly rare."

I do not quite agree with the historian when he says that the Indian element, however small, is undeserving of consideration. Dr. Beddoe, an English ethnologist, has been at the utmost pains to show that the pre-Aryan constituent in the complex English race is still clearly recognisable in parts of Great Britain, in the complexion and features of the inhabitants. It is regrettable that anything like resentment should have been manifested in conducting an inquiry such as that on which M. Poirier has expended so much labour. The writer whom he has criticised so severely seems to me to be the very last person who would do or say anything offensive or injurious to the people of either Acadia or Canada. In 1860 he visited the country and investigated thoroughly, on the very scene of his delightful and instructive narrative, every detail of the problem with which his enthusiastic interest in the romantic and heroic features of our early annals had induced him to deal. In January and the succeeding

* Some of those family names are English or Scotch quite as much as French, such as *Martin*. It is worthy of note that Abraham Martin, who gave a name to the memorable "Plains of Abraham," was known in his lifetime, and is entered in the Register of Notre Dame de Quebec as *L'Écossais* (the Scotchman).

months of the year 1886 he contributed to the Saturday *Minerve*—a special issue of that journal devoted largely to literary and historical questions—a series of sketches on his voyage across the Atlantic, and his tour through Acadia. No one can read those columns without being convinced of his honesty, impartiality, and love of truth, and the same qualities are discernible on every page of his historical works. It is a pity that, in presenting to the world so undoubtedly valuable a mass of information on the "Origin of the Acadians," Mr. Poirier should have adopted a tone of asperity towards an author so worthy of the esteem of all Canadians.

But the reader may ask, What is the real and trustworthy "conclusion of the whole matter?" Where such men of learning disagree, how is the student to know where the truth is to be found? Happily, on this point we have a court of appeal, to which even the most erudite of authors need think it no humiliation to submit his case. M. l'Abbé Tanguay has devoted the best years of his laborious life to the elucidation of this very question. His *Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Canadiennes* is a vast storehouse of knowledge as to all that concerns the race, country, and lineage of one great section of our people. Let us see, therefore, what Abbé Tanguay has to say on the subject of intermarriage with Indians.

JOHN READE.

WHY WE HAVE NO GREAT ARTISTS.

A SYNOPSIS of an article by John D. Champlin, Jun., which appeared in the August *Forum*, seems to be an admirable pendant to "American Art since the Centennial," from the pen of the Hon. S. W. Benjamin, which we abridged in a previous issue, containing besides many practical hints upon the development of native talent that may prove useful to Canadian art students:

The author opens his subject by saying: "We have produced sculptors and painters above the average in merit, but though a few have exhibited talent enough to entitle them to fair rank in their profession in Europe as well as at home, no master has yet appeared of genius sufficient to impress the age. Whatever our optimists may see in the future, it is safe to assume that there is no such thing at present as an American school of art. Nor is this any reflection on our native artists. Accepting therefore as a fact that we have not yet produced a national art, let us examine briefly into its causes, which will lead us into the domain of political economy. Art production, like all other production, is regulated by the law of supply and demand. Whenever in our evolution we shall reach the point where art becomes a national necessity, then we shall have a national art, and great artists will be born to us. Until that period arrives, all the art museums, academies, and professors in the world will not suffice to create for us great masters and masterpieces. You may build in a day a magnificent Chicago, and endow it with picture galleries, but they will not at once create an art atmosphere, nor breed art knowledge and traditions. They are the children of time. The history of art recognises but two periods of absolute perfection—the Phidian age in Greece, and the age of the Renaissance in Italy. The Greek through generations of laborious endeavour evolved the art of architecture and its sister sculpture from crude and conventional forms to a perfection which the world has agreed to recognise as final; the Italian by efforts no less slow and laborious rescued painting from the slough of Byzantism, and elevated it to a like eminence. In each case art came into being without any of the adventitious aids upon which modern civilisation sets so high a value. In each the advance has a true evolution—a progression through successive stages. In the daily contemplation of such masterpieces as the Zeus Olympius, the Pallas Athena, the Hera and Aphrodite, a love of beauty became a religious principle with the Greek, and art, part of his religion; thus it happened that art and religion acted reciprocally on each other, for as art was developed out of the fusion of humanity and duty, so religion derived its strongest impulse from the perfection of art. A like intimate relation between art and religion obtained in the Renaissance in Italy, the thread of tradition connecting them having never been broken throughout the Dark Ages, although what may be called Christian art had passed through a period of symbolism which had little of art in it. While the Greek, whose highest expression of his ideas in the incarnation of deity, found the noblest and exalting than mere physical perfection, required an art which appealed more strongly to the emotions, and devoted himself to the development of painting in colour. The church welcomed this new movement as an efficient coadjutor, and gave it its first great impulse in Italy; and for a long time the Old and New Testament and the *Acta Sanctorum* furnished the chief themes for the many painters whom the demand for church and convent decoration brought into being. Later on through many phases Italian art gradually widened into two distinct schools, the Florentine and the Venetian—the one representing the intellectual side of human nature, caring rather for moral and spiritual than for external beauty, the other the sensuous side, seeking beauty for the sake of beauty, and caring more for the pictorial effect than for the inculcation of a moral lesson; the one culminating in Leonardo, a Raphael, a Michael Angelo, the other in a Giorgione, a Veronese, a Titian.

"Now while it may be true that art owes its genesis to religion, it is probably also true that the inspiration of opportunity had much to do with its advancement, and that the success attained by the artists of the Peri-