

THE CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS is printed and published every Saturday by THE BURLAND LITHOGRAPHIC COMPANY (Limited), at their offices, 5 and 7 Bleury Street, Montreal, on the following conditions: \$4.00 per annum, in advance \$4.50 if not paid strictly in advance. All remittances and business communications to be addressed to G. B. BURLAND, General Manager.

TEMPERATURE

as observed by Hearn & Harrison, Thermometer and Barometer Makers, Notre Dame Street, Montreal.

THE WEEK ENDING

Nov. 3rd, 1883.			Corresponding week, 1882.		
Max.	Min.	Mean.	Max.	Min.	Mean.
Mon. 81	50	70	Mon. 71	50	60
Tues. 81	50	71	Tues. 72	54	65
Wed. 80	50	71	Wed. 79	62	70
Thur. 80	55	69	Thur. 79	64	71
Fri. 78	61	69	Fri. 78	64	71
Sat. 78	60	71	Sat. 78	61	70
Sun. 79	65	72	Sun. 78	62	70

CONTENTS.

ILLUSTRATIONS.—The King of Spain in his Ulan Uniform Attending the Review at Hamburg with the German Emperor—The German Review at Hamburg—The Prince of Wales in his Hussar Uniform—The Crown Prince at the Review—The Chinese Military Attack—The National Horse-Show at New York—Rev. George Andrew Shaw—Matthew Arnold—The Guard—Bas Relief on the German National Monument—Reformatory at Deer Island, near Boston—Ready for Market.

LETTER-PRESS.—The Week—Titles in English Society—Prinroses—A Penny a Bunch—Matthew Arnold's Influence—Matthew Arnold in America—Rev. George Andrew Shaw—My Vis-à-Vis—Forget-Me-Not—Anthony Trollope's Autobiography—City of Las Country—Echoes from London My Mother's Book—Presentation to Mr. G. Mercer Adams—Charming Women and Women in Earnest—The Luther Anniversary—Foot Notes—The Sord Song of Theodore Koerner—Echoes from Paris—Varieties—His Love and Mine—Editorial Care for Authors—Miscellany—Our Chess Column.

CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.
Montreal, Saturday, Nov. 10, 1883.

THE WEEK.

ALBANIA continues to be restless. It is determined to shake off the hated Turkish yoke, and is seeking annexation to Greece.

THERE is, fortunately, no truth in the rumor of the attempted assassination of Prince Bismarck. His sudden removal, specially through the agency of Nihilism, would brew mischief in Europe.

THE French are determined to carry on the war in Tonquin. The hopes of arbitration are rapidly disappearing, and a China war is imminent. This would prove a diversion in favor of the Republic.

THE Conservatives have had a good week of it in Great Britain. In the various municipal elections they made important gains, and Sir Stafford Northcote was elected Rector of the University of Edinburgh by a large majority. This election has a considerable political significance.

THE committee of the Delegations, at Vienna, in their report agreeing to the foreign estimates of the budget, laid stress upon the continued close alliance of Austria with Germany. It says the alliance has no hostile feeling towards foreign nations; Austria's only endeavour is to preserve peace as long as possible. The solidarity of Germany can be relied upon. The committee sincerely believes in a continuance of the present friendly relations between Austria and foreign powers.

THE speech of Lord Salisbury in answer to the Leeds Conference, is very important. He plainly informs the Radicals that the Lords will not submit to their threat of sending again and again to the Upper House a bill dealing only with a county franchise. He intends himself to insist upon seeing the whole plan of reform, including the scheme for the distribution of seats before accepting any part of it. This declaration strengthens the probability that the ministry will persevere in the original programme to attempt to pass the County and London Government Bills at the next session and to postpone the Franchise Bills.

THE Spanish Government have received news of grave importance from Cuba. They have received information of the departure from the United States for Cuba of a so-called Cuban general connected with an expedition organized under the auspices of the Comité Separatist Centrale, established in New York with the co-operation of certain influential persons in the South American republics. The expedition will endeavor to effect a landing in Cuba, and a certain number of the insurgents will await the arrival of contingents to the expedition at different points of the island. The insurgents are expected to arrive as simple travellers. Supplies and munitions of war are said to be ready at Philadelphia and Key West. Reports have also been received of the organization in many cities in America of sub-committees charged with the collection of material aid for the insurrection in money and kind. A large number of women figure amongst the most active agents of the insurrection, and a female club is being organized in New York similar in character and purpose to that existing at Key West under the name of "The Daughters of Liberty," in favor of the independence of Cuba. The members of the club solicit monies and jewels. It is thought in Madrid Government circles that Gen. Bouacheas' expedition is the supreme effort of the Cuban separatists. It is believed that if it is not successful the insurrection will be checked for a long time to come. The Spanish Government have an intention of sending a special envoy to Washington for the purpose of calling the attention of the Government of the United States to the conspiracy, and to watch the movements of the conspirators, but they have not found a suitable person for the post. Meanwhile instructions based on the above information have been sent to Governor-General Co-telle.

TITLES IN ENGLISH SOCIETY.

Lord is pure English, the ancient *hlaford*; *sir* is one of the endless forms of *senior*. The two may pass as the English and French translation of one another. But in modern use they have parted off a good deal. *Sir* at first sight seems to be inferior to *lord*, and, strictly as a title, it is so; but, as a mode of address, it is the special possession of those for whom *lord* is now thought too lowly. One point needs to be specially insisted on, that the title of *lord* has not necessarily anything to do with peerage. All peers are lords, but there are many lords who are not peers. The king's chancellor, his treasurer, his chamberlain, his high admiral, the president of his privy council, certain of the higher judges, all English judges when actually on the bench, Scottish judges at all times, lieutenants of counties, the lieutenant of Ireland and his deputy, the mayors of London and York, the provosts of several Scottish cities, the rectors of Scottish universities, the younger sons of dukes and marquesses, all these are lords by some rule, by law or by courtesy, many of them without being peers, and, when they are peers, without any reference to their peerage. A bishop's title of *lord* has not, as many people fancy, anything to do with his peerage; it belongs equally to bishops who have seats in Parliament and to bishops who have not. Some such title, *Dominus Monsigneur, Despotés*, is given to bishops everywhere. We have even corporate lords. The members of the privy council, the commissioners for executing the offices of lord high treasurer and lord high admiral, are "my lords" collectively; and, in the two latter cases, the man himself, though he be not called Lord A. or B., is called "a lord" of the Treasury or the Admiralty. Meanwhile the Scottish form *laird* has stuck so much more closely than any of these to the original meaning of the word that people sometimes forget that it is the same word. The English lord of the manor indeed abides, but his lordship is much less prominent than that of his Scottish brother, and he is at least never addressed by his lordly title. "Sir," as every one knows, when used as a title, as distinguished from a mode of address, is now confined to knights, including, of course, the hereditary knight, the baronet. But it had formerly a wider use; it belonged to priests as well as to knights; in the universities *sir* in English, *Dominus* in Latin, was the title of a bachelor of arts, a trace of which is seen yearly in the Cambridge tripos, where printers have a tendency to turn the traditional *Dr* into *Dr*. In this last case *sir* is attached to the surname, while in every other case it cleaves inseparably to the Christian name, and does not complain if the surname is cast aside. So it was with its old Italian forms *ser* and *messer*; so it is with the Spanish *Don*, the representative of *Dominus*, as *sir* is of *senior*. But *monsieur* and *monsieur*, essentially the same word as the English and Italian title, are used in a different way.

The English *hlaford* has two Latin equivalents. The older one is *senior*, one of that endless class of words, from *alderman* to *sheikh*, in which, in almost all tongues, age is taken as implying authority. In Latin use *senior* gave way to *Dominus*, a word more directly express-

ing authority than *senior*, though the special notion of a master of slaves had passed away from it. But *senior* did not die out till it had brought forth an abundant crop of descendants in the Romance languages, *senior, senior, seigneur*, and the contracted forms, *ser, sieur, sire, sir*. *Dominus* has been less fruitful: yet we have *Don, Donna, and Dame*, the latter, be it remembered, originally standing for *dominus* no less than for *domina*. All these titles imply that he to whom they are applied stands, or is for courtesy's sake supposed to stand, in the relation of lord—*hlaford, senior, dominus*—to the person who is speaking. The personal relation is professed in many forms of address; "My lord," "Monsieur," or "Monsieur," "Messer," "Mein Herr," are forms which in strictness can be used only by one who is the man of the person to whom he speaks. It is simply the caprice of custom which has given special applications to several of these forms, lifting some of them very high among titles of dignity, while others—like *domina* in its common Italian sense—have become the common property of all mankind.

In English usage we may start from *dominus*. We may take *lord* as its English, *messire, monsieur, sire, sir* (the spellings of course are many), as its French translation. Gradually the English and the French words settle down into the parts allotted to them by existing usage. In England, except in half-forgotten university usage, *sir*, as a title, now, never sinks below the rank of knighthood. Indeed it belongs to the rank of knighthood in a special way. One might have thought that these sons of peers who do not bear the title of *lord*, the younger sons of earls and all the sons of viscounts and barons, ranking as they do above knights, would at least have borne as high a title. But in present usage no peer's son is called *sir*, unless he is admitted to some knightly order. He has his complimentary adjective, which we shall come to presently, but he has no complimentary substantive, no title strictly so called, save that which he shares with the common herd. Here is another English peculiarity. In France *monsieur* sinks to be the description of everybody, save those for whom *sieur* alone is thought good enough. To discharge the modern function of *monsieur* a title of another origin, but nearly equivalent meaning, has grown up in England, that of *master*. It would be curious to trace its beginnings, which are not at first sight so clear as those of *sir* and *lord*. *Magister* is strictly an academical title, and one higher than *dominus*. In France, *Maitre* is the distinctive title of a barrister. But in England it has passed away from all learned associations to become the description of all whom it is thought uncivil to call simply by their names, but who have no claim to any higher title. And among those come many who, as far as precedence goes, rank far higher than some who do bear higher titles. The peer's son of the lower degrees, the privy councillor, therefore in many cases the actual ruler of the land, is, in ordinary talk, in all but very formal description, not to be distinguished from ordinary men. Here is a sore puzzle for foreigners. How is it that in a land where there are men called *sir* and *lord, earl* and *duke*, the man who can practically make all of these, is not at least *sir* or *lord* himself? He doubtless has a lofty adjective description, but that is confined to formal use; it is not heard every time he is spoken of. "Mr. Gladstone," plain "Mr.," like any other man, is a stumbling block to many an intelligent foreigner. I have known foreign papers cut the knot by habitually speaking of "Lord Gladstone." And about this same title of "Master," we have a small puzzle at home. Spelled and sounded the ordinary way, it has come to be descriptive of a little boy; it is only when written in its contracted shape and uttered with its special sound that it is thought fit to describe the boy's father. Why this is we need not go on to ask. *De minimis non curat lex*.

But now comes another of our anomalies, one which greatly puzzles European continentalers, and which is not always fully grasped even by our American kinsfolk. This is the nature of the *esquire*. A class of people are habitually called plain "Mr." in ordinary talk, who would be greatly offended if their letters were so addressed. I am not speaking of those who claim a higher adjective description; I mean those who are spoken of as "Mr. A. B.," but who, in any formal description, from the address of a letter upward, must be described as "A. B., Esq." In itself *esquire*, like *knight*, is a title, if not of office, of something very like office; and it would not have been wonderful if it had been usual to call men "Knight A." and "Esquire B." But "Knight A." seems never to have been in use; and "esquire," or rather "Squire B." can hardly be said to have ever been in polite use. Men like Hampden, who would have ranked as nobles anywhere out of the British kingdoms, were simply "Mr. Hampden," and the like. To be sure "Mr." was then more of a distinct title than it is now. I have seen somewhere in the early records of a New England colony, an order in which, among other pains and penalties decreed against a certain man, it is forbidden to speak of him any longer as "Mr." Possibly, though used to be spoken of as "Mr." he did not hold to the technical rank of "esquire." For *esquire* is a technical rank, as much as earl or knight; and one odd thing is that, when the word, in a contracted shape, is put before a name, it means something different from that technical rank. Many people put "Esq." after their names, not by mere assumption or conventionality, but of

perfect right, to whom no living soul would even think of tacking on "squire," before their names. "Squire A." marks a position which, if not strictly official, certainly comes very near to it, a position which is not held by all who are described as esquires even by strict formal right. But the thing that most puzzles the foreigner is the presence of the distinctive title after the name, or rather its absence before the name. He is ready to write "Mr. A. B., Esq.," it is hard to persuade him to write "A. B., Esq.," with nothing before the A. B. And no wonder, for it is a description altogether without parallel among continental descriptions. We are so used to it that we hardly think of its singularity. It fails to do, at least it seems as if it were going to fail to do, the very thing which titles are invented to do. "Lord," "Sir," "Mr." stand as guardrails before the name, to show that the mere name is not going to be used. But the name of the esquire stands bare, without any protection. We do in fact call him by his mere name, though we stick on his description afterward. "Esquire" has no feminine; otherwise it would be curious to see whether a woman's name could be allowed to stand unsheltered in the same way. How singular our treatment of the esquire is seen at once if we fancy a like treatment of the rank next above him. We speak of a man as "Mr. A. B.," and we address our letters to him "A. B., Esq." It would be an exact parallel, if we spoke of a man as "Sir A. B.," and addressed our letters to him "A. B., Knight."

Again we come to the case of the wives. Our Old-English *hlaford*, as expressing a rank or relation rather than strictly an office has, unlike the king and the earl, a feminine. Without raising any minute philological questions, *hlafdrige* is practically the feminine of *hlaford*. And it abides so still; the softened form of *lady* is still, in grammar at least if not in usage, the feminine of *lord* and of *lord* only. But the practical use of the name has been very shifting. In early times the lady had rather a tendency to soar higher than the lord; in later times she has rather had a tendency to sink beneath him. When queenship, so to speak, was abolished among the West-Saxons, the king's wife became the *lady*. The title was therefore lower than that of the queen; but it was so high that, with the simple exception of Ethelred, Lady of the Mercians, it is never given to any but the wives of kings. The wife of the reigning king is "the lady;" she whom we should now call a queen-dowager was then known by the homelier style of "the old lady." So, as has been already noticed, *lady* was, down into the eighteenth century, the true English style for the younger daughters and the nieces of a king. In the peerage *lord* and *lady* exactly answer to one another. If in one case they seem not to do so, if the daughters of an earl are called *lady* while their younger brothers are not called *lord*, it is because all daughters rank with their elder brother and not with their younger. *Lady*, like *lord*, is used vaguely for all ranks of the peerage under duke, and in a special way for its lowest rank. It is when we get below the peerage that the laxer use of the word begins. As *dominus* parted off into English *lord* and French *sir*, so *domina* parted off into English *lady* and French *dame*. *Lord* and *lady, sir* and *dame*, should in strictness go together. And so in formal style they do; the wife of Sir John is properly Dame Mary. It is doubtless by a bit of man's homage to woman that she is in common speech raised to the style of *lady*, while her husband is never raised to the style of *lord*. And those who report court ceremonies, who surely ought to "know their own foolish business," jumble together under the common head of "ladies," the wives of knights, the wives of barons, and the daughters of dukes, marquesses and earls. Dame Mary has no place in such exalted company, and the other two classes of ladies may teach us a lesson in the difference between mere precedence and substantial privilege. *Lady* Mary A., the duke or earl's daughter, goes before *Lady* B., the baron's wife. But let them be charged with treason or felony, and the baron's wife can claim to be tried by the House of Lords, while the earl's daughter must be tried by a jury like any other woman.

Lady, then even as a title, has come down, in common use at least, a step lower than *lord*. And, when not used strictly as a title, it has sunk lower again. It has perhaps not sunk quite so low as some words which in strictness translate it, certainly not so low as Italian *domna*, perhaps not quite so low as French *dame*. Still to most minds *lady* is the feminine, not of *lord*, but of *gentleman*. The gentleman's rightful companion, the *gentlewoman*, seems to have vanished altogether. And some people seem, even on very formal occasions, to forget that the lady is the rightful companion only of the lord. When men were debating as to the proposal to confer the title of comress on Queen Victoria, a public meeting was held in a great English city for the discussion of the question. Some proposed "Sovereign Lady of India" as a more becoming title. To this one speaker objected. He was a barrister, and in ecclesiastical matters a zealous churchman. He might, therefore, be expected to know both his law-books and his prayer-book. Yet he opposed the style of "sovereign lady," on the ground that, when there was a king, he would have to be called "sovereign gentleman." His hearers, wiser than himself, shouted, "Sovereign lord." But the man of law remained unconvinced; "sovereign gentleman" was the one masculine of "sovereign lady," and "sovereign gentleman of India" was a style that would never do.