

mors, he clearly tries to prove that the religion of honor is insufficient. The father of M. de Camors traces for his son this programme of life: "To develop in all their extension the physical and intellectual gifts which chance has given to him; to make of himself the accomplished type of a civilized man of his own time; to charm women and to rule over men; to give himself all the pleasures of the mind, of the senses, of power; to subdue all the natural sentiments as the instincts of slavery; to disdain all vulgar beliefs as chimerical or hypocritical; to love nothing, to fear nothing, and respect nothing but honor." M. de Camors enters life with this programme. and whoever has read the novel knows where it leads him.

Octave Feuillet at the time of his first manner was sometimes called the "Musset des familles" —the family Musset. It may be that the slight irony contained in these words was not without influence on him. The novels of the second manner certainly show us very dreadful characters. The atmosphere is always the same—the heroes and heroines are always genteel, but it seems as if next to every angel the novelist felt the necessity of placing a devil. Some of his ladies, though they have not read Darwin and Schopenhauer, are real moral monsters; and it must be confessed that some of the "angels" are very terrestrial. What their faith may be, it is difficult to imagine; if they are to be judged by their works, their religion seems not to be incompatible with laziness, extravagance, and coquetry. It is the religion of a caste: it has gilded prayer-books and goes to the fashionable church. At times Feuillet's ladies and gentlemen make on me the impression of musk or of some other strong perfume; the air in which they move is laden with intellectual and moral incense. There is a certain sort of coarseness in all their gentility, as there is in a number of the *Vie Parisienne*. If this is spiritualism, give me a little materialism. The spiritualism of Octave Feuillet is not of the rarest quality; it is not the spiritualism of a Jansenist, or even of the pious lady of the seventeenth or the eighteenth century: it is superficial; it is the mask of a society which wishes to hide its scepticism, its love of pleasure, its egoism. Still, his novels are valuable documents for the history of our time—just as valuable as the documents of the realistic and naturalist school. They show us something different, but what they show us does exist; and Feuillet has often admirably depicted the weaknesses, the contradictions, the pretentious frivolities of a caste which, having no longer any privileges, has partly lost its sense of responsibility, and which is losing by degrees its influence in every sphere except the sphere of social vanities.

Correspondence.

THE TARIFF ON DIRT AGAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I see from your last issue that the learned counsel of the Wool-Growers' Association of Ohio insist on the propriety of making carpet wool pay more duty per pound of clean wool, when imported clean or nearly clean, than when imported with the original dirt. To expose the fallacy of their argument would require more space than you are likely to grant me, but I may be permitted to ask Messrs. Sanders and Newlin a few questions with reference to some portions of the argument recently made by them before the Secretary of the Treasury and published by them. The closing sentence of that argument reads as follows:

"If the Secretary of the Treasury will notice the immense increase in carpet-wool importations

in 1885 over 1884, and if he will further notice the yearly increase in wool importations from Russia, he will readily see the importance of this question, and how the increase was fostered to such great proportions."

The official figures of our importations of carpet-wools during the last six fiscal years, as given in the last annual wool-circular of Messrs. Geo. W. Bond & Co., of Boston, are as follows:

1880.....59,320,411 pounds,	1883.....40,130,322 pounds,
1881.....42,345,709 "	1884.....62,525,092 "
1882.....47,208,175 "	1885.....50,782,300 "

making an annual average of 50,892,102 pounds, just about equal to the importation of 1885.

Will Messrs. Sanders and Newlin be good enough to explain how these figures are to be reconciled with the above-quoted assertions? If they ever had any figures showing the alleged increase in our importations from Russia, I should like to see them and to know their origin: until they produce and prove them I rely on my own experience, and on that of other importers from Russia, and pronounce this part of their statement as unfounded as the other.

Will Messrs. Sanders and Newlin be good enough to explain that part of their argument before the Secretary in which they assert that "washed wool" means "wool washed on the sheep's back," and support the assertion by half-a-dozen written opinions from dealers in American wools? Arguing that Donskoi wool, being washed after shearing, must be "scoured wool," will they explain how it comes that all these experts and they themselves forget the fact that even among American fine wools there is such a thing as "tub-washed wool," which is not washed on the sheep's back and still never passes for "scoured" wool?

Surely, Messrs. Sanders and Newlin have studied law in Ohio, and are entitled to a degree or a decoration from that most honorable concern, the Wool-Growers' Association.

GUSTAV SCHWAB.

NEW YORK, March 23, 1886.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS AGAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is believed that the vigorous and progressive public sentiment which has succeeded in securing a civil service law as a means of elevating and purifying the administration of public offices, will not be content with what it has already accomplished, but will continue its efforts to improve the public service by endeavoring to correct such abuses as stand in the way of further reform. But, while it is generally conceded that one of the worst obstacles to further progress in the direction indicated is the secret executive sessions of the Senate, it is evident from the manner in which the proposal, recently made by a member of that body, to throw open the doors for the consideration of executive business, was received by those to whom it was addressed, that the popular demand for complete publicity will have to be very strong and loud before the object sought can be attained.

It may be urged in favor of the suggestion made by the writer (in No. 1080 of the *Nation*), that the vote on nominations be public, but the discussion of them, if the Senate so desire, secret, that it is a remedy to which Senators could not object without betraying an unwillingness to bear their just share of responsibility in the matter of appointments. It would simply be requiring them to stand in line with the President, and be judged by their acts, as the President is judged by his. To this they could not validly object.

There is good ground for saying that the great evil of secret sessions for the transaction of executive business has been that they have afforded the most ample opportunity, of which industrious use has been made, for the consummation of bargains for the distribution of patronage, and

not that they have prevented the people from knowing what sort of men have been chosen to fill the public offices. In almost every instance where an actually unfit nomination is made, the fact is published before the nomination is confirmed. But the confirmation takes place, and nobody in the Senate is responsible. Public opinion is as strongly pronounced upon the character of the person appointed as if the people had derived their knowledge of it from the Senate, instead of directly from the press. But, perhaps by a coalition which would be impossible if constituencies were looking on, the appointment is completed.

It may, however, be said that if the character of nominees is exposed to public scrutiny already, it is illogical to advocate the secret discussion of nominations in the Senate out of regard for applicants' feelings. We reply that it is proposed to preserve secrecy to this extent not more because the probability of a public and perhaps partisan discussion of character in the Senate would deter sensitive men from applying for office, than because it is conceived that in such a matter secrecy is conducive to the complete information of those who are required to decide, as well as to proper freedom of discussion. A great many communications in reference to appointments to office are confidential in their character; and much valuable information is obtained in this way from men who could not be induced to appear as public accusers. We know how difficult it generally is to persuade people to appear in courts of justice to aid in the prosecution of persons who are the pests of a whole community, and there would be still less inclination to incur inconvenience and emitties on account of a Federal appointment. On the other hand, it is going a great way to say that no man should apply for a public position who (as the *Nation* has said) "shrank from having his fitness discussed before any audience, however large." Unfortunately for the country, many honorable men whose services might be of great public benefit do shrink from such discussion, and refuse to go before the people as candidates for official position rather than subject themselves to the detractions of unscrupulous opponents. The Higginases, Thomases, and Rasins are the sort of persons who probably care least for public criticism. They are used to being discussed; and not infrequently they are found courting "the fullest investigation."

It is erroneous to suppose that the public discussion of nominations would reveal, when the Senate confirms a man, "whether" (to use the *Nation's* phrase) "it confirms him because he is a great rascal or because he is a model of all the virtues." It is not likely that, if a Senator were influenced by the former motive, he would make a public declaration of the fact; and unless he did, his real motive would, after all, be a mere matter of inference or conjecture. An illustration of this may be drawn from the regular passage of the River and Harbor Bill, which is universally recognized as a grand log-rolling scheme; and yet, notwithstanding the public debate on it, no member of Congress is ever betrayed into a confession of the impurity of his motives. The bill goes through because the sentiment in favor of better government has not yet grown strong enough to overcome the seductive and enfeebling influence which an appropriation exerts on a large mass of voters.

With respect to the public offices, the case is different. The office-seeking class is comparatively small; and against those who would scramble into place in the old-fashioned way stands a large body of intelligent, vigorous men, representing a potential force of conviction which few Senators could afford to disregard, if they were made responsible, by an open vote taken by yeas and nays, for their action in reference

to nominations. The secret session might still be resorted to for the purpose of discussing the character of candidates. For daily experience shows that such secrecy does not prevent the people from knowing when an unfit man is nominated and confirmed; while it doubtless often enables the Senate to act intelligently, without needlessly and unjustly exposing applicants to inconsiderate and injurious discussions. J. B. M.

WASHINGTON, March 16, 1886.

FEDERAL COURTS AND STATE RESISTANCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your No. 1076, page 121, appears the following statement: "Until the present time the United States has never been victorious in its judiciary department over a State determined to defy it." At least one case has occurred in the history of the United States where a national court has imposed its will upon the legal, civil, and military authorities of a powerful State. On the 25th day of March, 1809, the Marshal of the United States District Court of the District of Pennsylvania appeared to serve a process of arrest in the so-called *Olmstead* case, upon a Mrs. Sergeant in Philadelphia. He was stopped by two guards with fixed bayonets, under command of General Bright, who was acting under the orders of Governor Snyder, backed up by special acts of the Legislature. The Marshal, being obliged by force to desist from his service, withdrew, with the warning that he should raise the posse. On May 2, 1809, in the case of the United States vs. Bright et al., the jury brought in the following verdict:

"That the defendants are guilty of knowingly and wilfully obstructing, resisting and opposing the Marshal in his attempt to serve [a] judicial writ, but that the defendants acted under the order of the constituted authorities of Pennsylvania in so obstructing and resisting the Marshal. The jury leave it to the Court to say whether, upon the whole matter, thus found, the law is in favor of the United States or the defendants, and if the Court are of opinion that the law is with the United States, then the jury find the defendants guilty; but if the Court are of opinion that the law is with the defendants, then they find them not guilty" (*New England Palladium*, March 31, May 9, 1809).

Whereupon Judge Washington sentenced the accused to fine and imprisonment, which was duly inflicted.

I have quoted this verdict in full, in part because of its entertaining form; but chiefly because the details of this interesting assertion of the powers of the United States Courts are quite difficult to find. The following references may be useful to any one who cares to follow the matter out: Hildreth's *History of the United States*, vi, 155-165; *American State Papers*, Misc., ii, 6-12; *Congressional Debates*, ix, 635; *American Register* (1809), 150 152, 165, 168-176.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

CAMBRIDGE, February 26, 1886.

WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MIGHT DO FOR EDUCATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation* is certainly to be commended for its vigorous opposition to that vicious and demoralizing piece of legislation, the Blair bill. The support of the measure depends largely upon demagogism on the part of politicians, and ignorant sentimentalism on the part of the people generally.

If there be one principle more firmly established than another in regard to public policy in this country, it is the duty of the state to provide liberally for the support of free common schools. People who do not reason about the

matter, or who do not appreciate the relation existing between the national Government on the one hand and the State governments on the other, and the respective duties and obligations of each, think it strange and inconsistent in the national Government not to share in this support. It is to this mistaken, though honest, feeling and sentiment that those influenced by less interested motives appeal, and from which they derive their support and strength—at least their reliable strength.

Now, this sentiment ought certainly to be recognized, and it seems to me that there are ways in which the national Government can legitimately and intelligently foster the cause of education; and I have been somewhat surprised that this branch of the subject has not been touched upon in the discussion in your columns.

In the first place, Congress can see that model schools of the highest efficiency are maintained in the District of Columbia, which is under its immediate and sole jurisdiction. It can make the office of the Commissioner of Education effective by providing means for its support, so that it can employ specialists in its legitimate work, distribute educational literature until at least the demand is satisfied, get its report printed sooner than three or four years after its compilation, and do all that work in which such an office can wield so great an influence and accomplish so much good. There are men, like Prof. G. Stanley Hall, who might be employed in this office, where their writings, researches, and work might result in giving a great impetus to educational work throughout the country.

There are burning questions in the science and art of teaching pressing for a solution. For example, How and to what extent can manual and industrial training be introduced into our public schools? Why is this not a legitimate field of investigation and experiment for the Commissioner of Education to undertake with the encouragement and support of Congress? In a word, are there not many legitimate objects to which the national Government has not yet turned its attention to any satisfactory extent, and to which its efforts should be directed before any such dangerous experiments as are contemplated by the Blair bill are undertaken?

JOHN J. JENNINGS.

BRISTOL, CONN., March 20, 1886.

TYPICAL INDIAN TREATMENT IN MICHIGAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In my former letter I pointed out that thirty years ago the United States attempted substantially the very same policy that is being put forward now in Congress as a new movement in Indian affairs. I showed how the experiment, which was tried on the Isabella County reservation here in Michigan, resulted in robbery and utter pauperization and ruin of all save three or four of the Indians who received their lands in fee simple, and who would still have had homes on the reservation had the United States continued to hold their lands in trust, or compelled white scoundrels to respect their rights. In the present article I propose to show how a swindle begun among these Indians in the past is still operative, and how some of the people's money has been going for years to sustain idle teachers in empty schools, and to pay the salary of a minister of the Gospel in violation of the laws of the State and the nation.

From 1857 to 1867 the United States expended, under the direction of the President, for the educational interests of these Chippewas on their new reservation, \$30,000. In 1864 the treaty of 1855 was amended, and among other things a provision was made authorizing the Missionary

Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church to start a Manual Labor School on the reservation. A quarter section of land was set apart for the farm of the said school. The Missionary Society should, within three years, "erect suitable buildings, for school and boarding-house purposes, of a value of not less than \$3,000" upon the school farm. The treaty designated a board of visitors, consisting of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Lieutenant-Governor of the State, and a person appointed by the Missionary Society, "whose duty it shall be to visit the said school once during each year and examine the same, and investigate the character and qualifications of its teachers and all other persons connected therewith, and report thereon to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs." "Upon the approval and acceptance of the school and boarding-house buildings by the board of visitors, the United States will pay to the authorized agent of said Missionary Society, for the support and maintenance of the school, the sum of \$2,000, and the like sum annually thereafter until the whole sum of \$20,000 shall have been expended." If, at the end of the said ten years, the Missionary Society can show that it has fulfilled the terms of the treaty "in a manner acceptable to the board of visitors during said ten years, the United States will convey to said Missionary Society the land before mentioned."

Well, at the end of the ten years the matter was allowed to rest until a proper opportunity came, when Republican officials in Washington aided the Missionary Society in obtaining the land, which it sold for \$2,500; and as that could not have been done without satisfying the Administration that the terms of the treaty had been faithfully observed by the Missionary Society, and as such satisfaction could not have been afforded if the Missionary Society had not drawn the aforesaid \$20,000 for the support of the School, it follows that the United States paid out for the education of these Indians, in addition to the \$30,000 first named, also \$20,000 in cash, besides awarding a quarter section of land which was sold at once for \$2,500. Thus in about twenty years the United States paid \$50,000 for the education of these Indians. But that is not all. Ever since the \$30,000 fund was expended, the three Government schools on the reservation have been sustained by the United States at the rate of \$400 per year each, or \$1,200 annually for all. That outlay is still being made year after year, although the average attendance is not over three scholars per school, as I am informed by the most intelligent Indians on the reservation, and they are corroborated by the whites who know the condition of the schools. One of the schools, that at Nipising, gets \$400 per year, and it has had but two scholars in the past year, as I am assured by Joseph Bradley, on whose land the schoolhouse stands, and who sends his own children to the district public school. This \$400, therefore, is virtually obtained from the Government by misrepresentation, and it goes to pay the salary of the Methodist minister who is settled in that parish, not over the Indians, but the whites.

I am assured by both Indians and whites who know whereof they affirm, that in these Government schools, sustained for thirty years by the United States, not more than two Indians have ever learned to write their names, and not more than five or six ever learned to read, and these only familiar lessons in the first or second reader. They assure me, those very few Indians who have learned to read and write, that they learned nothing until they got into school among whites. To-day those Indians who have any desire to educate their children send them to the district schools, and they keep right along with the white children in the classes there.

"Do the whites treat them well?" I asked of the Indians.

"Yes! yes! Good. All right. No trouble 't all. Want our children. come to school 'cause we who got any land have help pay school tax."

"Then you don't want the Government schools, do you?"

"They no good. Only keep few children 'way from district schools and draw money support teachers. We try to 'bolish these schools, but minister who gets \$400 year for teachin' one where is only two scholars, he go among old Injins and get them vote keep Government schools open."

Whenever this is denied, or an investigation is wanted, I shall be happy to produce evidence of the truth of my statements. But let there be no whitewashing attempted.

Further, in regard to the Manual Labor School, for the support of which the United States paid the Missionary Society \$20,000, and gave it a quarter section of land, the facts are that no such school ever existed on the reservation, none was ever attempted, and no such board of visitors as was designated in the treaty ever came up into the woods to visit the school—for the very good reason that there was none to visit. Now, will the present Administration continue to pay out the people's money to support idle teachers in empty schools against the wishes of the Indians, who want their children educated among the whites, among whom they are heartily welcomed, and where they are actually learning something—where, to use the language of an Indian who was himself a scholar in the Indian schools and who sends his own children to the district schools, "An Injin child learn more in district school in six months than learn in Government school in six years"? Will the present Administration, pledged as it is to reform, allow money to be drawn from the United States for the support of a minister of the Gospel settled over a white parish which includes an Indian school, which school the said minister presumes to teach, but which, in point of fact, is practically empty, and in which the Indian scholars learn nothing?

Here is an opportunity for those who propose to improve the management of Indian affairs to begin near home; and this matter is respectfully submitted to the attention of President Cleveland and his advisers.

CHARLES ELLIS.

EAST SAGINAW, MICH.

A HARVARD CONTROVERSY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have received a copy of the *Nation* dated February 18, 1886 (very curiously, my seventy-fifth birthday), and in it an article signed "Anglus." I would rather have seen the name, as in the case of most of the other letters in your journal. I always sign mine—sign or not write. It is a sort of guarantee when the attack is a personal one, as in this case. May I ask the favor that you will grant me space for this in an early number, and kindly send me a copy?

"Anglus" has strained his logic against his countryman. As to Mr. Waters, I rejoice at any reward or recognition that may be conferred upon him. His labor has resulted in a great success, which would not, however, have been less with a little courtesy, in return for mine in my offering all my notes when I had not the least idea of his labors, except that they were toward John Harvard. I am, however, too old to be troubled about accidentals.

Nor am I about to bandy words with "Anglus." I have taken the liberty of posting to you twelve copies of my pamphlet, 'Old Southwark and Its People. John Harvard, born Southwark, 1607; died, Charlestown, 1698,' and to ask you to favor me by giving a copy to any thinking rep-

resentative person who may desire one. That which I have written must speak for me; further I will, within my knowledge and power, answer any queries which may be sent to me. In my pamphlet will be found full recognition of Mr. Waters's work, the discovery of wills, etc., etc. On my side I produce evidences of the father's work and position in St. Saviour's parish, of the very site of his home for twenty-five or more years, and much else. Nothing of this was, I believe, known to Mr. Waters any more than his great find was known to me. The "hopeful" words of the President of Harvard will no doubt (after the heat is over) turn out to be correct: "That no difficulty will be seen in the different versions, but that they will be found to supplement each other." Those who honor me by reading my pamphlet may like to see also for themselves *Academy*, October 24 and November 7; *Athenæum*, July 11, 1885, and January 16, 1886. There I leave it, hoping to trouble myself no more with the controversial part of the question.

Faithfully,

W. RENDLE.

TREVERBYN, DARTMOUTH PARK, FOREST HILL, S. E.
March, 1886.

A LITERARY COINCIDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There are some authors who, instead of being inclined to call down imprecations on the heads of those who utter their own sayings before themselves, are only likely to find pleasure in a coincidence of judgment and expression; and such must be the case with Mr. J. R. Lowell and Mr. F. Harrison, if they are at this moment turning the pages of the last publication of each.

In Mr. Lowell's article on Gray, published in the *New Princeton Review* for this month, Mr. Harrison will read (in a passage about the eighteenth century): "Burke thought it impossible to draw an indictment against a whole people, and the remark is equally just if we apply it to a century."

In Mr. Harrison's essay, "A Few Words about the Eighteenth Century," published in a volume this month, Mr. Lowell will read: "Invectives against a century are even more unprofitable than indictments against a nation."

Again, Mr. Harrison will read on another page: "Perhaps even our own age, with its marvels of applied science that have made the world more prosily comfortable, will loom less gigantic than now through the prospective of the future. Perhaps it will even be found that the telephone, of which we are so proud, cannot carry human speech so far as Homer and Plato have contrived to carry it with their simple appliances."

Mr. Lowell will read, in "A Few Words about the Nineteenth Century": "It is worth a few minutes' thought to ask, What is the exact effect upon civilization, in the widest and highest sense of that term, of this marvellous multiplication of mechanical appliance to life? . . . Is an age which abounds in countless inventions thereby alone placed head and shoulders above all the ages since historical times began?" And on another page (in the essay on "The Choice of Books") he will find: "Telephones, microphones, pantoscopes, steam presses, and ubiquity-engines in general may, after all, leave the poor human brain, panting and throbbing under the strain of its appliances, no bigger and no stronger than the brains of the men who heard Moses speak, and saw Aristotle and Archimedes pondering over a few worn rolls of crabbed manuscript." **

March 22, 1886.

COBBLING EXTRAORDINARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In view of the numerous and startling expositions of the ignorance and the peculiar

methods of translators from foreign languages which have been made during the last year, it is surprising that more discrimination is not used in the matter. Some remarkable examples have appeared lately, but the translation (through the French) of Count L. Tolstoi's 'War and Peace' easily takes the lead. Repeated remonstrances have been made against this double translation. It can never be successful; and it is to be regretted that, now that Turgeneff is dead, Count Tolstoi should have been selected as the victim of an attempt to achieve the impossible. I quite agree with Henry Gréville that, bad as are most French translations of Turgeneff, Tolstoi suffers infinitely more by the process. A very slight examination will convince the most sceptical that the American versions of his novel is not true to the French; and the French is almost equally unreliable. This unfortunate result is due, in part, to ignorance of French on the part of both translators, as well as to carelessness, but chiefly to the headlong manner in which the version offered to the American public by two houses has been prepared, in which everything—sense, accuracy, and style—has been sacrificed to speed.

"The style is the man"; yet the liberties which have been taken with Tolstoi's style are innumerable. Would it be fair to Victor Hugo to translate him into pompous Johnsonese, or to Johnson to convert him into crisp Hugo French? By a free use of conjunctions, a number of short sentences are constantly welded into one long phrase; paragraphs are turned upside down; conversation is changed into description, and vice versa. Sentences belonging to two separate individuals have been united, thus putting the conversation which follows into the mouths of the wrong persons. Omissions, ranging from a significant adjective to a page in length, and inexcusable interpolations, are equally common. They do not restore the balance, however, by any means. Many of these points cannot be illustrated without longer quotations than space permits. In the specimens which follow, an (F) will denote that the French translation is faulty as well as the Anglo-American. The responsibility for all other phrases rests wholly with the latter. I attribute no blame to the person who is said to have revised and corrected the work, since, so far as I can discover, he has no existence except upon the title-page. It reads smoothly enough to the unobservant, but intelligent readers must have been greatly puzzled by the innumerable mistranslations and anachronisms.

In the first chapter, the American sends the elegant little Princess Lisa to an evening party in a "morning dress," and it is stated (F) that "her bewitching little upper lip could never be persuaded to close on the lower lip." *Rus.* "Her lip was short over the teeth, but all the more prettily for that reason did it at times lengthen and droop upon the lower." Again, (F) "Helen was so surprisingly lovely that she could not have a grain of petty vanity. If she had felt awkwardly conscious of such perfect, triumphant beauty, and had wished to mitigate its effect, she could not have done it." Her attitude is more pleasing in the original: "Helen was so lovely that not a shadow of coquetry could be detected in her; on the contrary, she seemed conscience-stricken at her undisputed, too powerful and triumphant beauty; she seemed to wish to lessen the effect of her loveliness, but was unable to do so." A good specimen of interpolation occurs here: (F) "Nay, he would have given a handsome sum never to see or hear one of them again, his wife included." "Tell that to the marines" is another elegant addition. The phrase is used by Anthony Trollope's vulgar Duchess Glencora, but not by Count Tolstoi. Another is: "It will all melt through our fingers, and then whose fault

is it?" *Fits* is a favorite expression of the Anglo-American translator, to represent a laugh of any kind. Not content with rendering "laughing heartily" by "such a fit of laughter as almost choked him," she interpolates it in this form: "In spite of herself, she, too, was in fits of laughing." These must suffice as instances of the numberless unwarranted additions to the text, which certainly are no improvement.

(F) "The ruthless glass showed her only a sharp, unattractive face." *Rus.* "As is the case with most people, her face assumed a strained, unnatural, stupid expression as soon as she looked in the glass." (F) "It is the morning drum, the sun is risen," is offered as the equivalent of "Not yet had the sun flushed the sky with dawn"; "evergreens" for "flowers"; "plaster" for "marble"; "Sonia went on crying" for "Sonia stopped crying"; "Cossacks" for "Croats"; "a helpless idiot" for "a lazy man"; "an indifferent shrug" for "a wave of the hand." "Captain," or "company commander," is translated indifferently "major" or "sergeant-major"; which reminds one of the drum-major's wife who begged her friend not to be so dreadfully ceremonious as to address her by that long title, since "Mrs. Major" would suit her just as well. Ignorance of the fact that Michael (diminutive *Mishka*) is the Russian name for bear, corresponding to *Bruin*, leads the American to transform that animal into a human being, and "Come, let *Mishka* alone," changes to "No, no, *Michka*, let them alone." "I never think" is the startling statement evolved out of "I never think of them"; and "he betrayed some strongly controlled emotion," out of "he had the air of a man who was not much interested in the conversation of the two ladies." Princess Marie is represented as playing a sonata by (F) *Dreyschock* in 1804. *Dreyschock* was not born until 1818. It should read *Dusseck*, who was a favorite composer of the period. "Bonaparte was a trumpety little Frenchman whose success was due to the fact that there were no longer any *Potemkins* and *Suvaroffs* to pit against him," furnishes a chance for an anachronism of which the American eagerly takes advantage. Bonaparte's success is attributed to "the incapacity of *Potemkin* and *Souwarow*." I admit that they were incapacitated: *Potemkin* died in 1791, *Souwaroff* in 1800. This is in 1805. On page 28, *Kutuzoff* and the Austrian general are described as inspecting the soldiers, and paying special attention to their tattered footgear, which is the chief point of the episode. (F) "From our boots to our screwdrivers, he inspected everything," one soldier is represented as saying afterwards. For this read: "He examined our boots and footbands thoroughly." Peasants in Russia and other countries often wind strips of cloth about their feet instead of stockings. The Russian word is *podvertki*; screwdrivers are *otvertki*, both derived from the root *vert* to twist. The Russian female translator probably used *Reiff's* dictionary, which is only good for elementary work, and, not finding *podvertki*, she accepted *otvertki* because both screwdrivers and footbands are twisted in use! "Reddish-yellow" is translated (F) "pale as wax;" "Marie Dmitrievna, nicknamed the Dragon," becomes (F) ". . . nicknamed the Dreadful Dragon"; "wringing her hands," (F) "half crazy with terror." Thirty-five *versts* become 33 in the French, 30 hours in the American; 150 *versts* dwindle to 50, and "a carriage which stood at the door" is multiplied into (F) "a long line of carriages gave his word the lie." On page 34, we find this ridiculous sentence: "The little man looked as usual—snub-nosed and black-haired." Was he in the habit of transforming himself into a Roman-nosed blonde every now and then? The American would lead one to think so, for a little later

she makes him red-haired. At first sight this is suggestive of the frugal woman in 'Handy Andy' who said she had had her old black silk dress dyed crimson. Investigation shows that, like the first sentence, this is due to carelessness, and that the red-haired man was named *Dementieff*. "Vaska Denissoff's snub-nosed, black-whiskered face, and the whole of his compact little figure, . . . was exactly the same as usual." This is sensible and simple: he did not shrink and turn pale under fire like the men who have just been described.

On the same page an extraordinary military manoeuvre is executed. *Rus.* "Denissoff took up his position at the end of the bridge and watched his squadron as it approached. The sound of hoofs was audible on the planks of the bridge, as though many horses were galloping, and the squadron, . . . deploying upon the bridge by fours, began its march to the other side." *American*: "Denissoff . . . watched his men pass by four abreast. . . . The whole squadron formed to pass to the other side." According to this, it will be perceived that the regiment passed Denissoff, turned and marched back over the bridge, which was immediately burned behind it, leaving it to the tender mercy of the enemy on the shore which had just been evacuated! Count Tolstoi now advocates the doctrine of non-resistance to evil; but he was a gallant and able soldier in former days, and when he learns what an astounding bit of strategy has been attributed to him—in connection with other imbecilities which are but faintly outlined above—he will probably renounce that doctrine long enough to visit New York armed like the traditional brigand. He may derive a profound and holy joy from cobbling shoes, but such unpardonable cobbling of his brains by incompetent and careless persons will be likely to awaken some other sentiment in his breast, as it does in the breasts of those who can read Russian, and who have been inspired with something like a warm personal affection for the man who can write such books. All the delicate touches which show the artist's hand have been ruthlessly eliminated from this translation. Instead of dainty portraits of people whose every word and movement disclose their several characters in clear, true outlines, we have something more nearly approaching the comic-valentine order of art.

"Owen Meredith" once made metrical versions of some Servian folk-songs. In the preface he claimed that their chief merit lay in the fact that he had gathered these fresh and simple wild-wood blossoms with his own hand, in their native vales. The Harvard Library copy of this volume contains a marginal note, in the handwriting of a distinguished professor belonging to the university, to the effect that they were adapted from the English prose translation of the French translation of the German translation of the Servian! Perhaps *pot-pourri* would be a polite word by which to express the state of those "freshly culled blossoms" after passing through five hands. I have not hit upon a polite word for the Tolstoi translation, and do not expect to. Neither do I expect that even the list of choice atrocities which I have given above—and which might be simplified by saying that there is hardly a page which should not be entirely rewritten—will have any effect in preventing further hack-work by unsympathetic and unskilled hands. I only wish to beg readers of translations from the Russian through the French—the worst possible medium—not to trust to the correctness of any ten consecutive words.

A word in regard to the proper names employed seems also necessary. The mongrel nomenclature leads to confusion. Part of the names are English, part French, part Russian: Count Rostoff is called *Élie*, and the Russian form, *Ilya*,

is then employed when referring to his daughter, *Natasha Ilinovna*. Count Tolstoi's name is *Lvov Leo*, but it halts half way in the French *Léon*, and *Lvovna* is changed to *Lvovna*, which is nonsense. *Pavlograd* is allowed to stand, *Pavlovna* is turned into *Paulovna*. Prince *Vassily* becomes *Basil*, while *André* is allowed to remain in French. *Mlle*, and *Monsieur* are put where they never were written, and *Vicomte* is as carefully translated every time. And the French *w* (pronounced *v*) is always used, without explanation, where an English *v* or *f* should have appeared. A similar bit of ignorance and carelessness occurs in a Polish translation of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' which must be a great puzzle to the unfortunate readers. Once, in the first chapter, Mr. Shelby calls little Harry "Jim Crow." That was too much for the Pole; but, nothing daunted, he translated it *Jimka*, explaining that it was the diminutive form of *Jeremiah*, and used it for several chapters. Then, without a word of elucidation, he introduced Harry, and proceeded to use both names indiscriminately, as though the unfortunate child were Siamese twins! Such minor points serve to sustain a translator's well-earned reputation for carelessness.

ISABEL F. HAPGOOD.

Boston, March 11, 1886.

Notes.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL & Co. have in press, for immediate publication, Count Leo Tolstoi's 'Anna Karénina,' translated from the Russian by Nathan Haskell Dole.

As the American "Men of Letters" series was obviously suggested by the English "Men of Letters" series, so the series of "American Statesmen" seems to have suggested to Macmillan & Co. the limited series of "Twelve English Statesmen," intended "to present, in historic order, the lives and work of those leading actors" in the affairs of Great Britain who have left an abiding mark on the policy and institutions of England. The first biography to appear will be Mr. Freeman's 'William the Conqueror,' and this will be followed by Mrs. J. R. Green's 'Henry II.,' Mr. Frederick Pollock's 'Edward I.,' Mr. Cotter Morison's 'Henry VII.,' Professor Creighton's 'Wolsey,' Dean Church's 'Elizabeth' (who is an English statesman just as Margaret Fuller was an American man of letters), Mr. Frederic Harrison's 'Cromwell,' Mr. H. D. Traill's 'William III.,' Mr. Leslie Stephen's 'Walpole,' Mr. Froude's 'Chatham,' Mr. Morley's 'Pitt,' and Mr. J. R. Thursfield's 'Peel.'

By arrangement with the English publisher, Mr. George J. Coombes will soon issue a little volume called 'The Pleasures of a Book-Worm,' by Mr. J. Rogers Rees, containing half-a-dozen chapters of easy gossip about books, criticism, dedications, etc.

Mr. Coombes will publish this week Mr. Lang's 'Books and Bookmen,' the first of the series of 'Books for the Bibliophile.' It will be followed shortly by the second volume, Mr. Matthews's 'Ballades of Books.' There will be a special large-paper edition of this series as well as a large-paper edition of Messrs. Matthews and Hutton's 'Actors and Actresses'—the five volumes of which appeal especially to the extra-illustrator.

We cheerfully substitute on our shelves Mr. C. A. Durfee's new Index to *Harper's Magazine*, vols. 1—70, for the previous Index, vols. 1—60. A great improvement is to be remarked in the typography, and in the table facilitating reference from volume and page to month and year. The obituaries, again, are now first displayed in alphabetical order. The portraits fill about the same number of pages as before, but the smaller type argues a great increase in their number. No