

contribute who now repudiate their liability is likely enough. But, so far as they are benefited by the improved drainage of late years it is strictly fair that they should contribute. The floods, which often make the cultivation of the low-lying lands a dead loss, are partly caused by the withdrawal of the water from the higher lands. As these latter are rendered much more profitable by the process which does injury to their less happily-placed neighbours, it is a matter not of kindness, but of justice, that the possessors of the uplands should bear their part in the outlay which is necessary to prevent their gain from being the loss of others.

It is a better-founded objection to the Bill that, while it taxes the owners and occupiers of the lands which the floods injure, it does not tax the owners of the mills and dams to which much of the injury done is really due. Lord CAMPERDOWN pointed out that the Bill is so far from making this class of owners bear their fair share of the burden, that it actually proposes to compensate them for any loss they may incur by the removal of their dams at the instance of a Conservancy Board. Unfortunately, there are few questions upon which experts seem more hopelessly divided than the operation of artificial obstructions to the course of a river. They are alternately represented as the principal cause of floods and as the one thing which has prevented floods from being much worse than they have been. Possibly the Government have satisfied themselves that the arguments on each side are not equally balanced, and that there is more reason for exempting millowners than there is for including them. In that case they ought to be prepared with conclusive evidence in support of their opinion; for it certainly is not one that they are likely to find taken on trust.

It is difficult to follow Lord CAMPERDOWN'S argument that the storage of water is a purpose that ought not to be included in a Bill for the prevention of floods. To us the two objects seem connected by the most natural tie possible. It will be the business of the Conservancy Boards to be created under the Bill to get rid of the superfluous water brought down by the rivers over which they severally have jurisdiction. The most natural and obvious way of carrying out this end will be to enable the river to carry away the water as rapidly as possible, and with this view the Conservancy Board will naturally do all it can to deepen the bed and quicken the current of the stream. But this very water which is a nuisance at one season of the year may be eagerly coveted at another season. The same perfection of drainage that has contributed to winter floods has equally contributed to summer droughts. The rain is carried off before there is time for it to soak in, and the result is that the springs are deprived of much of the water that used to find its way to them. Under the Bill as it stands the Conservancy Boards are enabled to remedy both forms of the evil; under the Bill as Lord CAMPERDOWN would make it they would only be able to deal with one of them. If they are not to have any power of providing for the storage of water, they must necessarily be accessories to its waste. They will have to decide what shall be done to prevent it from flooding the lands in the basin of a river; and, if they are not allowed to keep it in some safe place until it is wanted, they will be compelled to send it on to the sea with all the despatch they can command.

In the present state of public business, the most fortunate Government measure cannot count upon becoming law this Session. But, as the Bill is before the Lords, it is much to be desired that it should receive very careful attention. There is no reason to suppose that from this point of view a Select Committee has any superiority over a Committee of the whole House. As, however, the Government did not feel themselves strong enough to disregard the suggestion, there is no more to be said. We must only hope that what promises to be a useful Bill will not come out of the ordeal so changed that its own parents will be unable to recognize it.

MACHINE GUNS.

THERE can be no doubt that as we multiply new weapons of destruction, and as the possession of some at least of these in abundance and perfection by an army in the field becomes increasingly necessary, we are gradually being brought to face one of two alternatives. Either the carriage accompanying an army must grow to alarming proportions, or everything will have to give place to transport of man-killing *matériel*. In the latter case

all that is not absolutely required for immediate use must be stored at the base, or at some early stage of the operations. But we are at once arrested by the difficult question as to the mode of transport of soldiers' personal effects. A force gains vastly in proportion to its mobility—the mobility of individuals. A soldier standing in heavy marching order on parade impresses one with any idea rather than that he is, when thus equipped, in good condition for doing prolonged active work. He is evidently *géné* by what he has heaped on his back, attached to his sides and stuck on here and there in front. The soldier shows his thorough appreciation of this fact by pitching all but bullet and bayonet right and left when the tug of action approaches. Some persons, therefore, advocate consigning his knapsack and kit to the waggons, and would load him instead with extra cartridges, three or four days' ration, and an entrenching tool or part of one. Others say, if the men's kits were carried for them, they would not get them when wanted, and that, at any rate, the measure would add to the already heavy encumbrances of the transport train. One thing, however, is certain—that, after providing for the men's mouths, everything else should give place to the necessity of supplying them with means for destroying their opponents. They must never be separated from their reserves of ammunition, nor from their entrenching tools, which are almost as valuable as rifles; they should be able to carry their three or four days' prospective rations, and they require waterproofs for the bivouac. But the subject of readjustment of burden as between men and waggons, or pack animals in the matter of carriage of soldiers' personal effects, provisions, entrenching tools, becomes of minor importance when we look to the growing wants of armies in the matter of the *matériel* of destruction. Various devices are now used for the compressing of food, both for men and animals. A tiny block of stuff having the appearance of granite, and almost as hard, expands in boiling water into succulent vegetable. Other little blocks resolve into nutritious soup. Sausage-meat is jammed together till it really becomes what is termed in culinary science "forced-meat balls." A large quantity of hay is compressible into a very small space. All these expedients bring relief to the transport train, and, what is equally important, allow of a soldier carrying upon his person several days' rations. That which is to preserve life, then, is becoming more portable; at the same time, that which is to destroy is ever demanding increased carriage. The multiplication of methods of destruction entails corresponding provision to allow of various action, rapid use, incessant wear and tear. Formerly there were guns and muskets of simple pattern and slow action, to supply which with enough powder and shot was a comparatively easy matter of calculation. In front of earthworks more formidable guns are now needed; larger projectiles will take up more room; there will be a far greater abundance of these, seeing that fire is now opened at much longer ranges. Breech-loading and repeating rifles make away with a colossal total of cartridges; and it may be said, without exaggeration, if the advocates of extreme long-range infantry fire have their way, it will entail the carriage for a single brigade of as much ammunition as would have sufficed in "Brown Bess" days for a whole army. Again, we have not only the old arms improved, but others of a new type—machine guns in various disguises. Batteries of these take up space on the line of march; the carriage of their reserve ammunition will absorb nearly as much transport as that of field batteries; for mitrailleuses and revolving cannon expend at a furious rate. Were a battery of Gatlings to fire away for one hour, it might easily get rid of three hundred thousand rounds. Then the Hotchkiss revolver shell-gun for field service has, when mounted on its carriage, about the same weight and size as an ordinary cannon. A battery of such in action might discharge, without using over haste, each minute over 400 lbs. of iron. All these instruments require space, and they require transport; animals must drag the batteries and animals must draw ammunition for resupplying them, and these beasts must be fed from carriages drawn by other beasts. It is evident that, just as we want to reduce our encumbrances, the necessity becomes greater for adding to them—that is, if it is necessary to provide armies with all the latest fashions in inventions. Hence it becomes a matter of primary consequence that we should ascertain which instruments serve our purpose best, that we may discard others which take up equal room and much transport. If we can get the value of one gun out of another, let us not be encumbered with both. At any rate, we shall be rid of the inconvenience, often attended with confusion, of having to provide at the right time and place different ammunition for different systems. Inventors are much given to pointing to railroads as the ready means of conveying and distributing their productions. We are told that rapid-firing guns and rapid means of transport go hand in hand, and there is truth in this remark. But armies move away from lines of rail, and lines are blocked or destroyed, and when in working order have plenty to carry without conveying one set of instruments when another would do better.

The possibilities of the mitrailleuse have long ago been ascertained; but as some of its advocates back it so stoutly it may be as well very briefly to compare machines of that type with revolver-guns, with which latter we are here more immediately concerned. The great practical difference between the two is that, while the second propels shells which burst at certain distances, the first discharges solid shot. The mitrailleuse delivers a hail of balls on parallel lines utterly destructive of all upon their path. Whatever scattering motion may be given the volley at starting, the bullets only take effect along their line of flight. The revolver-gun dis-

charges successive single shells, the fragments of which on explosion fly more or less like radii to the rim of a circle. Though the mitrailleuse sets several barrels simultaneously in action, and the shell-gun only one at a time, yet, from the shell resolving itself into many pieces, to get in the same interval an equal number of missiles with the mitrailleuse, this gun must be manipulated with far greater rapidity.

There are several patterns of machine guns of which perhaps the best known are the Reffye, Montigny, Gatling, Hotchkiss, and Nordenfeldt. They are designed with variations for different uses; some being for field service, some for employment afloat, others for employment in fortifications. The Nordenfeldt is not on the revolver principle; the Gatling is an improved mitrailleuse; the Hotchkiss is a revolver-cannon. The latter piece has five parallel, or practically parallel, barrels of Whitworth steel, grouped about the same axis. When the mechanism is started the barrels are in turn brought round in front of the apparatus, which successively loads, fires, and takes out the spent cartridge. That is to say, a simple turn of the hand—the machinery being worked with the ease of a barrel-organ—suffices to load one barrel, fire another, and extract a cartridge-case from one more. It would appear at first sight as if the action of the piece must be necessarily slow, but the speed at which it may be worked depends less on manipulation that gives the rotary motion than on a constant supply of cartridges being at hand. When the gun is "fed" quickly, but without hurry, some sixty shots per minute may be easily fired. The missiles vary with different requirements. In the navies of several foreign Powers solid shot is fired from the Hotchkiss. For field service an explosive shell discharged with percussion fuze is used, and canister may also be employed. On board ship it is necessary to have missiles possessing perforating power for employment against boats, especially torpedo-boats, rather than those which scatter over a wide area. What we require in a land fight are missiles with disseminating action, missiles which will resolve into fragments numerically sufficient to search out all within a certain zone, and yet not too minute. Each fragment should be powerful enough to substantially maim man or horse, not necessarily to kill outright. It pays better, as has been said, to maim than to kill, for a wounded man requires looking after. The claim made for the Hotchkiss one and a half-inch revolver is that one of these will fire at least sixty shells in the minute, each bursting in some twenty or more pieces having size and momentum sufficient to materially damage, and of course often destroy, both man and horse. A battery of these guns—a battery of thirty barrels—would be able then to disseminate in one minute about eight thousand shell-fragments; and, with ammunition at hand and well served, there is no reason why a continuous discharge should not be maintained. The effective range is up to 3,000 yards.

Some of the advantages urged for the Hotchkiss over the ordinary mitrailleuse may be briefly summed up thus:—The former uses explosive shell, which creates a striking moral effect, and the destructiveness of which is spread over a wider area; the mechanism is simpler; the machinery does not require rapid manipulation; and it stands wear and tear well. Moreover, a less amount of ammunition is required to produce the same effect. The shock of discharge also is better distributed; or, rather, it is concentrated so as to bear upon the mass of the piece itself, and not upon the machinery—an important point this when the sequence of shocks is incessant and rapid. Opponents and rivals of the system we have touched upon above urge, on the other hand, various objections to it. The Hotchkiss fires one shot at a time; true that is a bursting shell, but it is the discharge of a single barrel, and it is argued that volleys of bullets from multiple barrels have a wider parallel of effect. Then it is said the solid bullets of hardened lead give more penetration than fragments of shell; but this objection is of minor importance in the field, seeing that shell-morsels or bullets would serve equally well for maiming and disabling, but would neither of them do appreciable damage to *matériel*. Again, the advocates of the Gatling say that a small gun on that system will up to 1,200 yards secure more hits in the same time than any Hotchkiss of whatever size. And a defect is alleged against the machinery of the latter, that if the extractor which takes out exploded cartridges, failed to act by drawing off the head of the cartridge, the machine would be brought to a standstill till the obstructed barrel was cleared, the other barrels not being capable of separate manipulation. The defect, however, is very soon remedied. Furthermore, the Gatling people assert that, when all is said the Hotchkiss reproduces with but some small variations the leading features of their own system. Dr. Gatling was, we believe, the first parent of machine guns, which he introduced nearly twenty years back. He was the first, if not to entertain the idea, at least to produce a gun capable of continuous firing from barrels practically self-loading. He may fairly, therefore, lay claim to have set other persons' wits to work, and if they improve upon his invention, it does not detract from his credit, and they deserve all of theirs. No invention, of whatever merit or utility, is of such finished perfection as that some one coming later may not add some touches. Especially is this the case with first inventions of their kind. Inventors, however, seem haunted by a dread that the "shine" will be taken out of their productions if any one adopts them with a difference and pushes the design a bit further. The truth is, that the greater the number of clever people who swoop down upon an invention and try to create a patent for themselves by giving it a novel twist, the more is the credit which is due to the man who sug-

gested to these clever people their occupation. Dr. Gatling's reputation speaks for itself; but it is also distinctly creditable to some others that they should have foreseen and provided for the necessity of having machine guns of larger calibre than he had suggested, or, at any rate, had made. Moreover, the Hotchkiss gun has striking points of difference from the Gatling and most other machine guns; one of which—the distribution of shock on discharge—we have referred to; and another is that all the barrels in the former are worked by one set of mechanism, but in the Gatling, at least, each barrel has its own machinery.

What the public is interested in is not the degree of merit attaching to one inventor or another, but the amount of profit to be derived from adopting one or other, or all, of their inventions. The question here is not one of calibre, but of system. Guns may be built up of any calibre on any system. There is nothing to prevent Dr. Gatling constructing a bigger machine than the largest produced by Mr. Nordenfeldt or Mr. Hotchkiss, and either of these gentlemen might then turn the tables on Dr. Gatling. But which system may be expected to give us greater results, or must we utilize both, or need we adopt either? Shall we take a piece concentrating in itself as many rifles as would fire continuously a thousand rounds a minute, or do we think the rifles can dispense with its aid and give of themselves more varied effects? Must we adopt the revolver cannon when field artillery gives us a larger shell and further range? But, first, as regards shell *versus* bullet.

It is plain that when employed against scattered formations the shell would be more efficacious than the hail of bullets; on the other hand, the latter would plough a lane through any closed body. But where are we likely to come across closed bodies? The tendency everywhere now is towards open formations. What is needed, therefore, is dissemination of missiles. The shell strikes out right and left, the solid bullets go straight ahead. Over a limited area like the deck of a vessel we can readily believe in a storm of bullets being much more certainly destructive than a shell with an equal number of fragments; but a field of battle is a wide space. The occasions must be rare where the fire of a skirmishing line would not, with the same expenditure of ammunition, create much more effect than would a mitrailleuse. There are cases, of course, when the latter might be used with grand results—for instance, against cavalry in closed bodies, on men rushing together to storm, on columns at a distance which had not resolved themselves into units, on a baggage train in enfilade. The question is, whether to meet these cases it is necessary that a force should be equipped with mitrailleuses or any gun propelling a mass of solid bullets, or whether we have not in cannon and rifles what will suffice for all emergencies. As to revolver-guns, their case stands upon a different footing. It was observed they meet one exigency of modern war—the necessity of scattering projectiles in order to meet scattered formations. But field-guns firing shrapnel do vastly more damage at every range than revolver-guns can possibly effect. What special advantages, then, can be urged on their behalf? First of all, a revolver does not require so many men for its service. It presents, therefore, a smaller mark. Its ammunition is more portable, more compressible, more manageable. Its fire is far more rapid. The big guns, however, must always be the principals, the small ones taking minor parts; while the former have the length and breadth of a vast square under command, the latter will serve admirably to fill up the interstices. *Qui brille au second s'éclipse au premier*, and many inventors would gain more lasting credit than they do if, instead of puffing their productions into a higher position than they can maintain, they would exhibit them in those aspects where their advantages are undeniable. It is the same with theorists who push doctrines to extremes. We remember well how after the Crimean war enthusiasm was extravagantly aroused about the effects of the Enfield rifle, and young officers fresh from the musketry course at Hythe declared loudly that artillery was "done for." It was of little use to urge that the introduction of rifled cannon was the logical deduction from that of rifled muskets. Two years later found rifled cannon in actual use in a great war. And now some persons would have us believe long-range infantry fire is to accomplish everything.

It would be worth the while of any who have doubts as to the part artillery will play in war to refresh their memory by the perusal of Dr. Russell's ever-memorable story of the battle of Sedan. Again and again does the writer revert to the effects, moral and physical, wrought by the crushing cross-fire of the German guns. The French cannon fire was reduced to impotence, while their infantry, brave as they were, cowered and quailed before the ceaseless storm. It is not only that men pounded with cannon, searched out by shell fragments even behind *épaulements*, suffer actual loss, but they become incapable of using their own weapons with effect. Since Sedan rifles have improved a little, but guns have improved a great deal more. The truth is that so many changes for the better are being effected in all connected with artillery—with the piece, its weight for power and abatement of recoil on discharge, with the cartridge, the shell, the powder, the range, attainment of accuracy at great ranges—that it is a question not how guns shall meet rifles, but rather how the latter may be improved to meet perfected artillery. With this latter *arma* we must now, we think, associate the revolver-cannon—not necessarily the Hotchkiss, though it must be allowed the system of that inventor is at present unsurpassed. As regards calibre, it should unquestionably be very moderate for field work. The gun is in no sense to be looked on as a rival to the ordinary field-gun. It is

simply and solely the complement of that piece. Skirmishing riflemen, supports running up to reinforce these, scattered troopers, marks which the big guns would be too occupied to notice, or be above noticing, all such the revolver is well calculated to take account of; while within its more limited range it would cause serious losses among any formed body. Of the several problems which the next European war holds in store for solution there are few more curious and more important than what is to be the result of vertical rifle fire as against that of the perfected shrapnel combined with the revolver shell. Where so much is uncertain, it is absurd to dogmatize, and the most we can do is not to begin with a theory, but work up logically by slow steps till we arrive at one. We ourselves have got little further than the recognition of two facts in the controversy—one of which is, that both cannon and revolver-cannon have a greater reach than rifles; and the other, that at distances where rifle fire can only be delivered with the vaguest idea of the locality where the bullets will descend, the former can still plant their shells with very destructive accuracy.

An army equipped with field-cannon and revolver-cannon can scarcely need the aid of any sort of mitrailleuse. The interstices of a battle-ground are sufficiently well filled without it. Solid bullets from machine guns propelled straight ahead, or with only slightly scattering action, are excellent against masses within their parallel of action; but we want that parallel to lie the other way—right and left, left and right—and we get much of this effect with the revolvers' shells. The former weapons are luxuries, rising to the dignity of necessities perhaps in other places, but, in our view, may safely be dispensed with in a *bataille rangée*. And, as was observed above, the incumbrances of an army must be reduced to a minimum if that army is to possess due mobility; in that minimum it would be difficult to find a valid reason for including any sort of mitrailleuse firing solid shot.

AMERICAN AMENITIES.

AMERICA has sent us several accomplished actors. It is commonly supposed that criticism thrives where art is successful, and therefore we might expect to find excellent criticism of the stage in the country of Mr. Booth and Mr. Jefferson. And yet, when we read the American theatrical critiques, we seem to miss that delicacy and urbanity, that fine reflectiveness and precision, which it was natural to look for. *Nym Crinkle's Feuilleton* is the name of an American journal, devoted to the best interests of the stage, which lies before us. The title is a little odd. We readily see what Nym has to do with the whole art and mystery of publishing as practised in the United States. "They will steal anything, and call it—purchase," as the Boy says of Nym and his companions. As to the name of Crinkle, we fail to see the humour of it. But a paragraph in *Nym Crinkle's Feuilleton* tells us "what Forney thinks about it." Forney thinks that "*Nym Crinkle's Feuilleton* ought to succeed. The stage should support such a paper as Mr. Wheeler (Nym Crinkle) publishes. He holds the very first rank among New York critics, and is, perhaps, the most brilliant writer of them all." If Forney thinks this it must be all right, and we are justified in regarding Mr. Crinkle as the foremost of the critics of the American stage.

So brilliant is Mr. Crinkle that the coruscating radiance of his style dazzles the mere European, even if he has accustomed himself to the gorgeous manner of the theatrical critic of the *Academy*. That writer appears to have excited some envy in the breast of Nym Crinkle. "Poor Coghlan," says Nym, "has been mangled in the London *Academy* for his representation of Corrado in *La Mort Civile* (*sic*), for, says the merciless critic, 'it is hardly to be accounted either faultily faultless, or icily regular.'" This is immense criticism; but Mr. Crinkle himself uses language which seems beyond even the opulent resources of the London *Academy*. He has to complain that the newspapers did not notice a certain performance of Miss Anderson's. "Every daily paper dodged it. Even William Winter, Esq., could not stretch his taffy sufficiently to cover its magnificent unfitness, and so gave up the job." This is like the obscure glow of the style of Tertullian, which has been compared to the polished darkness of ebony. There is no mistake, however, about the significance of a friendly notice when it appears in the *Kansas Times*. Thus we read that "Emma Abbott is coming this way—pretty, cosy, lovable, vivacious, bewitching, kissable little Emma Abbott. She is coming with her bird-like voice, her sunny face, her fair hair, her sweet smile," and a great deal more. The catalogue becomes, like a suppressed volume of *Sainte-Beuve's*, as described in a bookseller's catalogue, *étouffé* *intime*. In spite of this favourable notice in the *Kansas Times*, *Nym Crinkle's Feuilleton* takes a sterner view of Miss Abbott, whom it calls "the gushing paroxysmal Emma." We have always supposed hitherto that the most personal and unsparing criticism in the world was that applied by sporting reporters to the individual members of the University crews. "Five feathers abominably under water," "three does not pull the weight of his boots, and is a mere passenger." But actors and actresses are frankly told by Nym Crinkle that their playing is "vile."

Even when players are off the stage, Mr. Crinkle "stretches his taffy," as he would say, so as to bring them within the range of that instrument; for "taffy," we presume, is a New York scientific term for a telescope. Thus, in writing about Shakespeare and the

modern stage, Mr. Crinkle has to mention what he takes to be the opinion of Mr. McCullough. This is how he does it:—

If ever you should meet John McCullough late at night at Delmonico's, eating deviled lobster with the gusto of a Goth, and the gentility of a god, he will tell you, with inimitable suavity, and delightful confidence, that the people flock to his performances because of their love of Shakspeare.

If Mr. McCullough can preserve his suavity and modesty in a country where the most brilliant critics write in this style, it is impossible for any circumstances to spoil him.

The Greek philosophers thought that a city should never be so large but that all the citizens might be personally acquainted with each other. Large as the American democracy is, the citizens seem all to be on the most familiar terms with every one. The aristocratic title of "Mr." is dropped in the newspapers, and all men and women are spoken of by their Christian names or nicknames. This affectionate familiarity is extended even to natives of the old European States, where people are not so truly brethren, and do not so frankly regard each other as children of one great family. The *Feuilleton*, for example, has several columns of paragraphs, each paragraph being headed by the name of the person concerned. Thus we read:—"SARDOU.—Victorien Sardou is wintering at Nice." Here, again, is information about Mrs. Claxton's public engagements and private sorrows, conveyed in this delicate and sympathetic manner:—"CLAXTON.—Kate Claxton is billed for Albaugh's Holiday Street Theatre, Baltimore, next Monday. Poor Kate Claxton is still overwhelmed with the loss of her only child, who died in Albany on New Year's Day." His Majesty the Democracy's servants are not treated with very tender consideration:—"NASBY.—Petroleum V's widow, the relict of the late Bedott, will exhibit herself nightly at the Fourteenth Street Theatre, under the protection of Col. Haverly." This bereaved lady is spoken of with no more gentleness than "KNOX.—The learned pigs of Professor Knox have been a feature at the New York Aquarium." And what can be meant by the dark saying that Herr Sontag is "an actor full of vim"? As to a lady now playing with much applause in London, we are informed by the brilliant Crinkle that "she has dropped the Countessship gag." After reading these paragraphs, and others which we do not reproduce for very good reasons, we find out what Mr. Crinkle thinks of what he calls "Esthetic criticism." "Esthetic criticism is not a science. No one has ever succeeded in formulating its laws. Current criticism is the expression of individual taste," and we have seen the freedom of the individual taste of the untrammelled Mr. Crinkle.

The *Feuilleton* is not very particular; but American journalism is no longer what it was. The press of that country is, we imagine, becoming "Europeanized," and personal remarks are no longer so common or so malignant as of old. We have recently chanced to pick up a brief history of the American press, a statistical and detailed account of the fights and floggings of American editors, which is not disagreeable reading. The first American newspaper duel was fought as long ago as 1785. Matthew Carey met Colonel Oswald; they fought with pistols, near Philadelphia, and Carey was severely wounded. In 1804 Cheetham, of the *American Citizen*, challenged Coleman, of the *Evening Post*. Coleman not only wanted to fight, but proclaimed his martial eagerness in his newspaper, thus inducing the police to prevent the battle. This conduct caused Captain Thompson to praise Coleman for his Christian meekness. Coleman could not endure being called a Christian, and the parties met in a snow-storm. The falling light made it impossible for them to see each other distinctly at ten yards' distance, so they gradually advanced, till Thompson, exclaiming "I've got it," fell mortally wounded, and left the victory to the Christian warrior, Coleman. In consequence of a newspaper row, Mr. Pettis challenged the shortsighted Major Biddle. Biddle refused to shoot at a longer "rise" than five feet, and both fell at the first discharge. When the intrepid Cumming encountered the aristocratic M'Duffie, the former wore a light blouse and trousers of cotton, while the latter was dressed in silk. M'Duffie's bullet entered the ground within four feet of his own toes, but Cumming's was more skilfully directed, and struck M'Duffie under the short ribs. When the lamented Cilley, again, in consequence of newspaper criticism, fought Mr. Graves, the weapons selected were rifles. The men were posted at a distance of ninety-two yards, and, at the second discharge, Mr. Cilley was shot through the body. Colonel Webb, of the *New York Courier*, was hit by Marshall in the leg, and was afterwards put into gaol. Mr. Bennett, of the *Herald*, sent Webb (an old enemy) a box of cigars, but Webb, in spite of the bullet in his leg, kicked the weeds out of the room. Woods, of the *Kansas Democrat*, libelled young Levi Coleman, a minister of the Methodist persuasion. Woods also assaulted Coleman in the street, kicked him, and pulled his evangelical nose. All these insults at the editorial hand Coleman bore with Christian patience. What happened? Why the Methodists of Little Rock, like one believer, deserted and Boycotted their lately respected pastor. He was coldly dismissed by a young sister to whom he was betrothed. The bruised Methodist will turn, and Coleman accepted a challenge from Woods, then esteemed the most dangerous pistol-shot on the American press. Pistols were the weapons, an "unusually large course assembled" to see the parson shot, and the Methodist killed the newspaper bully at the first fire. The Rev. Levi Coleman was now admitted to the best society of Little Rock. But his victory lowered his moral tone; he became a bitterly sarcastic writer, and