

Mr. Popham says we cannot find that Palma il Vecchio ever painted such a subject; it is not necessary for him to do so; Sir Charles Eastlake informs us that he was in the habit of painting mythological subjects, and I do not think it is either just or honest to infer that because Rubens painted a picture bearing the title of *Mercury bearing Hebe to Olympus*, which is now in the Bridgewater Collection, that Palma il Vecchio never painted a picture of a kindred subject. Who but a simpleton or tyro in Art could put faith in such an absurd statement that the *Jupiter in Judgment* bears a resemblance in manner to the works of Rubens?—even those which he painted during his residence in Italy between the years 1600-1608.

It is many years since I was a boy on the fourth form, and it is a long time since I read my Lempriere; but if my memory, which is tolerably good, serves me, I think Hebe is generally represented in Art either with a drinking cup, or as a virgin crowned with flowers. Though I do not vividly remember that passage in her life when Mercury carried her to Olympus, yet I do Jupiter's carrying off Ganymede from Mount Ida and bearing him to Heaven and installing him as cup bearer instead of Juno's daughter. It is strange that Rubens should have omitted the symbols of Hebe—supposing this *Palma il Vecchio* to be a copy of the "Bridgewater original"—whilst we find in the picture in our Art Gallery, Apollo with his lyre; Venus, in the arms of Mercury, with her doves; Juno with her peacock, &c. I must dwell no longer on these delicious fables of mythology, or I shall forget Mr. Popham's ungenerous and disingenuous attack upon the Old Masters and upon those who differ from him in opinion. In his different communications on the subject, he sneers; he is facetious; he is full of disparaging insinuations; he, as it were, turns up his nose contemptuously at these "worthless imitations" of the Old Masters; "any criticism is superfluous"; it is "unnecessary to describe them, for they all speak for themselves" (*i.e.*, they are rubbish!); they have a *pretension* about them, lacking "any documentary pedigree"; he has seen such pictures exhibited at pawnbrokers' shops, where they are "familiar acquaintances"—places where the "triumph of poverty" is likely to be found in the shape of a counterfeit picture passed off on one of the Knights of Lombardy by a pawnier as an original.

"Is there no sequel at the heels" of Mr. Popham's abuse of these Old Masters? He may not admire them, he may see no beauty in them, but there are hundreds who do. The owner of the pictures—"these productions"—is not asking the Art Association to buy them, and he believes that their opinion either as to their quality or genuineness will not affect the eventual disposition of the pictures one jot. He thinks that there are many intelligent gentlemen, and competent judges who do not want "*attestation seals*" for tests of authenticity. If Mr. Popham can reasonably demand other proofs, to satisfy him and his friends, save those which have been vouchsafed by the owner of the pictures, he likewise, and his friends may consider Mr. Popham bound in honour to say where the original pictures are of which these copies—"these productions" are similar or identical in subject and treatment. Mr. Popham's recognized principle in law and logic, "that the onus of proof rests on him who alleges the affirmative" cuts both ways. Mr. Popham affirms that these pictures, now on exhibition, are either copies or forgeries; the *onus probandi* rests with him to make his vauntings true. Mr. Popham's mere assertion is not proof, his special pleading is not argument, and his forensic power cannot make me believe that all the pictures to which I have so prominently alluded, are, to use his own felicitous language, "imitations in form and colour upon worm-eaten panels, or old pieces of canvas, superadded with sundry coatings of varnish, duly blistered, patched and smoked" by some one or other of "the vast army of Chattertons in Art who impose worthless imitations of the Old Masters, as originals, even upon connoisseurs.

In conclusion, let me urge upon every one who has any knowledge or love of Art to go to the Gallery, in Phillips Square, and judge between Mr. Popham's opinions and mine. If I had not thoroughly believed in the meritoriousness of these five Old Masters I would not have written a line about them, and after this time, I shall write no more in their defence; they must plead for themselves.

Thomas D. King.

JEWISH REFORM.

No. II.

The movement towards Jewish Reform in New York was the subject of a recent article in the SPECTATOR. We live in an age when the most solid rocks of human thought and habits and religious belief are ever and anon shaken to their foundations by the waves of new ideas which beat upon them with all the intermittent force of a temporarily concentrated effort on the part of young, ambitious and unscrupulous, though not unfrequently misguided talent. Place, peculiarity or prominence are influences sufficiently powerful to some minds to forever ensure a plentiful perennial crop of traitors and rebels to even the most sacred causes. It is but a natural occurrence, calling for no especial comment, to see a Frenchman or Italian plotting against and overturning dynasties and constitutions. Even to the sluggish Anglo-Saxon mind there is nothing patricidal or unnatural in a gradual but not the less effective revolution in its non-social

or political history. But that the oldest and least impressionable people on the face of the earth should become divided by sects and schisms, has appeared, until lately, a moral impossibility.

To Hebrew and Christian alike any movement in the deep and placid waters of Judaistic teaching and belief, is freighted with portentous interest, and it would be unwise in the last degree for the orthodox majority of the community to be satisfied with an attempt to frown down or ignore, by a disdainful silence, the Jewish Reform movement now going on in the City of New York, and in other large centres of population.

There is no reason to fear that youthful fanaticism will ever succeed in dismembering the glorious inheritance handed down from the patriarchs, or consign to oblivion the traditions stretching through the dim distance from out the times when the Deity conversed with man upon the cloud-capped summit of Mount Sinai. But none the less is it our duty to raise a vigorous protest against and combat with voice, and mind, and pen, the insidious attacks which these so-called Reformers are making upon our institutions and our faith. Doubtless the Almighty arm which divided the Red Sea and delivered the children of Israel from the pitiless grasp of the Pharaohs, that victorious and all-conquering power which drove out the heathen from the Promised Land will still remain, after the lapse of so many thousands of years, faithful and true to its self-imposed obligations of protection to our chosen race. But men are by nature fallible and rebellious, and we must beware of angering a long-suffering Deity by these petulant expressions of impatience and this throwing-off divine restraints which gall and chafe some untutored spirits in this Christian era and this Trans-Atlantic Land of Liberty.

On the intact preservation of the Law and the Prophets we may well rest our hopes. Can these deformers of our faith provide an efficient substitute in all the innovations of their semi-Christian Temple observances? What improvement or "reform" can they in the name of common sense expect to effect by robbing the Church of all that is acknowledged to be pure and holy in it? Has not the lapse of time and the force of circumstances already stripped us of enough of our few and honoured Jewish rites and ceremonies? If simplicity of worship is a point aimed at, surely our present ritual sufficiently supplies this qualification.

One cannot refrain from noticing the acute worldly considerations which appear, so far, to set some limit to the bounds of the revolution which the Reformers seek to accomplish. They will retain the Synagogue, forsooth, shorn of its legitimate services; they will retain—yea, create and multiply and handsomely endow the opinionated and conceited leaders who urge them on in their blind career. For the world will not go round without show and affectation and gorgeous equipages and insane hobby-horses for madder men to ride. And so our young friends of the Opposition are graciously pleased (as yet) to abstain from the total annihilation of Judaism as a religion from the face of the earth. They must have their ministers and their officers, and, we blush to think of it, they apparently have little difficulty in finding an abundant though not over-choice supply of even the former!

Seriously, there can be no ultimate outcome of an attempt to disturb the harmony of the quiet old orthodox Hebrew congregations of our cities than a bitter remorse and an unsatisfied submission on the part of the rebel cliques engaged in the unnatural endeavour.

It may be left to be settled between their conscience and their God if anything can reconcile the continuance of their nationality with their avowed longing for calamity and affliction to visit the church of their fathers. We wash our hands of their violated Sabbaths, of their pandering to Christian observances; and we leave them, in all the deformity of their unrighteous efforts, to meet perhaps a slow, but a sure, certain and undignified failure.

D. A. Ansell.

THE REAL OBSTACLES TO FREE-TRADE.

It was a curious fact that nobody at the Free-Trade dinner given to Mr. Bayley Potter the other night made any allusion to the proposed Austro-German Zollverein, which would establish free-trade between 70,000,000 of the most industrious, ingenious people in Europe, besides that, through Austria, Bosnia at once, and probably Montenegro before long, would be covered by it. In fact, should Bismarck's scheme be carried out it would be the greatest triumph for free-trade yet achieved. Nor was anything said about the probability that, should it be carried out, a similar union would probably take place between France and Italy, and Belgium and Switzerland, which would give free-trade for all practical purposes to 70,000,000 more of an equally ingenious and industrious population. Both Mr. Potter and Mr. Wells, who were the only speakers who devoted themselves to the free-trade question, talked very much as if it were the affair of Great Britain, and the United States solely, whereas it is the affair of the whole civilized world; and they placed in the forefront of their cases a prediction that very serious consequences would ensue under our present system from a bad harvest next year here or a very good harvest in Europe, or both. Predictions, however, are always rather ineffective as arguments, and they fall with great lightness on the ears of the prosperous; moreover, the area of agricultural production in the United States is now so