

16, ST. GILES,
OXFORD.

January 5th
1892

My dear Bannister,

I shall be sorry if ~~you~~
what you say this morning about
Finland is your final determi-
nation. I don't understand
how it can be not "worth your
while." The case of Finland
is about the most curious
political study in Europe; you
may take my word for that;
I have known something about it
for a long time, and I have been
getting it up more fully lately.
Besides it is one of the most

important practical questions
of the like, whether a question
with a free constitution is to be
lived out. And perhaps the more
so because none but non-com-
-port can be given by any other
people.

The Home Rule people dead;
I hope not. But the clergy
with their question elsewhere
is a very small part of the
Finnish business. And you
may have seen in this paper
how the Tories
can bring in Finland and
anything else for the spread

of ignorance and confusion.

I am sorry you let in that
Latin paper - They - I used
the plural, because they confess
to be several people trading under
one name - might have been kept
in the place where they arose.
Whether the facts be true or
false I have no means of judging,
but in either case it is a
-sort of the vulgar, spiteful, re-
-viling sort of Russia, right
or wrong. And I think that
your having put that it is
another reason for allowing
a statement of it will do
(or purpose) of Russia for

one who has never been afraid
to applaud Rucie when in
the right, and that is Cont.
Rev.

So I hope you will shortly
be one of the Finnish
networks in your power.

Yours very truly
Edward Freeman

16, ST GILES,
OXFORD.

December
31st, 1891

My dear Bening,
Could you let me write
something in Cont. Rev. about
Finland before long? I have
not been there, and it is
only the political condi-
tion that I have to do
with. But that I have been
looking at a good deal, and
I have informants and in the
country. The most recent
able and successful case of
Home Rule in Europe is (I think).
And I think it is well

Let an exposure of Rusci's
if he wrong should come
from those who were not a-
-frail to welcome Rusci's
if he right rather than for
vulgar declaimers.

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman

16, ST GILES,
OXFORD.

November
8th. 1891

My dear Bunting,

Thanks for the cheque which
came yesterday.

I wrote the article pre-
sently in answer to Weldon
in your number of October.
I gathered from his opening
words that something was
going to happen at Cam-
bridge ~~but I had no~~
~~no~~ sometime; but I had
no notion that it was going
to happen before my article
could come out. So what I

said had no direct reference
to the ~~fact~~ immediate
Cambridge question, though
of course people fancied
it had.

The "country clergy" is a
very old cry. Hae it Oxford
it was at one time a true
one; but it has long ceased
to be so. I know not how
it is at Cambridge, where
twice kings at Oxford is
mainly the train which
brings down a crowd of young
sters for the London clubs.
And after all are not the
"country clergy" say I think:

well, Merivale, ^{Stall} Church, when
they lived at their several
parsonages, just as well able
to judge of things as any
concocted young chap who
lives either by torturing
cats or by making bad jokes.

By the way, you let in
a popular story: teller into
Capt. Rev. a little time
back. I read the first line
"His name was Charlie."
I therefore read no more. That
is not the way in which
Walter Scott or George Eliot
or Mrs. Gaskell began a story.
You may say
Edward Freeman

16, ST GILES,
OXFORD.

May 18th
1891

My dear Banting,

When I wrote Lay Endow:
=rents you spoke of Paul on
April, and I said April.
I concluded it did not come
in May, and now you doubt
about June. The existing
controversy which is going on
in several places is surely
more pressing than such reb:
=but in "Democracy & Dic:
=radr -" if the new her cry:
=that to say, what can't be
put it in a rational shape.
-and Harris' stale jokes
and of which we have heard

1001 lines. One does feel
a little annoyed, as an
old contributor who once
contributed for something, at last
-ing such stuff put before
one. On the other hand Duffer
Renaissance is a really
kindly and impatient way:
-ing which I consider you
did not hot out as the head
paper. And the report for
America is kindly too, if
it had a less affected
title.

You must allow for human
nature. When I look back
to my relation to the Co:

^{a down paper over back}
-terprayer Review, it does
seem strange to be head-
less of, I cannot guess why,
then there guess things that
look back yourself.

Yours very truly
Edward Freeman

16, ST. GILES,
OXFORD.

May 12th
1891

My dear Banting,

I am really sorry that
you put off (without telling)
my article on Ancient
dog documents for ^{9th} October
month. It is a pity, & because
it is putting it further &:
sooner for the earlier ones
to be sent it has reference,
and what have caused a
good deal of discussion in
some quarters. I think
this is a sound argument.
Besides this, it is rather

arriving to express feelings
to be shared for "Grant
Allen" and that sort of
heck thing. The record of
things for which I can put
aside do not seem at all
prevalent, and mine, had
an immediate purpose, has
been put off twice.

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman

16, ST GILES,
OXFORD.

19 Grand Pa.
Trade, East.
House, Felling
8th. 1891

My dear Bunting,

Thanks for the cheque which
followed me hither yesterday.
I broke down a bit on the
day of the show, and I have
been taken here to pick
up a bit - literary people
I believe call it recuperate
and hope to be back in Oxford
by the end of the week.

Elizabeth did not un-
derstand French; but I
won't quarrel with your certifi-
cate work, if you will allow
it to apply to the property

granted to the King as well
as to that granted to the
Abbot.

Hen. V.'s Parliament, for
thoroughly wise and just
reasons, confiscated the
property of the alien priors.
Could they not equally ~~the~~
have confiscated the property
of lay Frenchmen, if there
had been any?

But she might go on ar:
-guing for ever. so I want
you to let her go on with my
argument whenever you
will give her a place in Court.
Rev.

I don't smoke any more than
Pobstov, and I wonder why
anybody does. But I don't
think her all cracked.

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman,

16, ST. GILES,
OXFORD.

January
4th. 1891

My dear Bunting,

Could you let me have
a paper in the next Con:
-tributory Review - they
require only a very few - to
say a word or two on the cr:
-itics in your present number
on the ~~deceased~~ Edmonds
of the Church. I don't want
to dispute any of his facts,
but just to put (for the 1001st
time) the right application
of them, which is so hard
to make anybody of us

side group - they better so with have all the numbers here - but
their notions about Securities here all in chaos.
on one side, & National Pro-
-party on the other, and neither
seem to take in that the supreme
power of the State lies in the
nature of things, do whatever
it pleases.

There was an article in
Cont. Rev. some months back,
with much clearer notions
than usual. It was, I think,
by J. Allison Pictor. I read
it somewhere on my travels,
and I do not remember the
number. If I were at home, I
could find it at once. I

You do sometimes put in
lectures and addresses. Some
at Birmingham thought that
the address I made here to the
Midland Institute, chiefly
on Birmingham Borough and
City, ought to go further than
Birmingham and the coasts
thereof. So do I. But it
could not stand by itself -
and I do not know whether
you would care for it - it
needs too long a two Pran-
nyan. But I will send it
you when I get the proof.

copies. When will you ever
come and see me here?

Yours very truly

Edward T. Freeman

-Somerset, Wells,
~~Somerset~~ Somerset
June 21st, 1889.

My dear Bunkie,

There are too very different
kinds that I should
like to ~~find~~ write something
about, if you can find me
a place in Cont. Rev. Or
is my last Sicilian Tre:
vels and Research - of
my work is the first little
while back - in which I
have seen a good deal that
is not often seen. The other
is the new phase which

the political question seems to
be taking. I cannot go in
for Asquith's Federation - I
do not believe people know
what Federation means or
what they are ~~bringing~~ doing.
I have no ship I might see
to say: I have agreed the
whole thing from beach,
either with you or elsewhere,
but people forget so soon
that the same case has
to be stated over and over
again, specially when one

has my constant ill luck of seeing things
before other people. That is the worst part of
this one can do. One gets no satisfaction the
time, and when the question comes up again, one
is supposed to be following one's old chief.
I think it must be understood for the sake of the
I should like to state the case again.
Federation & Heligoland seem to have shared

a good long.

San Antonio has
a fine work.

I very truly
Edward Atkinson

16, ST GILES,
OXFORD.

November
26th, 1889

My dear Banting,

I send you at last my
lecture or paper or whatever
one is to call it on the po-
-sition of Seebohm and De
Glaillon. It was type-written
because it had to be read
for me; but, as I am not
used to type-writing, I have
no Latin what be it
~~might be~~ ^{hard}. And it
has been a good deal altered
since. I hope it may suit

you. It has a curious history.
I looked Subotkin's notions
when his book was new. They
were brought back again to
my mind by Dr. Chaillon. He
seemed hardly worth notice
in himself, but he became very
curious in his relation to
Subotkin. So I believe I
have made something out of
the two.

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman

7

March 26th
1888

My dear Bunking,

I am a little disappointed
with what you say about my
proposed article. I should have
thought that it was not a bad thing
when people are, I dare say, —
I am sure I am — tired of having
the same things said over and
over on both sides, to show
that the subject can be treated
with some freshness. And
people are always saying
that they don't know what or
nearly Home Rule. I know

very well what I mean by it,
namely the relation of a self-
governed dependency, distinct
from either federation or personal
union, ~~which~~ with which people
are apt to confound it. What
Gladstone proposed answers
my definition: if he or any
body else proposes a federal
union, that will be a new
proposal, which must be dis-
cussed on its own merits.

I want to cheer people's heads
a bit, and I hope you will let
me. I should like to do it
for May; but Jane could do.

Yours very truly
Edward Thornton

as far as we can see. Compare
the huge Siberian rivers with Pi-
=ber, Thames, and Seine. It is
the little ones which ~~have~~
~~done~~ are of real account. So
in the course of history. The
modern scientific discoveries
enabled large states to rise
to the level of small ones,
the small states were always
really at the head. All this
has been about Christianity
but "procentric", is exactly
of a piece as Bob Lower
sniggering at "petty states"
and despising battles where
so few people are killed.

I think I can make something
of this from my side, and I
should like to do so, if you
approve. It is of course
simply an argument, after
the manner of Bishop Butler,
not proving anything, but
meeting an objection.

If you like this, could
you mind telegraphing Yes
-or No, if your mind be the
other way - to the address
at the head of this letter. I
can then do it at once. I
expect to be here at Palermo
~~at~~ at least till the end of
the year, and then to think of

going to other parts. This is my kind wish,
to revise and fill up my big Picnic No:
-tag, which I hope will go to the (University)
press before the end of next year.

Believe me very truly yours

Edward Freeman

Albergo di Francia,
Palermo, December
2nd. 1888.

My dear Bunking,

(I see that I have begun
at the wrong end of the paper).
I have been away for many
days that there is a letter from
you to me waiting at Miles,
whether it was sent by mis-
take to a hotel to which I
did not go. We have written
several times; but they do
not seem disposed to send it
on. However it does not much
matter, as I believe I know what
was the letter. You did

not suggest any subject for
contemporary, but asked me
to suggest something. Well,
I have been thinking over se-
veral things, and this has struck
me. I read with great interest
an article in the Spectator
of November 27 about the dif-
ficulties which are supposed
to be known by modern Chris-
tians in the way of the Chris-
tian revelation. Put shortly,
it comes to this, The Earth is
so small and so insignificant
in the universe that it is im-
possible to believe that the
Creator has thought to use so
much trouble about it. It is

texts or Christianity teachers.
There is a good deal to be said
on this for several points: but
there is one of which I wish
specially to say something.
This kind of argument seems
to me to be simply another
form of the idolatry of physi-
cal science against which
I have constantly to fight
in historical and political
matters. "God hath chosen
the weak things of the earth
to confound the strong" is a
very good text and tells through
everything. It seems to me
to be quite in harmony with

all that we know of the earth and its history.
That a planet of brute physical nature
in the universe should be of the highest intel-
ligent. ~~But~~ We can really tell nothing
about the inhabitants of other planets and
other systems, whether there are any or not. But
it would surely tell us with the experience
of this earth, surely if they should be civilized
or inhibited by beings inferior to ourselves.
Look at the map of the world, how large a part
of it is both barbarous and uncivilized.

7

July 10th
1887

My dear Bunking,

There are two things which, if they suit you, I should like to write something about in Cont. Rev.

I. That is a very fine piece of rhetoric of Harrisons, with a vast deal of both in it; but he seems to miss one side of the question. A building that has been immenously used can only go on being used by a certain amount of repair, which may occasionally amount even to the rebuilding of particular parts. ~~say West:~~
They are not pure things of the

best, but the present has a
right in them also. The historical
consciousness of the nation calls
for the continued use of (1) the
Westminster Abbey, Westminster
Hall, and the Tower of London
for the great events.
And this cannot be, according
to Herriot's view - at least
cases might easily happen in
which it could not be. 'Tis an
old subject of mine, as old
as 1851, when I drew the case
drafted at the Bristol Meeting
of the Archaeological Institute.

II. ~~from~~ I went to say some-
thing for my point of view, about
this dispute about literature &

literature, with some, but not an exhaustive
reference to our Oxford doings, which have been
so widely misrepresented. We are all for liter-
ature, but not in the sense of "chatter about
Shelley."

Of these, if you like them, I should be done at
once. It had better wait till October or Novem-
ber.

At the end of p. 71 I gave present number of
with reference to the selection of Fletcher of
at No. 2. I need hardly say there is no such case
spoken of. I need hardly say there is no such case

as Vaud. The offender, as
the story shows, was the Bailiff
(Vost) sent by the Bernese
oligarchy to rule over the
subject land of Vaud.

Yours very truly
Edward Atkinson

7

February 15th
1888

My dear Bunting,

I wonder if you would tell me who wrote the first article in Cont. Rev. this month. Why or what does he not give his name? I have been exceedingly struck by it, by some parts of it most specially. He has so thoroughly grasped and so clearly set forth what I hold to be the leading truth of all history, ~~the essence~~ (which He: Rodon understood perfectly well, though Foreign Offices don't), the eternal opposition

between Greek and barbarian, European and Asiatic, or whatever you please to call it, as eternal difference, simply heightened, sharpened, sharpened - what actually people could call accentuated - by the difference between Christianity and Islam. And then he so clearly sees (though he has not directly brought out the contrast) why English missionaries don't succeed in India now as they did in former times. He says, the teacher is too far apart from the taught; then the teacher differs only from the taught only by his Christianity

and what his Christianity brought with it. But the Roman missionaries in England were not so removed as English missionaries in India now; at any rate both were white. I have not for a long time read anything that struck me here. I should very much like to know the author.

But I will speak to me would not talk about "Peters" and "Muckers". He could know the history of the letter u or y is Greek, sch, and English.

I sent you a paper ~~about~~
of mine about I wrote in an
odd place for the European Com-
pendium Company. I believe
it gets into a good many A-
merican papers; but I should
like it to ~~get into~~ get seen a
bit in England too. People on
both sides are so fond of philo-
sophies and will not see the
real ones.

Will you ever come and see
us here?

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman

7

March 18th
1888

My dear Banking,

I had hoped to have an answer
to the letter I wrote some time
back. I should like to write
something on the real and false
analogies of strict Home Rule;
for the false analogies are ~~very~~
every day cropping up on both
sides, and it would be a real
gain to put forth a few plain
truths as to what such ana-
logies prove and don't prove.
I mean this kind of thing, which
people do not seem to see.
"If Home Rule has ever succeeded"

That does not prove that it
will succeed in Ireland;
but it does prove that it may
succeed, that it is not some-
thing absurd and monstrous
in itself.

That Home Rule has ever
failed does not prove that it
will fail in Ireland, but it
does prove that it may fail,
that it is not an universal
remedy."

Nobody could deny that
too propositions, so put. But
people do practically deny
them all round.

I should like to work out
what I said in Salisbury

now fully.

I wrote about the ~~whole~~ whole thing in March
Garden about two years ago. There is no
better evidence (in itself) than what you get there;
only it ~~is~~ is not seen by A.B.C. that you
best to see it. So I wanted some of the Liberal
pressing affairs to reprint it; but they could
not attend. They don't attend to any thing when
we are in the Parliament or in some local set.

Yours very truly
Edward Sturges

Now write to me, I shall see before long.

7

Hôtel de France,
Palermo, February

13th. 1887

My dear Bunking,

I did not at all wish to
"abuse the Austrian rulers just
now"; rather the contrary. I
wanted to point out the very
curious fact that the Magyar
family estate is driven into
a quasi-national policy by
having to follow the wishes of
the only part of its subjects
which has a national being.
That is: there is just now
no Austrian policy; there is a
Hungarian policy. The fact

is obvious enough to More who
understands the state of the case;
but the confused way of talking
~~the~~ among diplomats and peer-
-paper writers is likely to put it
out of sight. But surely I said
all this in my former letter.

You don't know my other
question, whether you would like
anything about Western Society.
We have just come back from a
journey ~~there~~. On the road
with the "Firma in poste, Siracusa."

You shall have the Oxford volume
for April.

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman

X
A. Macmillan, Esq
Knapdale,
Upper Bookings, Dec:
October 24th, 1886.

My dear Bankings,

I am here out of the way
of the Oxford critics - the reason
by which I hold the best ground:
- that they are to be held here.

I gether for your letter of
October 13th that you could
not object to an article on
Oxford matters. So, if you
don't say anything to the con:
- trary, I will begin it as soon
as I have got rid of some
other things.

Yes, do skin up Seely to know me, if he
can. I see Froude has sold a plan of the book
elsewhere I can write but don't know how to
speak. I am agreed with the New Zealand man
who shows that he says to be lies, but (O
secret & simplices) expected Froude to write
something else.

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman,

1 letter for you
 October 13th 1864
 not object to be
 crossed out if you
 wish it to be
 I am for it
 O.K.

1 letter for you
 October 13th 1864
 not object to be
 crossed out if you
 wish it to be
 I am for it
 O.K.

7

16 St. Giles
Oxford.
December 1st
1885

My dear Bunkie.

O Horse printer - O. p.
 885. I ~~st~~ wrote Tzekinje, as
 plain as possible. They turned
 it into some folly, I forget
 what. I then wrote Tzekinje
 again on the proof, and they
 now make it Tzekinje.
 How on earth do the creatures
 sound it? And they delayed
 me like conkers, what I spe-
 cially asked to be spared.
Sweet make; but I press

There is nothing to be done; it is
hardly worth making a connecti-
on; but somebody is sure to
join.

I hope you will find the
Petrarchian article. I am quite
sure that that and others that
I have by me would take. I
find a bit of topography class
for you.

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman

7 - Arles, April 16th,
1885

My dear Bunkie,

I wonder if a paper or two
or some of the places down
here would suit you for Cont.
Rev. You know my obj.
the buildings to illustrate
the history and the history
to illustrate the buildings.
Arles itself I rather dislike
for a miniature sketch then
would suit you. But I
could easily make something
of one or two other cities. Would
you kindly let me know at

Posta Restante, Valencia,

Drôme (Somebody said that
Drôme was the most impor-
-tant department in France;
got Valentin's her a history),
what for think of this. I
have a lot of material, and if
it is to be worked into shape
the sooner I begin the better.

What does R. L. Stevenson
mean about Macaulay? He says
I believe it is the fashion now
to run down the one writer
of English - of course at least
than him, and with whom
else they need a sentence
1001 times out of sheer pique.

= sure, but never ^{used} it twice to see what it
means.

I get but faint scraps of news; but I write
cheerful hopes of peace. There a war with
U. S. A. I can conceive no greater evil than
a war with Russia - ~~signifying~~ the loss of
S. E. Europe to some beastly hole in the middle
of Asia, checked the ideas of "peace",
of "empire", and all that is loathsome.

Yours very truly
Edward Freeman

American
Mills
Somerset

Janeery
12th. 1885

My dear Bunting,

It is very much at my bidding that you don't "dress me as Professor." I wish everybody else could attend to my bidding as carefully. Locksome at Oxford, it becomes more locksome in our fields. I don't understand the fancy. No one calls me anything called me Churchwarden or Justice of the Peace or Visitor of the High School or anything else than one help-pend to be; why then Professor? Only I think "Dr" is worse;

(January 13th) and you let
Freighton treat me to Ket
in a late number of Cont.
Rev.

Who is Augustus Birrell?
A sharp man clearly, if a
trifle prickly. I looked in his
Obiter Dicta, and found that
I see a "horny-headed son
of toil." That I take it, means
that I can't tell a story, but
that Froude can, a super-
stition which I take to be
confined to those who have
not ~~the~~ read Norman Con-
quest, Vol. III.

Of my eight lectures, some, I think, could do
for articles; some not. They would not do for
a book. I will look over them when I get back
to Oxford. But I should best like an opportunity
of repeating them elsewhere.

I expect to go back next week, to collect
for a while, but before the end of term I hope to
be able to lodge people at 16 St Giles.

Yours very truly
Edward Freeman

7

Somerset,
Wells,
Somerset.June 24th
1884

Dear Mr. Buxton,

It is certainly a little
annoying to have one's High
Street aside north of the Rock.
It might perhaps be different
if, instead of solid facts and
the influence for the moment
about "natural selection"
as displayed among human
beings socially aggregated.
I suppose some people can see
a meaning in such jargon: I
can't. I can only guess that
H. S. has no learning (which I am
fully aware of) and no preachment

experience (which I should have
shared), & so despiser both and
talker jargon instead. I heard
a lecture in America talk of
"the economy of interpreting
power." I have not found any
man in either hemisphere who
could tell me ~~that~~ what that
meant, but one suggested that,
as it had no meaning, it was
likely to come out of Herbert
Spencer. Forgive this scribble
over - H.S. could call it an
obullition - I dare say he
gets for many more readers than
I do. I believe people like that

kind of stuff because they think they must be clever
to have got through it. Bryce is different: so is
Hatch, though I think he might be showned - and
I doubt not that Chadwick is wise, though his
facts are out of my head. But Emily Pfeiffer -
I think I can pile up the black in p. 831 out of
Sophtekles Elektra.

Well; if I had rather stick to what he settled
in New College Lane - to put the present article
in it - when people are not wholly satisfied,
but if it is as low as 20th of October. But if

The Greek Canonocellists cannot
get it this July. They had un-
-fairly better wait till Octo-
-ber.

Pres do something about the
Greek. Of course I don't expect
the printers to understand the
Greeks, but I fear they are
sufficient to know those rules
that are purely mechanical,
and not to print the kind of
thing: *αὐτός*.

I saw your colleague Mr. Petru-
at Oxford two days after I
received you.

Yours very truly
Edward Thurney

stay together. I thought it has
grown, it has grown very re-
solutely, and it does make
a whole.

This of course it has very
intensely with the special
Power - and special light-
subjects, which may follow
at leisure. I have it better
with in my head, but I am
working so hard at the sub-
jects themselves that I have
not always time to write fit
done articles: and. I have
done all the articles & I
crowd of books, light and
fence. But I want one
French book, Duruy, Hill:

Notice des Romains I think or
the exact title. If you have had
it sent for review, I should be
very glad of it, as it is rather
a costly book to buy. Only
I fear that what could be
sent to you could be Malaff
crib - how I loathe cribs -
I hope the French original.
Here I must take my chance
I have a good bit to say about
many others. And then in
course of time to follow with
a like English survey.

Yours very truly
Edward Freeman

7

Trinity College, November
Oxford. 28th. 1883

My dear Bessie,

I can find the memory of
that little evening at Brill
dwells sweetly in your mind.
When I arrive home next week,
you may come, after Oxford week,
stay Saturday to Monday, and
have somebody asked to meet
you on Saturday.

Thanks for the cheque. It
did come into my head whether
~~the~~ any of the lectures which
I have been giving in the Museum
this term, not, I think, without

some effect. You can look at them
some time when you come here.
I think some people would
like to read them ~~it is a~~ re-
-view, though they would hardly
make a book. On the other
hand.

1st. They are a long series,
eight.

2nd. They are essentially
lectures, Oxford lectures, and
could lose by having their
shape at all changed.

3rd. By printing them I
should lose the character of being

them again, here or elsewhere.

So you see I can express against myself,

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman

F

January
13th, 1884

Dear Mr. Burleigh,

Here is an article, with the
matter of which I am very well
satisfied, but not ~~with~~ ^{the} ~~the~~
together with the shape. I fear
that it has outrun your mo-
dular limit of length, though
hardly that which preceded
when I first began to write
for Cong. Rev. And the subject
is not exactly what I meant
to treat when I began. I was
going to speak of some of the
recent writers on Roman his-
tory, especially of their decl.

ings ~~about~~ with the earlier of
what I call the two critical
or determining periods. I
meant to bring it the reference
to Oxford & Cambridge rather
as the merest introduction. But
they grew on me, and led to a
fuller explanation of what I
take to be the holes in the system,
and especially of the character
of the two great lines of abso-
rption I have chiefly to con-
sider. Then the controversy in
the *Quarterly Review*, or what
I meant all along to say a few
words, proved such a fortunate
illustration of the effect of
the system of which I complain,

that my few words grew into something. Although
though the paper is not what I first thought of,
it has grown very naturally, the subjects are
important, and I venture to think they will
provoke thought in it. Only I am afraid you
will say it is very long. I have all along thought
the fashion of cutting things so very short a mistake
- as to other people's articles as well as my own -
~~but not in the paper~~ but that is far from the
reason for me. Of course ~~if~~ I should be
best pleased if it might stand as it is; but

I could cut something out, or
what I should like better,
cut it into two. If you choose
his best process, it could be
a great kindness if I might
do it on the proof (and a
greater kindness still, if you
could for once get the printers
to print per the MS., instead
of improving, turning one phrase
-which into nonsense, and all
that). The Oxford part I
should like to come out soon, as
it has an immediate object
about the archaeological pro-
-fessorship. The rest might wait,
tho' of course I should be
better pleased if it might all

7

Somerset
Wells
Somerset.

continuous. I send it for you
nearly for you to look at, and
to tell me whether you think
any part of it would do
to print, or for sometimes
print such things, here a few
pages at a time. If you should
think so, send it me back
again - send it me back
again in my care - and I
will put one or more such
pieces into shape and send
them to you again. I did not
like to do so till I knew
how the whole matter might
strike you.

If you do think of it, please
to let me know soon. I sup-
pose it would be too late to
get anything in for October -
though some of the little clark
alliance matters seem - approx-
imate just at this moment.
But if I have any putting
into shape to do, I should
like to be able to do it before
the end of this month, as I
think of going beyond sea in
October.

Would it do to print a
piece or two without my leave,

and see how they take? While my new book
draws attention in some quarters, it could
provoke attacks in others. He

When I come back, about beginning of ~~the~~
November, I hint to set to work on the
Racer subject which I promised for long
ago, and on a light one also.

Believe me very truly yours

Edward Freeman

7

Sept. 7.
Wells.
Surrey.September
17th, 1883

Dear Mr. Bunting,

I once began a speech in
Congregation at Oxford by
saying that ~~the~~ I "felt great
diffidence." You began to
laugh, holding that I was
incapable of diffidence. But
I did feel great diffidence
then, and I feel greater dif-
-fidence still in writing what
I have now to say to you.

I need not tell you that
I have written a great many
of prose. But I have also

also now and then debbled
it over, & kept for many years
only for my own amusement.
Somewhat more than a year
ago I began some verses of a
purely personal kind, which
I expected would ~~stand~~ ^{be} ~~series~~
of a purely personal kind,
and the thought of printing
any part of which never came
into my head. But as it often
took it notices of places where
I had been and of things that
are going on, it gradually
took another character, and

I wrote a great deal while, as far as its
matter was concerned, might be read by any
one. I have shown the whole to several friends
in whose judgment I put confidence, and
none has one of them ~~to~~ thought that there
are parts that might be well and worth to
print, and they suggested that the best way
to offer it to one of the periodicals to print
some parts of it, as might be good, & the
others and things are printed in periodicals.

You don't know how careful
I have felt about it: I be-
-lieve the fact that one has
gained a certain reputation
in other ways makes one ~~the~~
more careful of risking
oneself in a new line like this if
one has never printed a
page. But as for part
of the verses, lines or questions
which have just now been
forwarded again: ~~but~~ so that
has stirred me up, and I
take the venture.

You will see that what I
send you now has no business
or ending, it is not always

7
Somerleaze,
Wells,
Somerset.

Bourges
October 31st
1883

Dear Mr. Bunting,

I ought to have thanked
you better ~~fast~~ sooner,
which reached me at Cler-
mont, not far off for three
weeks back. I don't re-
sist I don't regret your
judgement; but I don't
pretend to dispute it; as
you are clearly a better
judge than I. But it is
pretty nearly a complete
bar to my getting any part

of the thing into print early,
as I should hate packing
it about ~~after~~ after a first
rebuff. So when I come back
(last week) I will sit down
to my prose writing, for gen,
Roman and English.

We have had a very "good
run" in Avenue - some
said it could be ~~best~~ best
weeks in October. Bating
for or three days it was
beautifully fine and warm.

Yours very truly
Edward Freeman

Nov. 27, 1882

proposes. You know the
Doubtless as Indian Reeds
in the University & Lees
Reeds at Christ Church,
author of several Indian
Hikes, one published for the
University. I know nothing
about the subjects myself.

Another friend whom I
should like to recommend
to you is Mr. Hunt,
(Rev. William 22 Nov:
Folk Terrace, Bayreuth,
W.) author of the little Italy
in my series - an excellent
in exp. He has led to

give up his living in his neighbourhood
for his health sake, & could be glad
of something new to do.

I am glad you have a pleasant re-
-sidence of your little visit to Somers-
-town. Everybody here will be glad
if you will repeat it on a future
visit.

Yours very truly

Edward Freeman

R

Somerset
Wells.
Somerset.

November
27th. 1882

Dear Mr. Baskin.

I have one or two things in
my head, but I don't know
yet they are very popular.
Current affairs are just
now, for me at least, as
good as dead, save that I
can see that Francis Joseph
is ribbiling and intriguing
every where.

I want to say something
I hardly know under what
title - about some of the
extreme sceptical views of
historical evidence. I am

just now thinking mainly of
Roman history and some of
the notions of Octavian (Nero
(now dead), which I can read
in not long back. But I
could give it a wider scope,
and I think I could make
something of it.

And I want to say something
sometime about a lot of new
views & books, like a political
or early British & English
history. But I am not ready
for this yet, as I have so
much to do.

Or can you think of anything better for me?
A good summary - say half: really ~~and~~ on
freedom - of what comes out in the different
branches of knowledge, reviews, but never
not altogether isolated but somehow linked
into one another, would, it strikes me, be
a capital feature. But I am not sure that
I could be of much help for it. I don't deny
my "hydraulic" powers of comparison" in some
cases; but I think they are to be found only
when I have a thing very well at my fingers

end, and specially where, as
in the case of the little Nor-
man Conquest, I have written
the same story at full length.
But it could hardly pay me
in time or money or anything
to read a great lot of books
not always made in my
own line, to do the or a very
small scale. But I should
not let the mind drop some-
thing in the old style of writing,
talking about the book & say-
ing something of our own tra-
dition Douglas American book
- Craythorn Pope's book.

Do you think anything could
come of what Sidney Owen

Somerset.
Wells.
Somerset.

September
17th. 1882

7

My dear Sir,

Thanks for the cheque which
came this morning, and for
which I send the receipt. I
see that you are in this coun-
try, and still more that you
know that you are in it. For
many years that Porlock and
the coasts thereof are all in
Devonshire, as they say that
Blanc to be in Switzerland and
Orange to be in the Netherlands.
Can you come back this way,
look in on us at Somerset,
and handle the New York Pro.

if from difficulty, how I wrote my books in
my old house.

Thanks for letting them reprint Cartouche. It
can do no harm.

Yours very truly

Edmund Freeman

7
Somerset.
Wells.
Somerset.

May 23rd
1882

My dear Sir,

The proof has not come
yet.

I am rather attached to the
heading "Alter Orbis" to which
I rather meant the article to
lead up. And I don't know
yet there is any harm in
a heading being a little mys-
terious, while this one would
be very speaking indeed to
those who do know the
reference. But, if you insist
on a change, please to let it be.

"Inquirer Britain" - Not
expensive, pretty much the
same idea.

Yours very truly
Edmund Freeman

I shall be in London again
Thursday & Saturday. at 49
Lexham Gardens, Cromwell
Road, W.

7

Somerset.
Wells.
Somerset.April 25th
1882.

My dear Sir,

Your subject seems a good one, and I think I should like to undertake it. I have always clung to the notion of "alter orbis" - I can assure that everything that is specially characteristic of us, good and bad, comes of our settlement in the island. When would you like to have the article? I will try and see you Thursday or Friday.

Believe me yours truly
Edward Trueman

Samuel
Wells
Samuel

My dear Sir
I have just received your letter
and I thank you very much
for the information it contains
I am sorry that I cannot
reply to you more fully
at present but I am
very busy at the moment
and I must close for this time
I will write again when I have
time to do so
Yours truly
Samuel Wells

7 - W. B. Dewkins, Esq.
Woodhurst,
Fellowfield
Manchester
April 25th. 1882

My dear Sir,

The letter that I wrote
to you on board ship I posted
at Liverpool yesterday even-
ing. As soon as I got here
I heard the good news of my
noble son's release.

Now therefore there can be no
doubt of holding over peace.
If I do get a proof I might
change the title of a line or two,
but that could be all.

I expect that we shall go

home on Friday.

Believe me yours truly
Edward Freeman

7 - Philadelphia, Febru-
ary 20th, 1882.

Dear Sir,

Your letter of Feb. 1st has
reached me here. I am really
glad to hear that Mr. Straker
has no longer anything to do
with the Contemporary Review.
I began to write in it at his
special request in 1876, and
for two or three years my re-
lations with him were not
pleasant. Then he seemed sud-
denly to lose all notion either
of business or of courtesy. He
put off and put off for months

after month answering the six-
plest letters, and now he
several times to the very un-
pleasant work of asking for
payment for articles. At last
I could stand it no longer,
and I told him I ~~could~~
must give up the review al-
together. But I should
greatly prefer going on with it
under any reasonable manage-
ment. As for me, I hear
from others that his kind
of treatment is not peculiar
to his dealing with me, but
I cannot at all understand
it.

I thought "Cato and Aspern" was at least in-
teresting as some of the other very special
things on ~~these~~ other subjects which have appeared.
All parties should be covered for it. But
it does not need matter, and I think I
can find a place for it elsewhere. I should
enjoy like to write something on the state
of things in Delichia & Herzegovina. I wrote a
letter to Spectator which has not been put in -
it is very long - and I have bidden the MS.

to be sent to you. It could
hardly do for any other peri-
odical as it stands: but,
if you like the subject and
its treatment, let me have
a "cablegram" of one word
Yes or No to 22 Bond Street,
New York (Messrs. Macmillan
& Co. American Agents), and
if the word be Yes, I will
make something before I sail
(April 15th) or on the voyage.

Believe me yours faithfully

Edward Freeman

I have had a letter in
New York Nation on the
same matter