

well-intentioned, but a colonial patriot in his way, and especially acquits him of blame in the matter of the famous letters, leaving at the same time a dark shade of doubtfulness on the conduct of his opponents. By appointing such a man at such a time the British Government showed that its designs were not malignant, while by allowing its soldiers to be brought to trial and actually branded on the hand for firing on a mob which attacked them with sticks and stones, it proved that it was not disposed to trample on the laws or riot in blood. The testimony of Mr. Hosmer, which is supported by the writer of another of these volumes, to the discipline and forbearance of the British soldiers in Boston, comes opportunely at a moment when unscrupulous faction and malignant ambition are traducing the record of the British army as well as that of British statesmanship and that of the country.

Mr. Hosmer seems to think that the American revolution was necessary in order to arrest the course of political reaction in England. We find difficulty in tracing any such effect, though it is true that the event has been too much viewed in its aspect as the revolt of a dependency, and too little in its aspect as a civil war. One consequence of it certainly has been a French and Catholic Canada. Mr. Hosmer, whose tone is to us most refreshing, would like, if we do not misinterpret him, to see the political union of the race restored by a Pan-Anglo-Saxonic Confederation. We cannot share that dream, but moral reunion, were it not for the Irishry, might come to-morrow. It is something, at all events, to have found an American, and a patriotic American, refusing to glorify the revolutionary intrigue which combined with royal folly to break, in a paltry quarrel, the grand and beneficent unity of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Of the Southern and slave-owning revolutionist the best specimen is Patrick Henry. Not that he actually belonged to that high-spirited, hot-headed, spendthrift, horse-racing, cock-fighting, gambling, duelling, and domineering slaveocracy of Virginia which furnished many of the leading patriots. As a lawyer of humble origin he stood midway between the F.F.V.s (First Families of Virginia) and the 'mean whites.' He had failed in shopkeeping before he took to law. His able and industrious biographer, Professor Coit Tyler, takes pains to rescue him both from the imputation of illiteracy and from that of having kept a tavern. He only, it seems, while preparing for the legal profession, helped his father to tend the bar. But he was the offspring of a community to which the slaveocracy gave its tone; and he was himself, though an occasional declaimer against slavery, through life an owner, and not only an owner, but a buyer and seller, of slaves. He seems, in fact, to have been rather a notably sharp hand at bargaining for human chattels. In that school his notions of liberty were formed. His political education was received, as his biographer tells us, by means of