

such inaccuracy. Mr. King has surely forgotten his Lempriere, when he calls the subject of this picture *Jupiter in Judgment*. It represents "Mercury bearing Hebe to Olympus." Hebe, as every school-boy of the fourth form should know, was the goddess of youth and daughter of Jupiter. Mercury was her father's messenger, and she, her father's cup-bearer. Secondly, the subject was painted by Rubens, and the original is now in the Bridgewater collection, in London, where it may be seen four days of every week. Thirdly, we cannot find that Palma il Vecchio ever painted this subject, and we have yet to receive the proof usually furnished with all alleged productions of old masters, that the picture in the Art Gallery is original, or even a copy of this master. But whether a copy or an original of Palma il Vecchio or Rubens, we have pleasure in agreeing with Mr. King in this, that it is of sufficient intrinsic merit to deserve especial study. It really presents a fair example of the Venetian school to which also Rubens belonged more than to any other. We wish we could say as much of the rest.

The Jacob Ruysdael, it is now claimed, once belonged to Queen Isabella of Spain. If it be so, this surely will not, independent of intrinsic evidence, establish it to be genuine. That lady, unless report sadly belies her, knows more about, and better understands, nature than art. If otherwise, the seal of the Spanish Crown would appear on the back of the canvass. No one, not the veriest "ninny" in art, would believe the "Spanish Curator of Her Most Catholic Majesty" would have injured its marketable value by selling it without the customary seal of authentication; or that a competent judge could be goose enough to buy it without the seal, or documentary evidence of equal value. Where are these proofs? If they exist, show them, before the owner should expect any intelligent person to believe it genuine.

The "Raphael," Mr. King says, once belonged to Baron Rothschild of Paris!! This is news indeed! Baron Rothschild selling his Rubens! We say, as Dominie Sampson would have said: "This is prodigious!" When, where was it sold? Surely these questions are reasonable, and if the statement be true, very easily proved.

It is not expressly said it was bought from the Baron, but here we are told that during the *régime* of the Commune, in 1871, the Tuileries, the Palais Royal, and the Chateau of the Rothschild family were sacked, and we are left to infer that some of the pictures in question form part of the *loot*. This is surely an equivocal compliment to the owner to suppose he would purchase stolen property, and then have the hardihood to exhibit it.

The inference is scarcely deserving notice. It is well known few pictures of value were stolen, and these few stolen were recovered. The owners of valuable objects of art very naturally removed and concealed them in safety before the Commune arose, and before the Prussians reached Versailles. Ere then the Old Masters in the Louvre were also taken from their frames and stretchers, rolled up and placed in cylindrical tin boxes, and sent from Paris by the authorities; and one of the *Gardiens*, a few years after, showed us the place, in a heavy wall, in which the colossal Venus of Milo had been buried during this national struggle. If this Raphael had by accident a place in the choice and valuable collection of Baron Rothschild, who is, as his father was, one of the best connoisseurs in Europe, and has been stolen from thence, it is reasonable to suppose he is very grateful to the thief.

A down-eastern Yankee has, it is said, recently bequeathed a munificent legacy to another for running away with his wife. The Baron, if he can discover the alleged culprit of this Raphael ought to be no less generous to him. The Communists have sins enough deservedly to answer for; and, bad as they are, we believe they were, and are, too familiar with good art to steal rubbish.

We refrain commenting on the other pictures in this unique collection, because they have not yet received any laudation in print. In the meantime, there is, to quote the classical words of Mr. Artemus Ward, "nuff sed."

John Popham, alias Juan Mahpop.

P.S.—Mr. King, in a foot-note, states that Mahpop "has mixed, in his description of the pictures by Rubens, a scene from the Garden of Gethsemane and the Crucifixion." Mahpop has done no such thing. When Mr. King visits the Cathedral at Antwerp he will, we trust, find, as thousands besides ourselves have found there, both the "Raising of the Cross" and the "Crucifixion," one of the two on either side of the entrance to the nave.

J. P.

IN Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. 1, part 1, p. 76, printed at the THEATER, OXFORD, A. D. 1717, the author, speaking of Charles the First, says:—

"He might have said, that which *Pericles* was proud of, upon his death-bed, concerning his Citizens, 'That no English-man had ever worn a Mourning Gown through His Occasion.' In a word, many Wise men thought it a Time, wherein those two Adjuncts, which *Nerva* was Deified for uniting, *Imperium & Libertas*, were as well reconcil'd as is possible."

Will the Right Honourable the Earl of Beaconsfield be deified by Englishmen for making the Queen an Empress and giving liberty to her people? Again, Have no Englishmen worn mourning gowns through his occasion?

A FEW WORDS ON PRINTS.

A Paper read before the Numismatic and Archæological Society of Montreal, by Thomas D. King.

PART I.

There will not be a word in this paper about the print works of Lancashire, Glasgow, and Paisley, or of Mousslin-de-laine dresses and Cashmere shawls, with their beautiful designs and wonderful chromatic effects, or of Chintzes and Cambrics with their variety of style and brilliancy in colour; though the arts of the colour printer and dyer are, in the estimation of our young ladies, most important.

Again, the history of cotton printing, from its origin in 1675 to 1879, would be an interesting and curious study; and, so would be the tracing the connection of the art of cotton printing with the art of dress, and the trying to discover the moral effect of dress upon the conduct of mankind.

An inordinate love of the gay frippery furnished out by tailors, tirewomen, and fashion mongers, though it enriches the body, is apt to impoverish the mind. Our great poet hints that the gaudily painted jay with his bright feathers is not so precious as the brown-coated lark that "at heaven's gate sings." And, one of his best commentators considers that an inordinate love of our modern novels, illustrated with sensational prints, tends to weaken, if not to destroy the powers of the mind.

The prints to which I shall chiefly confine my remarks, and to which I shall claim your attention are those which are generally, though improperly, called engravings. They differ in quality and texture as much as cotton prints do in fabric and design, and their nomenclature is equally various.

If it requires an apprenticeship to readily distinguish the different cotton fabrics, such as *Jaconets*, *mullmuls*, *betelles*, *tarlatans*, *tanjeeds*, *bukes*, *doreas*, and others, so it requires years of patient study to become thoroughly acquainted with the mysteries of *Line*, *etching*, *drypoint*, *dotting*, *stippling*, *cross-hatching*, *scrapping*, *lowering*, *chiaro-scuro*, &c.

There are various modes of art by which prints are produced, therefore, a few words on their technical processes will be a fitting introduction to the beautiful works of the engravers' art here collected.*

A print is an impression taken in ink, or other coloured fluid, upon paper, vellum, silk, cotton, or other suitable material from an engraving made upon some hard substance, such as metal and wood; the metal generally being copper, and, occasionally, steel; the wood, box, beech, pear tree, and apple tree. The engraving, therefore, is not the print, but is that which produces the print. The first practice, and, indeed invention of taking impressions on paper from engravings on metal, is generally attributed to the Italians.

The goldsmiths, who executed works in intaglio, for purposes of ornament for armour, scabbards, knife-handles, bracelets, &c., were accustomed to fill their work, when finished, with a black composition, which they called "*niello*," which when dry became compact and hard, and not again removable from the work; all the fine lines of the graver on the metal plate being thus made visible, gave great effect to the work. It is said that the workers in this method were accustomed after finishing their engraving in the metal, and before filling it with niello, to take an impression, or mould, of it in fine clay, and from that mould to take a sulphur cast. This cast, which was an exact counterpart of the metal, was rubbed in with a black pigment until the cavities were filled. The surface of the sulphur is then cleansed to enable the artist to estimate the effect of his engraving when it should be filled with the niello.

Of engraving upon wood there is one method only, but there are several methods of engraving upon metal. On metal the design is produced by cutting, scratching, or corroding the material;—on wood, the operation is precisely the reverse, the design being cut in relief, the rest of the surface being lowered. Engraving upon metal may be called a work in Cameo; engraving upon wood, a work in Intaglio. In order to better understand the difference between the terms *cameo* and *intaglio*; in the latter the subject is hollowed out so that an impression of it would resemble a bas-relief; in the former the object is presented in relief. In other words, the impression from a cameo would be an intaglio, and the impression from an intaglio would be a cameo.

The executing of the incisions on the metal is performed in several ways; the mode of working to which the term "engraving" is applied, is by a lozenge-shaped steel point called a burin, or graver, which ploughs up the copper, by the pressure of the artist's hand, in the direction required by his design. Hence the term Line-engraving, which is considered the most powerful, durable, and difficult. To Martin Schoen, born about the middle of the fifteenth century, has been generally conceded the credit of being the first person, known by name, who engraved metal plates, for the express and sole purpose of taking from them impressions on paper. One of his prints—St. Anthony carried into the Air by Demons—was copied by Michael Angelo, in

* The parlour, in which the paper was read, had its walls decorated with many choice prints, embracing works of some of the masters of the 17th and 18th centuries.