

LINES.

ONCE in the hapless Stuart's reign,
As on some olden page I've read,
A peasant, loitering through the plain,
Saw that which made him bend his head
In homage: for, with dust-dimmed ray,
The Crown of England dangled from a bramble's spray!

Failure, thou art a bramble's stem:
Thou hast no pride of fruitage fair:
Yet men have found a diadem
Upon thy thorny branch and bare:
For haply they have plucked from thee
The secret of the things that are, and are to be.

Toronto.

G. A. M.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

THE Greeks, like the English, sent forth a great many colonists from their shores. These colonists made their permanent home in the lands in which they settled, and at all events in their Italian colonies, which specially received the name of Greater Greece, they mingled with the inhabitants of the land, whom they raised by a swifter or slower process to their own level. While the Greek colonists made for themselves new homes, they did not forget the old home, nor did they cease to be Greeks. They carried with them the love of Hellas, its religious rites and its civil customs, to Italy, Asia Minor, and Gaul. Nor did the colony forget the mother-city, but continued to cherish for it reverence and love, and the mother-city usually watched over the colony, and readily employed its good offices in its behalf. Corinth steps in alike when Syracuse is pressed by foreign enemies, and when she is torn by domestic seditions. There was, however, no political tie in the old Greek days between the mother-city and its colony. No War of Independence, no Declaration of Independence, was ever needed between a Greek metropolis and its colony, because from the beginning the colony was as independent as the mother city. The absence of the political tie is the distinction between the colonies of Greece and England; for Englishmen, when they went forth as colonists, did not cease, and did not wish to cease, to be English subjects. The causes of this difference are well explained by Mr. Freeman. The Greeks were citizens of a city, the English, subjects of a kingdom; and in the old Greek time it was hardly possible for a man to carry his citizenship with him beyond the bounds of the territory of his city:—

"The change in the meaning of the word 'loyalty,'" writes Mr. Freeman, "well marks that leading political characteristic of modern Europe, which stands out in fullest contrast to the political thoughts of the ancient commonwealths. 'Loyalty,' once simply *legalitas*, obedience to the law, has for ages meant—when it has not meant something far baser—no longer obedience to the law, no longer duty to a community as a community, but faith and duty owed by one man to another man. The notion of a personal allegiance, a notion which could have been hardly understood by either the aristocratic or the democratic Greek, has been the essence of the political system of Europe for many ages. The primary and formal duty of the member of a State that acknowledges a prince, a duty to which in many cases he is bound by direct personal promises, is a personal duty to a person. It is a duty which he cannot throw off under any circumstances of time and place; it follows him wherever he goes. While the active duties of the citizen of a commonwealth can hardly be discharged beyond the territories of that commonwealth, the duties of the subject of a king, the subject, that is, of a personal master, are as binding on one part of the earth's surface as on another."

It is true that the United States of America threw off their allegiance to the English Crown, and parted from the Mother Country in anger; and England, made wise by disaster, has sought to make the relation of dependence between herself and her English-speaking colonies as little irksome as possible. It is still, however, correct to speak of our Colonial Empire; for even in the freest of colonies, we have retained certain latent powers which might at any moment be called into exercise; and as Colonial Legislatures cannot, like our own, exercise an influence upon the policy of English Ministries, colonies may at any moment find themselves plunged into wars against their will and contrary to their interest. It is on this Imperial position of England towards her colonies that many Englishmen look with most satisfaction; and they look with still greater satisfaction upon our Indian Empire, in which we not only possess but exercise greater powers than were ever wielded by Imperial Rome.

The proposal that all the English-speaking colonies which own allegiance to the English Crown should form with England a great Federation has an attractive look. It gratifies the Imperial instinct of those Englishmen who wish to see the English Power great, and it is also attractive to those who wish to see English-speaking men drawn into close bonds of brotherhood. The Prime Minister said to a deputation that recently waited upon him, in terms of somewhat equivocal compliment, that the growth of a public opinion in favour of Federation had been remarkably rapid. But it must be looked at in the light of political facts and principles. The chief Federations of the world have arisen by a number of small States agreeing to become one State for all purposes that touch their relations to other Powers, while still keeping each one its separate being. The States which unite to make such a Federation, while they keep certain powers in their own hands, give up certain powers to a central body which speaks

and acts in the name of the whole body of States. Is England prepared to enter into such a Federation, and by so doing to sink to the position of the State of New York or the State of Delaware? Are Englishmen prepared to see the Parliament of Great Britain become a subordinate Legislature? If they are not prepared for this sacrifice, there is no use in talking of Federation, for Federation requires it. But perhaps it is not Federation that is meant by its advocates, although they say so, but such a union of Great Britain and her dependencies that their inhabitants shall be all represented in one Parliament. In this case also, let it be remembered, the Imperial character of Great Britain would disappear, and the Colonial Party might at any time outvote the English Party, even on home affairs.—*From the Spectator.*

HAMPTON COURT.*

THE issue of new works is perpetually reminding us of the rare wealth of literary treasure that has been lying unexplored in the archives of the Record Office and in the great national libraries. One of the most recent of these works is Mr. Law's delightful monograph on the "History of Hampton Court Palace in Tudor Times." And we are glad to hear that it is to be followed by a second volume, bringing the picturesque story of the palace down to the present day. For the studies of Mr. Law have been labours of love, and he has made himself thoroughly master of his fascinating subject. He has ransacked annals and records, and, as he tells us in his preface, he has familiarized himself with each nook and corner of the buildings. The volume is richly illustrated with engravings after famous historical portraits by Holbein, Antonio More, Zuccherro, or their imitators, by maps and quaint architectural elevations after old drawings and designs, and by views of the interior, from the venerable cellar-doors to the richly-wrought ceilings of the State apartments. But if these illustrations appeal to the eye, there are others still more interesting, which forcibly address themselves to the imagination. For although Mr. Law's narrative is based upon patient archæological investigations, he has succeeded in avoiding all dulness of detail, and has presented us with a succession of vivid pictures of the manners of courtly life in England under the rule of the magnificent Tudors. And, considering the many strikingly dramatic scenes he has to describe, and the great popularity of the palace with excursionists from London, it would seem strange that the task should have been left to him had not the richness of our records been a late revelation.

He traces the story of the manor of Hampton back to the mention in Domesday-book, but the historical interest of its chronicles begins when it was transferred to Wolsey, then the Archbishop of York, on a ninety years' lease from the order of Knights Hospitallers. At that time a small manor-house must have stood on the present site, but there can have been no buildings of much importance. Wolsey, with a plurality of bishoprics and abbeys, had ecclesiastical residences in abundance. But his manifold political occupations kept him near the Court, and Mr. Law surmises that he sought a country retreat beyond the reach of importunate suitors, and yet having convenient access to Whitehall. And in those Tudor days when roads were often impracticable, a well-manned barge on the river was incomparably the swiftest means of transit. Be that as it may, the Archbishop built his country retreat according to his superb ideas of what was due to his power and station. He maintained the retinue of a King, he practised profuse hospitality, and if he drained the national purse through scores of converging channels, he was as lavish in spending as he was eager in getting. He engaged a regular army of artificers, whom he employed on the new palace. He enclosed the double park of 2,000 acres with palings or substantial red-brick walls, and on many of the bricks are still to be seen the mark of the cross which was the symbol of the prelate. He surrounded his mansion and gardens with a moat, which is one of the last survivals of the fashion of fortifying English residences; he carefully drained each part of the buildings, connected the drains by a system of subterranean sewerage with the Thames; and at an immense expense he brought pure spring water, in leaden pipes, from Combe-hill to Surbiton, and from Surbiton under the river. In short, everywhere traces are still to be distinguished of the master-eye and the master-mind. When the magnificent residence was finished, and when the grounds were fully laid out, the great Minister's health was already failing. Henry was constantly charging him to take a rest and change, for he was still the King's friend and trusted favourite. That he had withdrawn to Hampton for the sake of repose seems clear from the many contemporary complaints of his irritating inaccessibility. Even ambassadors found it hard to obtain private audiences; and meaner men had to go back to town grumbling over their bootless expeditions. But his establishment was always on the most sumptuous scale, and he kept literally open house for all comers, while the chief apartments were a museum of the arts and industries. The tapestries from Flanders that clothed his walls were perhaps unrivalled before or since. The floors of the great apartments were covered with the choicest Oriental carpets. Nor did he greatly care how he came by these; he paid for some in money and for others by his good offices. We find him putting pressure on the Venetian ambassador to induce the chiefs of the Republic to buy for him with their merchants who had a monopoly of the trade with Levant. And the Venetian ambassador estimated Wolsey's golden plate at £150,000, "which, if we were to multiply by ten to give the equivalent in modern coin, yields the astounding sum of a million and a half." Yet before all he was a spiritual prince, and the chapel vestments and the church plate

* "The History of Hampton Court Palace in Tudor Times." By Ernest Law, B.A., Barrister-at-Law, author of "The Historical Catalogue of the Pictures at Hampton Court." George Bell and Sons. 1885. (Mr Law is brother to Commander F. C. Law, R.N., of this city.)