

they might supply the garrisons with provisions at a fair price, and so reduce the cost of maintaining them. It was also felt that the French, if they could be induced to become loyal subjects, would be a great source of strength to the Colony from their knowledge of wood-craft, and from their friendly relations with the Indians. It was, therefore, on no pretext that this desire to keep the Acadians in the Province—which is attested by more than forty years of forbearance—was succeeded by a determination to remove them from it. Grave and weighty reasons existed for taking so extreme a step, and on the sufficiency of these reasons its justification must depend. It must be remembered that in 1755 England was entering on a great war with France, which, although it ended disastrously for the latter power, certainly commenced with the balance of advantage in her favour. In such a death-struggle it was evident there was no room for half-way measures, and that a weak policy would almost certainly be fatal to British power. Ever since the treaty of Utrecht, a period of more than forty years, the Acadians had lived on their lands without complying with the terms on which they were to be permitted to retain them, which was to become British subjects. Although, the soil upon which they lived was British territory, they claimed to be regarded as neutrals, not liable to be called upon to bear arms either for or against the English. Their neutrality, however, did not prevent them from aiding the French to the utmost of their power and throwing every possible embarrassment in the way of the English. It did not prevent many of them from joining with the Indians in attacks on the garrison at Annapolis and on other fortified posts in Acadia. It did not prevent them from carrying their cattle and grain to Louisbourg, Beauséjour and the River St. John, instead of to Halifax and Annapolis, when

England and France were at war. It did not prevent them from maintaining a constant correspondence with the enemies of England, or from acting the part of spies on the English, and keeping Vergor at Beauséjour informed of the exact state of their garrisons from time to time. It did not prevent them from being on friendly terms with the savages, who beset the English so closely that an English settler could scarcely venture beyond his barn, or an English soldier beyond musket-shot of his fort for fear of being killed and scalped.'

Mr. Boyesen's biographical and critical essay on Goethe and Schiller* will likely attract many readers who have derived their impressions of these authors from reading translations of their best known works. Of course the writings of Carlyle and Emerson and David Masson have done much to better the knowledge of the general reader of the authors of 'Faust' and 'The Robbers,' but Mr. Boyesen's essay appeals to a more direct and influencing interest still. For several years he has been professor of German literature in Cornell University, and his book is the natural outgrowth of the lectures which he has from time to time delivered before the young men under his care. The vast accumulations of notes and criticisms and observations which came into his possession form the material out of which this agreeable volume has been fashioned. Mr. Boyesen has produced a strong book, entertaining to read and useful to study. It is rich in criticism and full of suggestion and individuality. The author is almost too searching, though, for at times he explains away much that we would prefer to have had remain as it was, or as we were accustomed to know it, before his sharp

* *Goethe and Schiller: their Lives and Works, including a Commentary on Goethe's Faust.* By HJALMAR H. BOYEBSEN.—New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Toronto: Hart & Rawlinson.