

tures published in the Saturday issue of the Mail and Empire; and these spirited drawings are a sufficient evidence of his talent. His taste has always led him to depict the stirring incidents of war. During the progress of our costly campaign against the Zulus, Woodville drew vivid pictures for the London News of the victories of the British troops—gained, in some instances, at the price of many valued lives. I remember one enormous picture (on a quadruple sheet folded in the middle of the paper), representing one of the principle battles, the point of view being taken from the ranks of the Zulus, who are represented as completely encircling the British.

Woodville is particularly strong in his drawing of horses. He draws the typical trooper's horse with a fidelity unsurpassed by any other military painter. The animal is not, perhaps, a model of beauty, being inclined to squareness and angularity of body, and exhibiting a Roman-nosed tendency as to the head. But the beast is eminently serviceable, and suited to the purposes of the army; and any beauty which it possesses (and most well-conditioned horses have some title to the term "noble") is shown when on the field, affected as it is by the general excitement, by the din of artillery, and by its own exertions in the evolution of troops. And this glorification of the military half (or less) bred horse is what is so splendidly rendered by Woodville. His charging cavalry come thundering towards the spectator with whirlwind power and velocity. It is impossible to imagine that a charge led by Woodville could be abortive (!); and when you take into consideration the fact that an approaching body of cavalry can only be studied by the front ranks of the opposing lines, it is a marvel how the artist came by his realistic rendering of the facts.

Historically considered, the pictures of Woodville are as valuable as they are interesting. He adheres strictly to the text; and he can be relied upon for accuracy in matters of uniform, accoutrements, guns, relative positions of troops, etc.; and this is, so to speak, half the battle. Some of the old prints and pictures are amusingly conventional in their details; and the whole disposition of the field is often subordinated to some ridiculous old canon (not explosive) of composition. The majority of old pictures, too, give no idea of the masses of men engaged in these conflicts of armed hosts, but, on the contrary, they make the most important battle appear to be a mere skirmish between a couple of detachments. Of course the recently published illustrations of battles by Woodville are not above criticism, and occasionally they betray the weakness or laxities that must show themselves when an artist binds himself to complete a large illustrating contract; so it is not quite fair to judge of the painter's worth from this evidence alone. The only just means of estimating his great ability is by a general review of his works in the illustrated papers in conjunction with his yearly Academy pictures. It must be conceded, however, that as a painter of battle pictures he has never seriously rivalled the brilliant De Neuville (though to my mind he has much more genius than the laborious Detaille): it is in the enormously varied, ingenious, and spirited designs for the Illustrated London News that he shows himself in the front rank of draughtsmen.

E. WYLY GRIER.

Letters to the Editor.

THE "COLONIES."

SIR,—Why do you find fault with the term, "The Colonies?" Does not the name correctly describe the outlying portions of the Empire? There is nothing in the least derogatory implied by the word "colonial," which is no more than a simple statement of actual fact. It is probably sometimes used in a depreciatory sense by a certain class of people who are indifferent as to what they say, and careless in their manner of expressing themselves—the kind of people who are apt to express something akin to contempt for a Yorkshireman or an Irishman, or any one else who lives out of London. This misuse of the term is not prevalent enough to alter its meaning, or to cause us to feel otherwise than proud to be colonial citizens of the Empire. "Civis Romanus Sum" was felt to be a proud thing for one to be able to say; and the Roman "colonia" was an important portion of that Empire. Is it not vastly more to be a citizen

of the *colonia* of an Empire of extent and power in comparison with which the Roman was simply insignificant?

Any feeling of uncertainty regarding the expression which exists in Canada (which I believe to be almost infinitesimal) probably has been suggested by some faint echo from across the border, for the American notion that such a connection as exists between England and her colonies is "unnatural and inexpedient" finds expression in other ways besides Secretary Olney's plain and ill-mannered statement of it.

Possibly, however, as the existing situation is one of recent development, a new term may be required to describe it better. Who will suggest one? "Transmarine Britain" would express the idea, but is a little lengthy; though if Mr. Chamberlain should carry his imitation of Disraeli so far as to suggest to the Queen the assumption of a new, up-to-date title, "of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, and Empress of Transmarine Britain and India," would not be far astray either in meaning or dignity of expression.

A "COLONIAL" BORN.

THE ANTI-ENGLISH FEELING.

SIR,—In reading the late numbers of THE WEEK, which, by the way, travels beyond the sound of city traffic and the reach of the telephone wire, it is noticeable that the anti-English feeling of Americans has been put forward with much insistence, and causes for the same given.

In your issue of February 14th, under the heading "The Wooden Nutmeg Age," a contributor writes: "From long enquiry on the subject I have come to the conclusion that it is a result of the manner in which popular and school-accounts of the Revolution are written."

Perhaps it would be well to look a little nearer home and enquire whether there exist signs of a somewhat kindred feeling on our own side of the boundary line.

Any such could not be attributable to the source just mentioned. Take this same number of THE WEEK (February 14th).

Does it not contain some straws which perhaps point the direction of the wind?

Its opening sentence is: "Colonial affairs are becoming of some interest to Englishmen." This under the marginal note "The Colonist."

Turn a page or two, and we have the legal controversial method and its armourial bearing with regard to "Evolution," as called forth by the "Waldronian" incisiveness and "definition."

A little further on, at "Street Corners," we hear from "Diogenes" thus:—"I do not approve of the Retired Butler's idea that art and music may be made subservient to 'style' and to 'high-caste affairs.' We have no 'high-caste affairs' in Canada."

Subservient is the word used. (Vide notice of Miss Ada E. S. Hart's piano recital, by T. A. H., in your issue of February 7th.)

Can we not trace the tone of these remarks, when taken in conjunction with their context, in either case, by a simple psychic process, to the mere hint of the word "colonial."

We may seek also for a reason why the term "colonial" so often carries an unpleasant savour.

"What is it marks the soul 'provincial,'
And stamps the word 'colonial' with such odious sound?
'Tis self-complacency—
The one, in form transitional, like to the tadpole stage, that
sees not aught beyond the margin of its shallow pool:
Nor cares to see.
The other, safe in the thought of long descent, and its inheritance, looks round and thinks the highest form is his:
And needs must be!"

Permit me yet one self-complacent quotation from a recent English daily, in reference to the American press comments upon the President's famous Message. Does this not show the English feeling in regard to their American cousins?

"Our kin in the great Republic
Exuberant in youth,
Like hobbledheys, take ill-bred
Noise for a duty they owe to Truth."

N. W. T., Feb. 25th, 1896.

EX-OCCIDENTE.