

Orange against Monmouth. She became intimate with the Duke of York, with Rochester. She sometimes alarmed Barrillon: she was a real diplomat, and she became the true sovereign. Louis XIV. ordered that the estate of Aubigny should become a French duchy, and sent her the letters-patent. He signed letters of naturalization for Charles Lennox, Duke of Richmond. Her court at Whitehall was sumptuous; she held a *levée* every day, like a queen. Charles often spent the evening in the great gallery, playing *bassette* with Madam of Portsmouth and Madame de Mazarin. On the evening of February 12, 1685, he got up, had a stroke, and fell. The Duchess of Portsmouth sends for Barrillon at once; she tells him that the King is Catholic at heart. Barrillon speaks to the Duke of York and to the Queen; a monk is introduced mysteriously near the King, who died five days after having been struck down by paralysis.

The new King, James II., made a visit to Madam of Portsmouth an hour after the death of his brother. He wished to keep the French subvention and the friendship of Louis XIV. The Duchess determined to go back to France. She had 130,000 francs income, besides great savings invested in France—furniture, jewels, 250,000 in gold which she had received immediately after the death of Charles, 50,000 francs of *rente* which had been promised to her son from the confiscated estates of Grey. She lived fifty years longer, survived all her contemporaries, and only died in the middle of the reign of Louis XV., in the midst of a new generation who hardly knew of her. Under the Regent, Saint-Simon speaks of her as "deeply converted and penitent, very much embarrassed in her affairs, obliged to live in the country." Her pensions had been suppressed in England, and she had creditors in France. Her son is thus described by Saint-Simon: he was "without religion, lost himself in wine and debauchery, and, from the handsomest creature imaginable, became the most hideous." The Duke of Richmond died first, in 1723. Two years afterward the Duchess of Portsmouth lost her sister Henrietta. She lived herself seven years later, chiefly at Aubigny; she founded there a convent of sisters. In October, 1734, she came to Paris to consult some doctors, and died November 14, at the age of eighty-five years.

Correspondence.

THE MARYLAND APPOINTMENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your New York letter from "Civil-Service-Reform Democrat," in reply to your Baltimore correspondent "O. L. D.," is a wise and timely reminder to the civil-service reformers of Maryland that the President of the United States has something else to think about and to do besides making appointments, and, he might have added, *Maryland* appointments at that. Civil-service reformers may be classed as political specialists, and, like all specialists, the price they pay for their peculiar qualifications to speak on that subject is but too often an ignorance of or indifference to other matters of at least equal importance. Who shall say that the President of this country must ignore the silver question, the tariff question, and the complex question of administrative reform, in order to determine with absolute certainty the personal character of applicants for appointments? And I say, without hesitation, that such is the price of that certainty.

But their reflections on the President are pec-

uliarly unjust when we consider the political situation in Maryland. It is a well-known fact that easy access to the source of Federal patronage has made it a revered tradition at Washington that the Baltimorean in politics, whether for amusement in leisure hours, for patriotic motives, or professionally, is a nuisance; wherefore the judicious shun him, the good pity him, and the wicked use him or else laugh at him. The cause of this unfortunate state of things is not difficult to discover. The good Baltimorean is, in politics, eloquent, but weak and irresolute. His talk leads one to expect great things, but his performance is disappointing in the extreme. He is the Dimitri Roudine of politics, except that he is generally well-to-do and never dies on the barricades.

A sad illustration of this peculiarity was seen in the campaign of last fall. The good Baltimorean went to Washington, and, with an eloquence which would have been more effective had it not been for the tradition of which I have spoken, assured the President that Gorman was a wicked man whom the citizens of Baltimore abhorred, and whom they would consign to his political grave at the first opportunity. Gorman replied, and assured the President that the good Baltimorean was doing him a cruel injustice; that the good people of Baltimore loved him above all men; that he was their "favorite son." And Gorman called to witness great numbers of the most prominent business men of this city, who admiringly listened to the most shameless avowals by their favorite of his devotion to the spoils system, and heard him proclaim, amid the noisy applause of his horde of roughts and heelers, his sole responsibility for the appointment of Higgins and Thomas and Mahon, and distinctly divide with the rest of the Maryland delegation the credit of the best appointments from this State. And these representative men of Baltimore poured in the coffers of this same Gorman thousands of dollars, and elected him and his creatures as the only true representatives of the political opinion of Baltimore. Gorman and all that that implies was the one and only issue of last fall's campaign, as it was fought in this city. The speakers on both sides emphasized this personal element, and on that issue Gorman, with shame to us be it said, triumphed as he never triumphed before, electing a solid delegation from Baltimore. After that, not only Gorman but the public voice of this city pronounced for Higgins and Thomas and Rasin and Mahon and for all that may follow.

No, after that overwhelming disgrace, let us be silent, or, if we must talk, let it be in sackcloth and ashes and with a conspicuous modesty becoming our merits. And, above all, let us not open our lips to cast upon such a man as Grover Cleveland the responsibility of our own shameful shortcomings. The burdens of our wise and patriotic President are already sufficiently great. He will need all his strength to correct the folly of his own party, and to contend with success against the bitter hostility of enemies rendered furious by the success which they feel must attend his course. The duty of civil-service reformers at this time is clearly to uphold the hand of the one strong man upon whose wisdom and will depends the success of their cause for a long time to come, and to recognize in the mistakes of the President, in the matter of appointments, only fresh illustrations of the truth that competitive examinations will ever remain the sole remedy for the evils of which they complain, until we can elect Presidents miraculously endowed with a perfect knowledge of the character and qualifications of each and every applicant for office, even from Maryland.—Very respectfully,

ROGER W. CULL.

BALTIMORE, February 27, 1886.

A MICHIGAN INDIAN RESERVATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In 1855 the United States made a treaty, which was in fact a trade, with several bands of Chippewas in Michigan. The whites coveted the lands which these Indians then possessed, and the United States helped them to gratify their greed. These Indians gave up their lands in all other parts of the State, and accepted in return two or three tracts far removed from the then frontier, the largest of which was 138,000 acres in one body in Isabella County. Besides this land, the Indians were to receive sundry sums of money, consisting of annuities, for twelve years, of agricultural funds, school funds, aid for building and running mills, shops, building houses, procuring teams, mechanics, teachers, and missionaries for a period of ten years—in all, something over \$300,000. In 1856, and several years immediately following, about 1,500 Indians went upon the Isabella Reservation and settled there.

Now, although such was not the understanding, yet, in point of fact, this was from the first just such a movement as is contemplated now in the Senate bill of Mr. Dawes, in which it is proposed to patent their lands to the Indians and hold their patents in trust. Here, the Indians were to go upon the reservation and make selections as follows:

Each head of a family, husband or widow, 80 acres;

Each family of orphans of two or more, 80 acres;

Each single orphan under 21 years, 40 acres;

Each single person over 21 years, 40 acres.

Having made their selections, the Indian agent would forward the name of the person and the description of his land to the Department of the Interior, and the Secretary would issue to the Indian a certificate to the effect that his selection was recorded and his rights in the land acknowledged, and would be protected to him and his heirs forever, the United States being a perpetual trustee for the estate. The proposition now made is to limit the term of trusteeship to twenty-five years.

Well, the Indians went at their new mode of life with some hopefulness, and a good deal of stolidity. They had already been in contact with a rapidly increasing white population for nearly half a century, and with the French and British for a much longer period. The wiser ones among them had learned that there was nothing to be hoped for from the whites, but the great mass were thoughtless, ignorant, governed by impulse, and ready to be cajoled by any white who had the courage to go among them for purposes of gain. The presence of a public crib always draws that class of animals that would rather steal a living than get it honestly, even if the one required no more labor than the other. This \$300,000 which it was known would in ten years be paid out to and for these Isabella Indians drew to the reservation the usual crowd of whites, who went simply and solely for what money they could in one way and another capture from the Indians. Had the United States hung or shot every white man who went upon the reservation, and left the Indians entirely alone to lapse to savagery, the result would have been vastly better than it was.

Almost the first thing done was for the Indian agent to permit his brother-in-law to open a store on the reservation. The Indians were tempted in every way to buy. There was no need to pay. Accounts were kept, and when the agent brought money the store was paid first, and if anything was left it went to the Indians. The United States built a grist-mill there, and paid a man to run it; but when the Indians got to raising grain, the storekeeper apparently arranged with

the miller to keep out of the way and leave the mill idle. That forced the Indians to buy flour and meal of the store. The most extravagant prices were charged for everything, and the Indians were robbed as completely as if they had been "held up" periodically by highwaymen. Then, too, finding that they could not get grain ground, they quit trying to raise it. Government furnished them teams, but white men sneaked upon their reservations, made them drunk, and coaxed them into some foolish trade whereby they lost their teams. They had schools and teachers supported by the United States, but they got no practical knowledge. They had churches, but their religious culture did not make them moral or save them from terrible degradation, into which they were easily led by the white men among them. Instead of enabling them to understand the value of their property and the worth of money, and the importance of keeping them, their education seemed only to make them acquainted with the white man's vices. Yet some of them were doing well, in spite of these obstacles. Gradually the little patches of clearing grew around their homes, and a few were giving promise of success as farmers, and they were doing it, too, without help. Had they received the encouragement of practical farmers, who could have been sent among them as agricultural missionaries; their advance would have been much more rapid; but they were literally surrounded by enemies.

Their land was covered with white pine. White men wanted it. They set about getting it by fraud, and finally succeeded. As long as the title to the land remained vested in the United States, it was dangerous to steal this pine. Hence they must in some way get the title into the hands of the Indians. Then they teased the Indians into a state of unrest with the thought that the United States treated them like children and slaves, and made them believe that the reason the white man was better off than the Indian was because he owned his land himself and could sell it if he wanted to do so. They made the Indians themselves appeal for the ownership of their lands. This was backed up by a hypocritical pretence made by agents, missionaries, and the men who wanted the pine, that the Indians were civilized, Christian people, whose manhood ought to be recognized by making them feel that they were masters of their own destiny. The scheme succeeded, and the treaty of 1855 was amended in 1864. The Indians would be given their lands in severalty without encumbrance. They were, as a precaution adopted by the Administration at Washington, to be classified. All who were competent to take care of their property were to receive patents without limitation. Others would receive patents, but could not alienate them without the knowledge and consent of the Secretary of the Interior for the time being. But this safeguard of the Government amounted to nothing. Out of 1,700 who received patents in 1871-2 all but 48 were classed as competent to take care of their own property, and yet it had been virtually stolen from most of them even before the patents were issued, and it was but a short time until all but a very few of them were driven from the homes in which they had been protected nominally by the United States since 1856, and were doomed to pauperdom and a steadily approaching extermination.

They have been for years and are to-day, all save a very few of them, in a hopeless state of ruin, while, if the United States had increased instead of ending its term of trusteeship, and had compelled its agents to actually take care of the rights of these people, forcing the ravenous whites to move off and remain away, the Indians would have been worth millions through the sale of their pine alone, and there would have been

no possible reason why they should not have been able to secure for themselves the benefits, not of a merest smattering, but of a thorough practical education; and the power which that would have given them would have been a greater protection than the whole United States army could give. The formation of any new policy will be unwise and unsafe that does not profit by this fatal experiment in Michigan. CHARLES ELLIS.

EAST SAGINAW, MICHIGAN.

THE NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the review of Part II of the 'New English Dictionary,' which appeared in your issue of the 4th inst., the writer has, I think, done injustice to the editor of that work in several instances, two of which I will now notice:

So far from its being true that the title of anti-slavery is not "explained in the 42 columns devoted to anti- and its compounds," on page 364, there are four successive quotations, each of which contains it; the last being from one of Wendell Phillips's speeches.

Then, the writer takes exception to the assertion that *approve* in the sense of 'approve' is "often used in the United States"; and says: "We have never heard the word, or heard of any one employing it." But Worcester informs us in his dictionary, after mentioning the disuse of the word in England: "It is, however, employed by the American clergy as a sort of technical term in the sense of *to license*, or *to give license* or *approbation* to preach."

I am very much surprised at the reviewer's statement with regard to the omission of the special use of *author* in the sense of 'editor,' which, he says, was "a common employment of the word during a large part of the last century." That such a "common employment" should have been overlooked by more than 1,300 readers, as well as by many modern lexicographers, is not only one of the strangest, but one of the most inexcusable omissions of the 'New Dictionary.' I wish very much, therefore, that the writer of the review would favor the readers of the *Nation* with some quotations in proof of his assertion.

J. P.

February 24, 1886.

[Our correspondent's points will be taken up in the order in which they are made. In the case of *anti-slavery*, it is sufficient to say that a quotation illustrating the use of a word is not a definition of that word. Our notice specifically mentioned that *anti-slavery* occurred in the Dictionary; but that it might perhaps strike an American with surprise that no explanation of it as the name of a definite party existing at a definite period was to be found. No such explanation can be found. As a matter of fact, we did not insist that it ought to be found.

Our correspondent's remark about *approve* does not even touch the point made, and, besides, gives a wrong impression of what we did say. In the Dictionary it is definitely asserted that *approve* is "often used in the United States" in the general sense of "simply 'approve.'" This is quite another thing from the technical sense of 'license to preach,' as quoted by our correspondent from Worcester. Nor, again, did we in this case deny the fact of the word being used; we simply denied that it was *often* used. Nothing has been brought forward in the letter given above to impeach the correctness of this assertion.

In the case of *author*, we really cannot consent to the view implied in our correspondent's words, that any amount of ignorance, however astounding, on the part of modern lexicographers or the "1,300 readers" for this particular dictionary, can be fairly held to counterbalance any amount of knowledge on our part, however slight. Our knowledge on this point, moreover, is not slight. If our correspondent will examine the early volumes of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, begun in 1731, or of the *London Magazine*, begun in 1732, or of the *Scots Magazine*, begun in 1739, or of the *Universal Magazine*, begun in 1747, he will find that communications addressed to him whom we should now call the Editor were then addressed to the Author of the particular magazine. We mention these periodicals because the sets of them are very long, and because, with one exception, they survived into this century, and, as a consequence, are more likely than others that could be named to be found in public libraries. As our correspondent asks for specific references, however, that disposition of human nature to oblige people who at heart are not anxious to be obliged leads us to furnish a few. In the *London Magazine* for 1752 he will find on pages 31, 67, 69, 154, 184, 202, 227, 228, 247, 298, 311, 322, 323, 356, 360, 365, 367, 374, 375, 391, 417, 422, 454, 458, 463, 511, and 550, letters from correspondents addressed "to the author of the *London Magazine*." Illustrations from the *Gentleman's Magazine* could not be so readily furnished, for correspondents usually addressed the exalted being who presided over that periodical as "Mr. Urban"; but a sentence from the preface to the completed volume for this same year, 1752, may perhaps be of interest to our correspondent. "From another imitator," it is said, "we have had fairer treatment; the author of an Edinburgh magazine, as he copies our best pieces, sets before them or after them *Gent. Mag.*" It must not be supposed that this method of address was peculiar to this type of periodical publication. We have before us at this very moment of writing a volume containing the London newspaper entitled *The Saint James's Evening Post*, for the years 1748 and 1749. Every letter to the one we should now call the editor is addressed "to the author, etc." There is no need of multiplying instances; but our correspondent can rest assured that if it be deemed worth while, we can easily furnish a separate instance of this usage to each of his "1,300 readers." Later in the century the term *author* was abandoned; and to some extent certainly, if not universally, *printer* took its place. It was, for illustration, "to the printer of the *Public Advertiser*" that the letters of Junius were addressed. When the term *editor* came to be employed, we shall hope to know when the new dictionary reaches the letter E.

So far from intending to do injustice to the work reviewed, which we look upon as an indispensable requisite in English study and an honor to English scholarship, our words were very carefully weighed so as not even to do it unintentional injustice. Mistakes in details must inevitably be made, and it is neither fair to the public nor ultimately beneficial to the Dictionary to deny them or to overlook them. The subject of Americanisms, in particular, is

one of peculiar difficulty, because so constant is the communication between all parts of our country that terms and phrases strictly characteristic of one section are always liable to be transplanted, and to turn up occasionally in spots most remote from their place of origin or of general use. Our language was therefore in every instance cautiously guarded, and we have a right to ask that those who except to it shall base their criticism upon what we actually did say, and not upon the false impression they form from careless reading as to what we said. —ED. NATION.]

CHALLENGE AND BANTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The common people in the eastern part of Nova Scotia use "banter" in the sense of "challenge." It is the word with them for the idea. Boys say, "I banter you for a race," "I banter you for a jump." They never use banter in the sense of raillery. JOHN FRASER.

Boston, February 23, 1886.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As was stated by a correspondent in the *Nation* of February 18, the use of the word "banter" in the sense of "challenge" is quite common in parts of Ohio. If I am not mistaken, however, there is a marked difference in the use of the two words which is worthy of attention. So far as I have observed, the word "challenge" is almost invariably used when any element of formality is involved; but when this is lacking "banter" is very frequent indeed. To illustrate, the First Nine always *challenges* the Second Nine to a match game of ball, but Jack meets Jim along the road and "*banter*s him for a race." When the word is used in this sense it is almost always followed by the preposition "for," as above. These distinctions would be obvious to any one in the localities covered by my observation. If they do not obtain elsewhere, will some one please let us know? W. H. J.

IND. UNIV., MUSCOGEE, I. T.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I write to substantiate the statement made by a writer in the last number of the *Nation* relative to the use of the word "banter" in the Southwestern States. Being a resident of northern Ohio, where one never hears it used in the sense of challenge, but now visiting in Texas, the statement made impressed itself upon my mind. The very next day after reading the letter my eye fell upon the announcement in the local paper that "Mr. Blank, the noted Southern athlete, is in the city, and has made a *banter* [underscoring mine] to throw," etc., etc.; and as I sat down to write the above, a youngster rushed in, and, to the query of what he had been doing, said he "had been down in the hollow making banter." Upon inquiry, I learned he meant *challenges*.—Yours truly, JOHN C. SAGE.

DENISON, TEXAS, February 25, 1886.

THE HENNEPIN CANAL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial note in No. 1077 you speak in tones condemnatory of the Hennepin Canal, but do not attempt to show the hollowness of much of the pretence used by Murphy in his argument. He claims that the improvement is needed to enable the Western producer to get his

wheat to market in competition with other countries contending for the foreign trade. This claim rests on ignorance and is built of misrepresentation. Let us see what the producer can do. Every mile of railroad in Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Dakota is either owned or controlled by a company with an outlet at Duluth or Chicago, and there is not one of these companies that would give a local rate to the Mississippi River that would allow a water route to transport it the rest of the distance. The present local rates of railroad companies per ton are:

	10 miles	50 miles	100 miles	150 miles	200 miles	250 miles	300 miles
In Iowa.....	\$1.40	\$2.20	\$3.40	\$4.00	\$4.40	\$5.00	\$5.40
In Minnesota...	1.60	3.20	4.40	5.40	6.00	6.20	6.60

Rates from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, to Chicago are \$4.00 per ton. Allowing that freight on the canal can be moved as cheaply as the workers in favor of this route claim, viz., 85 cents per ton from Davenport, Iowa, to Chicago, and basing our estimates on that, our figures will be something like this:

Cedar Rapids to Davenport by rail	\$2.70
Transfer to barges.....	25
Canal to Chicago.....	85
	\$3.80

Now let us try a Minnesota point:

Ramsay through to Chicago.....	\$5.60
By rail to McGregor, Iowa.....	\$3.60
Transfer to barges.....	25
Water route to Chicago.....	1.40
	\$5.25

In this last we have taken a pro-rata mileage for the distance travelled on the Mississippi River as on the canal. As will be seen, it affects Cedar Rapids rates 20 cents per ton, and the Minnesota rates 35 cents. In neither case will it affect wheat over one cent a bushel.

Now let us try points further West:

From Des Moines, Iowa, to Chicago, the railroad rates are.....	\$5.20
By rail to Davenport.....	\$4.20
Transfer to barges.....	25
Water to Chicago.....	85
	\$5.30

Rates from Sioux City, Iowa, to Chicago are now.....	\$6.00
Sioux City, Iowa, to Dubuque.....	\$5.85
Transfer to barges.....	25
Water to Chicago.....	1.00
	\$7.10

Rates from Watertown, Dakota, to Chicago are.....	\$7.00
Watertown to Davenport.....	\$6.60
Transfer to barges.....	25
Water to Chicago.....	85
	\$7.70

When the canal assumes to help the farmer in the West it is not able to make the assumption good. It cannot affect rates from the region that is now clamoring for cheap transportation. And how will it affect rates from Dakota, where the Northern Pacific and Manitoba roads make a common rate to either Duluth or Minneapolis? No amount of fine words can make a change in these rates even when used in connection with a vile open sewer for the coming metropolis of the country.

As an owner of land and raiser of wheat in Dakota, I wish to protest against being used by the boomers of the grandest humbug we have yet seen. The Galveston Harbor might have been of some value when completed, but this ditch can never carry a bushel of our grain; the Chicago scalpers will never let our Minneapolis flour pass through their greedy claws without taking all the profit a canal might save as their inspection and warehouse charges. If Chicago wants a sewer, or if Moline manufacturers want the canal, we have no objection if they will buy in their own name, but we don't want the cost charged to our account. Give us a chance, and the wheat growers will get along without Mr. Murphy. Give us a little relief from the present war tariff and burdensome navigation laws, but don't treat us to a canal we don't want and then call us ungrateful. A. M. VAN AUKEN.

OJATA, GRAND FORKS CO., DAK., February 22, 1886.

THE OHIO IMBROGLIO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In an article entitled "The Ohio Imbroglia," published last week, the author, Mr. James Boyle, says: "The Constitution of Ohio, in explicit terms, defines the duties of the Lieutenant-Governor. It states that he shall preside over the Senate, order roll-calls, and announce results of votes, etc."

The Constitution of Ohio section 16, article iii., says: "The Lieutenant-Governor shall be President of the Senate, but shall vote only when the Senate is equally divided." That is all the Constitution says as to the duties of the Lieutenant-Governor. It does not "in explicit terms" define his duties, nor does it state that he shall order roll-calls and announce results of votes, etc. LAWYER.

CINCINNATI, February 22, 1886.

THE REDEMPTION OF SILVER DOLLARS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In recent issues of your valuable paper you state that "the Government is virtually redeeming its silver dollars in gold at the custom-houses." We do not understand how this is done. Will you kindly explain fully and clearly in what mode, manner, or process this redemption is performed? A CONSTANT READER.

CHILLICOTHE, MO., February 19, 1886.

[Prior to the passage of the silver-coinage act, all customs duties were payable in gold. The silver-coinage act made silver dollars receivable for customs duties the same as gold. Anybody who has silver dollars can therefore get gold value for them by using them to make payments at the custom-house, or by exchanging them with somebody who has to pay duties there. It is this process which we have described as "virtually redeeming silver dollars in gold at the custom-house." Some form of redemption must be going on to keep 80 cents' worth of silver equal to 100 cents' worth of gold. We conclude that it is this virtual redemption at the custom-house that performs the office, which would otherwise be a miracle.—ED. NATION.]

A HOME THRUST AT SENATOR BLAIR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The experience of New Hampshire with her "valued policy" law, referred to in the *Nation* of February 18, deserves a great deal of careful attention, at a time when the Government is being importuned, on every hand, to enter upon a wholesale assumption of the duties and responsibilities ordinarily considered as belonging to individuals or communities.

If a mere lack of facilities for insurance, by throwing the danger of loss upon the individual owner, has decreased the number of fires in New Hampshire more than one-half, the question may well be raised whether the total abolition of the insurance system would not be a positive gain to the country. Individuals or communities are not going to develop watchfulness and industry if the penalty of carelessness and indolence is to be borne by some one else. Perhaps it will not be straining a point unduly to suggest that this insurance law and its result may be a wise dispensation of Providence for the purpose of giving Senator Blair a good illustration, right at home, of the beneficial effects of throwing people upon their own resources. If the Senator's

constituents can take so much better care of their property when they themselves are responsible for it, ought he not to conclude that the people of the South will do more for education when responsible for the evil effects of illiteracy than when his pet scheme shall have placed that responsibility upon the nation at large?

The *Nation* speaks of the decrease of fires in New Hampshire as "curious and unexpected." Unexpected it doubtless is, but is it curious that property should be better cared for when the owners' self-interest in having it well cared for is largely increased? The good effects of *laissez-faire* have not had a better illustration for a long while than is given by the results of this much-ridiculed "valued policy" law of New Hampshire. W. H. JOHNSON.

FEBRUARY 23, 1886.

JOHN HARVARD: A DIFFICULTY SOLVED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It appears to be clear that John Harvard was born in Surrey, at Southwark, and it is certain that when he went up to Cambridge in 1627 he was described at Emmanuel College as of Middlesex. This is the matter upon which I propose to offer some observations, with the view of removing an apparent discrepancy, for which some would account by the statement that in 1627 he was probably living in London with his mother and her husband. How far this is satisfactory will appear from what follows.

The first point of inquiry is in what manner in Harvard's time the questions addressed to a young man on entering college were put, and I think we are not without a guide which will lead us in a certain direction. When St. John's College published the first part of its Admission Register, which begins in 1629-30, it was an object of interest with me to identify, for my own information, some of the places which appear in it in a form truly grotesque. For reasons into which I need not here enter, I was led to rely mainly upon sound, and, having thus succeeded in overcoming difficulties which appeared almost insuperable, I arrived, upon independent grounds, at the same conclusion as the editor of the Register, namely, that the entries were made from statements taken down from the lips of the persons admitted; and there was no doubt uniformity of practice among the different colleges of the University.

The next point is, What was the nature of the questions? and this renders it necessary to speak of the object which they had in view. That object was not, as the man of to-day might suppose, the mere collection of useful statistics, but was to indicate for what scholarships and other advantages, restricted to those born in a certain district, the person admitted was eligible. It is ignorance of this leading fact which has led into error those who hitherto have attempted to explain the matter. The place at which the person was residing when he went up to the University, was foreign to the scope of the inquiry; the place of birth being alone material.

The chief question, then, which was put to John Harvard at Emmanuel College was, where he was born, and the entry of Middlesex leaves no doubt that his reply was "in London." It is stated that the precise locality of his birth was the High Street of Southwark, and the statement derives corroboration from that which proceeded from his own lips. The High Street of Southwark, which extended southward from London Bridge to the spot where stood St. Margaret's Hall, formed part of the City of London, being included in the City Ward of Bridge Without, so that a person born in that street properly described himself as born in London. Z.

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND, February 12, 1886.

Notes.

A TRANSLATION of Dr. Paul Radstock's 'Habit and Its Importance in Education,' with an introduction by Dr. Stanley Hall, is in the press of D. C. Heath & Co., Boston.

Cassell & Co. will publish early in the month the first volume of 'Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and the United States, from the days of David Garrick to the Present Time,' edited by Brander Matthews and Laurence Hutton. In scheme this is akin to both Ward's 'English Poets' and Mason's 'Personal Traits of British Authors,' as it will contain signed biographical sketches, like the one, and extracts, criticism, and anecdote, like the other. The first volume is devoted to the chief performers who were contemporary with Garrick; and it will contain brief biographies of Macklin and Tate Wilkinson, by Mr. William Archer; of Quin and Mossop, by Mr. Robert W. Lowe; of Barry and Henderson, by Mr. Walter Herries Pollock; of Mrs. Abington and Mrs. Bellamy, by Mr. Percy Fitzgerald; of Lewis Hallam, by Dr. Edward Eggleston; of Foote and the elder Sheridan, by Mr. Matthews; and of Garrick, Kitty Clive, and Peg Woffington, by Mr. Austin Dobson. There will be four more volumes, considering in chronological sequence the performers of the Kemble period, of the Kean-Booth and the Macready-Forrest periods, and of the present time. Among the other contributors will be Mr. Edwin Booth, Mr. Lawrence Barrett, Mr. W. J. Florence, Mr. Harry Edwards, Mrs. Agnes Ethel Tracy, Miss Kate Field, Mr. William Winter, Mr. Joseph N. Ireland, Mr. H. C. Bunner, Miss J. L. Gilder, Mr. W. M. Laffan, Dr. B. E. Martin, Mr. Clinton Stuart, Mr. Henry Norman, and Mr. Laurence Hutton.

A new edition, limited to 125 copies, is about to be published by J. W. Jarvis & Son in London (New York: Scribner & Welford) of Downe's 'Roscius Anglicanus,' the chief authority for the history of the English stage from 1660 to 1706. The new edition will be printed with notes by Garrick's biographer, Tom Davies, and with an historical preface by Mr. Joseph Knight, the dramatic critic of the *Athenæum* and editor of *Notes and Queries*.

The *Truth-Seeker* Company, of this city, will publish directly the recent discussion in the *Nineteenth Century* between Gladstone, Huxley, and others, under the title 'The Order of Creation: The Conflict between Genesis and Geology.'

A new edition of C. B. Vaux's 'Canoe Handling and Sailing' is announced by the *Forest and Stream* Publishing Company.

Mr. W. R. Jenkins, No. 850 Sixth Avenue, has added Louis Enault's 'Carine' to his series of "Contes Choisis." He announces that he shall make a venture in Italian reprints, beginning with 'Alberto,' by E. De Amicis, annotated in English.

The *English Magazine* will reproduce some of the latest drawings of the lamented Mr. Randolph Caldecott in connection with a paper from his own pen, "Fox Hunting, by a Man in a Round Hat." In no other class of designs were his skill and humor more eminent.

Like the *Harvard Advocate* recently, the *Yale Literary Magazine* celebrates an anniversary (semi-centennial) in its February issue by printing articles specially contributed by former editors, including Senator Evarts, one of its founders; Donald G. Mitchell; President White, of Cornell; President Gilman, of Johns Hopkins; Profs. E. R. Sill, T. R. Lounsbury, and C. A. Lyman; W. W. Crapo, and Charlton T. Lewis. This is a distinguished list, and the *Yale Lit.* can further say for itself that it is the oldest college

periodical in the country, and indeed the oldest monthly of any kind in the United States.

A city which sustains two first-class operas may, perhaps, be expected to support two *North American Reviews*. Such would seem to be the opinion of Mr. L. S. Metcalf, who edits the new *Forum* (No. 97 Fifth Avenue). One thing is certain, that his long connection with the *North American* has thoroughly acquainted him with the secret of that publication. His first number does not indeed contain a "symposium," but that may come later. The list of contributors to the March issue—Professor Alexander Winchell, James Parton, E. P. Whipple, Rev. Dr. R. H. Newton, Rev. E. E. Hale, Bishop Coxe, Dr. W. A. Hammond, Rev. M. J. Savage, Chancellor Howard Crosby—shows that the plan of bespeaking essays from celebrities at a liberal price will be followed here as in the older magazine. It shows, too, what a very artificial *forum* Mr. Metcalf presides over; in appearance an English review, but in fact not the natural medium of the persons we have just named, nor one called for by the amount of thought and culture seeking expression in this country. Mr. Hale lets the cat out of the purveyor's bag in his article, "How I was Educated": "The editor of the *Forum* has thought that a series of papers in which different people shall describe the methods of their school education may be at least amusing, and perhaps profitable, if only by way of caution. He has, therefore, induced a good many men to pose on his platform as 'awful warnings,' etc."

Mr. Rideing's pretty volume, 'Thackeray's London' (Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co.), with two good portraits of the novelist and some other interesting illustrations, is an extension of a magazine article previously published, and makes a convenient guide-book to the haunts and dwelling-places of the novelist and his characters. The slight localization of his scenes Mr. Rideing mentions as a characteristic of his art; and in consequence of this the volume is slight and sketchy, and somewhat padded with anecdote and sentimental criticism, the pages on the Charter-house and the Athenæum Club being the most substantial part.

To Mackenzie's 'Man of Feeling' (No. 5 in Cassell's National Library) the editor, Prof. Morley, prefixes an "index to tears (chokings, etc., not counted)," by way of preparation for this sentimental romance of the last century. Izaak Walton's 'Complete Angler,' we should have stated, is No. 4 in the same series.

One of the most delightful of misprints is to be found in the recent charming little sketch of 'Madame de Maintenon,' by Mr. J. Cotter Morison. Mme. de Maintenon was fond of being asked to go up higher, gratifying her pride by refusing the proffered honor, and Mr. Morison declares that "she belongs to the class of *glorieuses modestes*, as Sainte-Beuve says, with untranslatable felicity." And the English printer, with a felicity as great as the French critic's, has made it appear that the second wife of Louis XIV. "belongs to the class of *glorieuses modestes*!"

Mr. Frederick Locker, the lyrist of London, has one of the finest collections of rare and beautiful books in England; it abounds in scarce first editions and contains many curious MSS. Mr. Locker has at last been persuaded to print a catalogue of the Rowfant Library, and it will appear in March, only 150 copies being printed, a few of which will be for sale through Mr. Quaritch. Mr. Andrew Lang has written two poems to adorn the catalogue.

It may be noted that Mr. Lang is generally credited with the authorship of the clever mythological sketch in the current *Macmillan* on the "Gladstone Myth."