

ther these whole fine presentations of the Irish question...

So when I listened to this history of Froude's taking out the names and the dates, I did not recognize the story...

THE ENGLISHMAN IS FALSE; false in this sense, that it clutched at every idle tale that reflected upon Ireland...

THE MOST IMPORTANT FEATURE of England's political life. Eight years ago I was hissed in Cooper Institute...

I do not wonder at all that the thoughtful Englishman should long to explain to the world, if he can, how the steps by which his country has been brought to this step have been inevitable...

that proposition; if he could convince the world through the American people that England accepted the inevitable fate which the geographical proximity of Ireland had entailed upon her...

IRELAND HAS CONQUERED ENGLAND.

She has summoned her before the bar of the civilized world to judge the justice of her legislation; she has checkmated her as a power on the chessboard of Europe...

VACANT LAND IN NEBRASKA!

(Laughter and applause.) I do not see any exact moral principle. Then he brings us down to 1641-49, the era which Cromwell, with 14,000 troops, subdued Ireland...

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND MEN!

Every other man in the island went out. When France elevated herself with gigantic energy to throw back the utter disgrace of German ambition, how many men did she put into the field?

otherwise it would not have been possible for the brilliant essayist to end off with his usual figure that after one or two stalwart blows they all disappeared like a snow-drift before the sun...

KNELT DID IT?

Well, the next city he went to was Clonmel, and he resisted so gallantly that he granted her honorable terms. In Kilkenny nothing but the treachery of some persons inside the walls would have got Cromwell inside...

IS THAT A SNOW DRIFT?

Rather it is more of a snow-drift than Ireland. I claim no praise for Ireland especially. She did make no gallant resistance, broken up in races, divided by sects, worn by centuries of oppression...

THAT IS ANGELIC!

(Laughter and applause.) The French minister of Louis XIV. reported to the French Government the names of the men who took money to sell their country in the time of Charles II.—every great name except that of Russell, the younger Hampden, Algernon Sydney, and all the great names that figure in a boy's rhetoric at college...

MR. FROUDE'S HEAD US,

with great nausea, some very absurd proclamations that proceeded from the pen of Wolfe Tone, but remember that there have been a great many silly proclamations, and it does not prove at all, because a man's head may have been carried away with the excitement of the controversy...

I SAT, LET HER TRY

(Applause.) Mr. Froude says why if Ireland wants it we will let her go, but we know it will be to anarchy. Still I say, let her try. Suppose she fails, suppose that her statesmen fall her, whose fault will it be?

suppose that in mid-ocean his captors relented and said: "We have done wrong; we must let him go; and if they let him loose and flung him unbound into the sea, and he sank and were drowned, whose fault would it be?"

In the course of the lecture the speaker was liberally applauded, for his audience was largely made up of those Bostonians who believe in and always swear by Wendell Phillips.

MR. FROUDE'S POSITION.

A REVIEW BY THE AUTHOR OF "MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS, AND HER LATEST ENGLISH HISTORIAN."

(To the Editor of the Tribune.)

Sir.—When I answered (Tribune, 23rd Nov.) your question "Why should not Mr. Meline accept the Challenge which Mr. Froude has just uttered in Boston?" it was my intention to say no more upon the subject...

For one, I find it to be my duty to protest against the reception of that gentleman's "History of England" as a work unworthy of the name, and to do all in my power to avert the calamity of having such a travestie of history read by and impressed upon the minds of the rising generation in this country as a trustworthy record...

In his lecture at Association Hall, on the evening of November 30, Mr. Froude refers delicately and carefully to this reply, giving it treatment anonymous, and evading answer to any of the charges advanced in the work above mentioned...

Another instance: At p. 295, vol. ix., Mr. Froude speaks of the examination of the so-called casket letters submitted to the Duke of Norfolk and others as Commissioners for Queen Elizabeth, and says: "He (Duke of Norfolk) enclosed extracts from the letters in his dispatch, and he left it to Elizabeth to say whether, if they were genuine, which he and his companions believed them to be, there could be any doubt of the Queen of Scots' guilt."

Perhaps it is in this case which provokes Mr. Froude's remark that he has "found by experience that con-

published five years ago, but from among his books and papers Mr. Froude has as yet given no sign. He does not answer simply because he cannot answer. And his system has the merit of consistency. It begins with his "History." The one all-important point of controversy in the Mary Stuart question is that of the Casket Letters. If they are genuine, Mary Stuart is beyond doubt a guilty woman; the case against her is closed. If they are forgeries she is innocent, and her accusers are the murderers of Darnley; with Queen Elizabeth and Cecil as accessories before and after the fact. On this single point as every one else knows it. On introducing them into his History, his first duty was to establish their authenticity—if he could. He does not attempt it, but promises to discuss the authenticity "in a future volume." The reader, all anxiety to have this major question settled, reaches the future volume only to be evasively informed by Mr. Froude that "the inquiry at the time appears to me to supersede, authoritatively, all later conjectures," and to listen to some twaddle as to the genius of Shakespeare being required to invent one of the letters. Upon this performance, here is the opinion of high literary authority in Scotland—that of the Glasgow Herald: "That the writer of a voluminous history should pool pool as unnecessary such discussion, while scores of able men hold opinion opposed to his own, is cowardly and impertinent; that he should weave them into the texture of a history both before and after the time for discussing them arrived, is unjust and unworthy of a historian."

I am aware that it may be claimed for Mr. Froude that he did sustain a controversy in at least two instances. The first and earliest case was that in which he was taken to task by The Edinburgh Review for attempting to blacken the character of one of the greatest and best of men—Sir Thomas More. I am under the impression that he will thank me for not dwelling upon it. It may be found in the number of the Review for October, 1858. The second case is that of an unfinished controversy with Miss Agnes Strickland, out of which Mr. Froude contrived to wriggle. I am sorry to be obliged to use the word, but it is the only one which properly describes his maneuver. In his history Mr. Froude suppresses all mention of the fact that Darnley's mother, the Countess of Lennox, became satisfied of the innocence of Mary Stuart, and so wrote her in a letter which is entirely accessible in the English Record office, where Mr. Froude is so entirely at home. (See "Mary Queen of Scots and her latest English Historian," pp. 281, 282.) A controversy upon this point was carried on in The London Times, which I am fortunate enough to be able to describe in Miss Strickland's own words. From a letter of that lady to a correspondent in the United States, dated March 22, 1872, I make the following extract: "Of course you are aware that I was the first to introduce the letter of her (Mary's) mother-in-law, to the world—a complete justification of the calumniated Queen. I obtained Her Majesty's leave to have a fac-simile of the precious document made by Nethercliffe and printed in my volumes as an act of justice to Mary's memory. I then said: 'Now the controversy is at an end; for if the mother of Darnley could write in such a loving and reverential style to Mary, who shall dare to doubt her?' Judge then my strong surprise and indignation at Froude's disgraceful book, which appeared just after mine was finished. I wrote to the editor of The Times, exposing his false witness respecting Darnley's murder, and inquiring his authority for the scene in Darnley's house at Kirk o' Field, after the Queen was gone, and his singing the 55th Psalm to his page, reminding him to whom I wrote that Darnley was a staunch Roman Catholic, and would not have tolerated the English version of the Psalms; for when John Knox presented him with a copy of his version of the Psalms which he had dedicated to Darnley, the petulant youth tossed the book into the fire, instead of thanking Knox for his compliment. Froude, after a few days, made a most lame reply, to which I rejoined, and quoted Lady Lennox's letter. He answered by quoting a letter written two years previous, when Lady Lennox was under the impression that Mary was guilty of her husband's death. Of course I wrote again, explaining the misconception under which Lady Lennox at first labored, and quoted her own letter to Mary in which she apologizes for her mistaken idea of her guilt; but—of The Times, who had written the laudatory review of Froude, being his brother-in-law, of course prevented the insertion of my letter, which must have flooded the false witness. So he went on in his career of audacious falsehood unchecked."

I have cited these instances to show that Mr. Froude's refusal to answer my book is part of a system long since settled upon by him, and that it does not arise from the fact that the Atlantic is between him and his books and papers. That my book merits an answer, or—more properly speaking—that Mr. Froude's reputation stands sadly in need of a reply to it, is not my judgment, but that of persons far more competent than I am to decide. Goldwin Smith, late Regius Professor in the University of Oxford, says:—"Unless Mr. Meline can be answered, he has convicted Mr. Froude not only of inaccuracy, not only of carelessness, not only of prejudice, but of tampering with documents, perverting evidence, practicing disingenuous artifices, and habitually disregarding truth."

A distinguished American author and critic expresses himself to the effect that "if Mr. Meline is sustained, if there is no evidence to offset his showing, Froude is a fraudulent writer of history," and the New York Evening Post, which editorially means Wm. C. Bryant and Parke Godwin, is of the opinion that "the case made against him by Mr. Meline's work should not be left to stand if Mr. Froude places even a moderate value upon his good name." But if Mr. Froude will not answer my whole book, I have a right to exact that he shall, at least, complete the answer already entered into by him against one of its charges. I have, so to speak, a lien upon him, and am justified in insisting that he shall finish what he has undertaken. At page 211, volume viii., Mr. Froude presents a vivid picture of Mary Stuart full of passion and revenge, and adds, "she said she would have no peace till she had Murray's or Chatelherault's head," supporting the passage with this reference, "Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 5, Scotch Mss., Rolls House." Mr. Froude was told that there was no such letter in existence, in or out of the Rolls House, and, soon after, a reply evidently inspired, if not furnished, by Mr. Froude himself, appeared in the New York Tribune of October 15, 1870. It claimed that there had been "either by himself or a compositor, a clerical error in giving the name of the letter." "It was the Earl of Bedford instead of Randolph who wrote the letter, though, owing to the fact that Randolph was at that time about the Court and in connection with Bedford, the latter could only have been written with authority of Randolph." That in the letter I was right, but in the spirit false, &c., &c., and much more to the same effect—all elaborately misrepresenting the nature and tenor of the Bedford letter, and totally failing to show where Mr. Froude found the passage, "She said she could have no peace," &c. I procured from the English Record Office a certified copy of the Bedford letter, which, with an account of the controversy so far as it was carried, may be seen in the 8th chapter of "Mary, Queen of Scots, and her latest English Historian." The passage "She said she could have no peace till she had Murray's or Chatelherault's head," is not in the Bedford letter as cited by Mr. Froude, for that letter, he admits, has no existence. It is not in the Bedford letter. Where did Mr. Froude obtain it? I pause for a reply.