

spect as was the late President Woolsey of Yale, and to call the well-known flower "anemo'ne"?

The difficulties of consistency in the pronunciation of such words are very well illustrated by an anecdote that is related of Lord Erskine when he was still a comparatively unknown Scottish lawyer. In the course of an argument before an English judge Mr. Erskine (as he was then) had occasion to use the word "curator," which he pronounced in the Scotch fashion "cu'rator," accenting the first syllable. Whereupon the judge, in his ponderous and patronising English way, interrupted the young barrister and

observed: "Let me call the attention of counsel to the fact that the word which has just been pronounced "cu'rator" should properly be called "cura'tor," thereby following the usage of the Latin language, in which a long penultimate syllable receives an accent." Quick as a flash Erskine bowed low and replied with the blandest possible manner: "I am profoundly grateful for any correction at the hands of so accomplished an ora'tor and so learned a sena'tor as your lordship." A neater retort it would be difficult to find.

Professor A. Schinz of Bryn Mawr calls our attention to a curious feature of the recent European success of Sienkiewicz's *Quo Vadis*.

**The Sources of
"Quo Vadis."**

It is now about three years since the book was at the height of its popularity in this country, but in continental Europe it has been widely read during the past year, and as a result of this vogue scholars have taken up the question of the sources from which Sienkiewicz drew his historical material. Professor A. Sabatier, of the *Faculté Protestanté de Théologie* of Paris, in one of the *causeries* which he contributes weekly to the *Journal de Genève* recently made the bold assertion that the whole archæological part of *Quo Vadis* was borrowed from the *Antichrist* of Ernest Renan. He relates how, in reading Sienkiewicz's novel, he was surprised at the abundance and minuteness of detail and at the wonderfully vivid and truthful reconstruction of the Rome of the time of Nero and of the imperial court. Comparing *Quo Vadis* with Renan's *Antichrist*, in order to see just how far the data of the novelist agreed with scientific authority, he found that not only was the information absolutely exact, but that nothing was missing, and also that the story contained nothing that was not to be found in Renan. In a word, the erudition of the novelist stopped just where Renan in his book had stopped. In printing his discovery, Professor Sabatier laid special stress upon the fact that his intention was not in the least to take away from Sienkiewicz's invention and merit. But he insisted that Renan should not fail to receive his due. The character of Petro-



AUBREY BEARDSLEY. BY HIMSELF.

nius, the one dominant figure in the book, is from beginning to end a borrowing from *The Antichrist*. The same may be said of Nero and of many of the minor characters of the novel.

Admirers of the late Mr. Aubrey Beardsley will be interested in the collection of his drawings which, under the title *The Later Work of Aubrey Beardsley*, comes from the press of Mr. John Lane. From this book we reproduce the accompanying characteristic literary sketches.

Mr. Stedman's *American Anthology* is carefully reviewed upon another page of the present issue. It has formed the subject of a good deal

About
the
"Anthology."

of miscellaneous conversation among literary men at their casual gatherings during the past six weeks. Every one whom we have heard speaking of it has expressed surprise at the omission from the writers included in it of John G. Saxe. We understand that many questions with regard to this omission have been addressed to Mr. Stedman, but that he has invariably declined to answer them—which makes the mystery still more interesting. Mr. Stedman could hardly have omitted Saxe through any oversight, yet it is difficult to see what other reason he could possibly assign. Saxe, to be sure, is not a great name in the records of American literature, but he is very individual, he stands for something, and in his own day he had a quite unusual vogue. On his own abstract merits, and had Mr. Stedman drawn the critical line high up, Saxe might quite reasonably have been excluded; but when we contemplate the extreme generosity which Mr. Stedman shows to writers of whom not one man in ten thousand has ever even heard, the whole thing resolves itself into a genuine literary mystery. We have been somewhat amused by Mr. Stedman's treatment of the women writers in the brief biographies contained in his Appendix to the work. In the case of ladies who may still be conscientiously described as "girls," he has given the dates of their birth explicitly, while in the case of ladies of uncertain age he has discreetly and indefinitely declared that

they were born "in 18—." This is no doubt at first sight very tactful; but doesn't the very omission of the year create a most invidious distinction, and does it not serve to classify a number of these ladies as being no younger than they ought to be? Moreover, even those ladies who are now just "girls" will not be "girls" forever; and when they cease to be so, there will stand Mr. Stedman's record staring at them pitilessly, and they will not like it. Altogether, we are afraid that Mr. Stedman has got himself into an embarrassing position all around, and we offer him herewith our heartfelt sympathy. Speaking of this matter of dates, we notice that one "poetess" is set down as having been born ten years after her father's death; but as this question seems to be rather more physiological or perhaps typographical than literary in its nature, we shall not pursue it any further. Finally, there is a certain inconsistency of treatment in these biographies. In the main they are obviously intended to give only the most essential facts about the life and the writ-



MANON LESCAUT. BY AUBREY BEARDSLEY.