

formance to the judgment of all who have taken an interest in the present discussion.

In answer to my demand for further examples, J. G. W., who professed to have such a store of them at command, now tells us that he has not 'the work' by him, or else he could produce some fine ones. Then by all means, let him get the work, and give us something at last that shall really be to the point. He need not be afraid of tiring his readers in that way for some time to come, though I should hesitate to say that they have not had enough of moral denunciation of Dr. Newman and his opinions. The latter part of the business, I should say, has been as much overdone as the 'glittering generality' part has been underdone.

When, in my last contribution, I charged J. G. W. with confusion of mind, the grounds on which I did so were obvious, I think, to the meanest intelligence. I would beg, therefore, any reader who cares to estimate the candour of my opponent—a 'liberal' assailant of Dr. Newman—to turn to what I wrote—3rd paragraph—and then to J. G. W.'s statement that I charge him with mental confusion partly because he believes in certain new systems of morality. It will be found that the statement in question is utterly without foundation. The 'confusion,' as any one can see—as J. G. W. must have seen—was in adducing as a 'generality' what was not a generality, in criticising it, not as a generality, but as an example of the baneful effect of ecclesiasticism, and then passing on to considerations wholly foreign to the matter in hand.

The Editor is possibly of opinion that this discussion has lasted long enough; but, if he allows it to go on a little longer, I trust that some light may be thrown upon the question whether or not Dr. Newman has been imposing on the literary world with 'glittering generalities,' giving us in fact a false rhetoric instead of the careful, measured and significant utterances which were supposed to be characteristic of his style. If J. G. W. can expose him to the world as a literary trickster, instead of the serious thinker and writer he has had the credit of being, the achievement will be one of some moment. A caution, however, seems here to be necessary. J. G. W. appears to imagine that every

historical statement with which he does not agree, may be cited as a 'glittering generality'; but, in the language of the *Edinburgh Review*, 'this will never do.' We want the 'generalities,' and we want the 'glitter': less than this will not meet the case.

TINEA.

A PARALLEL.

Mr. Goldwin Smith was much berated by some of the party journals for having described Canada as 'rough, raw, and democratic, but our own.' An able American writer, however, 'M. W. H.,' in the *New York Sun*, does not hesitate to speak in terms, at least as plain, of American civilisation and literature. Criticising Mr. Henry James's 'Life of Hawthorne,' and accusing the author of an over-refinement of style and thought, this writer says: 'There is a ludicrous incongruity in the application of Saint-Beuvenian methods to a raw and chaotic society, to a puny, callow and amorphous literature. To be in the least appropriate or helpful our American criticism must borrow the manner of the pedagogue, and not that of the courtier; we need plain speech and not pretty speech; the truth must be hammered and not filtered into us. . . . We are all provincial, perhaps vulgar, and why should we be scared by words which Mr. Matthew Arnold intimates are also applicable to contemporary England?' Now in all this there is not the least disposition manifest to underrate things American. On the contrary a certain honest pride is shown in avowing the limitations of a civilisation and a literature which, with all their faults, are yet dear to the writer's heart. It is easy to recognise when the truth is spoken in love, and when compliments are paid in malice; and we may thank Mr. Goldwin Smith that he has sincerely, and in a spirit of true friendship, told us the truth about the country in which he has cast his lot. The evil-minded may find fault and try to arouse ignorant prejudice; but the common sense of the country will be with the man who, undeterred by fear or favour, speaks from moment to moment the truth that is required.

L.