

*Pedro* too. Spain had many dogs—all “foreign,” wherefore she hated them—as *canis gallicus*, *galgo*, the “French” dog; *canis gothicus*, *gozque* (gothici), the “Gothic” dog; *canis sabaudus*, *sabueso*, the “Savoy” dog; *canis bodineus*, *podenco*, the Po or “Italian” dog; *canis alanus*, *alano*, the Alani’s dog, and *cáravo*, from the Arabic *kelb* (Fuero Viejo de Cast, p. 73 n); so they called the native dog (*canis patrius*, “our dog” (*Español rancio*), attracting the vowels, according to their wont, into *paitro*, *petro*, *pedro*, and then assimilating for the above reason into *perro*.

W. I. KNAPP.

## Correspondence.

### WOLSELEY ON LEE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just finished reading Gen. Lord Wolseley’s article on Gen. Lee, in *Macmillan’s Magazine*, and cannot forbear the expression of my astonishment that such wretched trash could emanate from an officer above the grade of subaltern. The ignorance of facts and the incapacity for military criticism exhibited by our British cousins during the progress of the war of secession were sometimes amusing and sometimes provoking; but that “the only general” of the British army could, twenty-two years after the war, at leisure and deliberately, put forth statements and opinions like those contained in the *Macmillan* article, is simply amazing.

Two sentences will suffice: Lord Wolseley asks, “Was ever an army so hopelessly at the mercy of another as that of McClellan when he began his retreat to Harrison’s Landing after the seven days’ fighting around Richmond? What commander could wish to have his foe in a ‘tighter place’ than Burnside was in after his disastrous attack upon Lee at Fredericksburg?”

What does the first sentence quoted mean? Does Lord Wolseley suppose that the retreat to Harrison’s Landing began after the seven days’ fighting? That retreat was accomplished during the seven days’ fighting; that retreat was the seven days’ fighting. So much for Lord Wolseley’s conception of the situation. His criticism is equally worthless. Lee had all he could do to dislodge McClellan from his position in front of Richmond and make his retreat to the James necessary. Indeed, he was very fortunate in being able to accomplish so much. His army was on several occasions more at the mercy of McClellan than McClellan’s army was on any one occasion at his mercy. Had Porter been properly reinforced on the 27th of June, had Heintzelman supported Sumner on the 29th, the Confederates would have been put in great peril. The nearest Lee came at any time to threatening the existence of the Army of the Potomac was at Glendale, on the 30th. Here a Confederate victory would have involved a serious disaster to McClellan’s army, but that victory was not in fact won; the Confederate assaults were thrown off with severe loss, and McClellan’s reserves, at the close of the battle, were numerous enough to have taken all the fighting off the hands of the troops that had been engaged. Perhaps Malvern Hill is the point where Lord Wolseley conceives Gen. McClellan’s army to have been most hopelessly at the mercy of Gen. Lee!

Lord Wolseley’s conception of the situation after the battle of Fredericksburg is not more erroneous, but the error is far less excusable. I venture to assert that the six corps commanders of the Army of the Potomac would have agreed unanimously, on the 14th of December, 1862, to march the best brigade of each division back to Acquia Creek, on the condition that Gen. Lee

would attack on that day or any day following. The man who is capable of imagining that the Confederates could have run over the Union army, even after its disastrous repulse at Fredericksburg, is not capable of forming an opinion of value regarding any phase of the American war. In saying this I do not write as a Union soldier, but as an American; and I do not doubt that every Confederate officer present in that battle would agree with me in this.

Lord Wolseley’s opinion regarding the movements of the Union and Confederate armies, considered, not strategically but as examples of logistics, is highly amusing. Any one who has read the accounts in the English papers of the efforts of the English military authorities to move a small corps, in light marching order, a few miles, by good roads; give the troops a dinner of cooked food sent down express from London, and get them safely back to camp by nightfall, cannot fail to be entertained by Lord Wolseley’s reflections upon the logistics of the American armies, North and South. Repeatedly, during the campaign of ’64, bodies of from thirty to fifty thousand men were moved many miles during the night, over the worst of roads, sometimes amid pouring rain, with their hospitals, trains, and artillery, and put into position to deliver or repel an assault by four o’clock in the morning, the whole movement having been ordered and even conceived upon information received after nightfall.

One would not lightly use contemptuous phrases regarding an officer of Lord Wolseley’s rank; but the whole body of military criticism contained in this pretentious article cannot be characterized otherwise than as silly, empty, and vain.

FRANCIS A. WALKER.

### WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN MASSACHUSETTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The “additional statistics” of “E. L.” in your number of March 17 are as misleading as those which Sydney Smith once characterized. Granted that only a few thousand women go every year to the trouble and expense of getting themselves registered to vote for school committees in Massachusetts, the wonder is that even so many do this. Under parallel circumstances, not five hundred men would vote. Col. T. W. Higginson recently told the Woman Suffrage Committee of the Legislature that he had taken an active part in many political movements, but that all his political duties during the entire year did not give him so much trouble as trying to keep his wife’s name on the Cambridge voting list, and that he had failed in doing so after all. Every one knows that the nomination of school committee is a minor part of the general system of municipal suffrage, and is shaped and determined in the party caucuses, from which women are excluded. The nominees of these caucuses are afterwards elected on a general party ticket, with no regard whatever to their respective merits. The 1,200 women voters of Boston have more than once brought forward the names of first-class men who have subsequently been taken up by the Democratic party and elected. No woman has ever yet been elected upon the Boston School Board upon a general ticket, unless she has first received the Democratic nomination, and no woman has ever failed of an election when she has been thus nominated. Miss Abby W. May, Miss Lucia Peabody, and Mrs. Emily A. Fifield have been thus chosen, and have done admirable service. But these ladies have been left off because they were too independent to do the behests of party managers, because politicians wanted their places, and because they were not Democratic voters. They

have always received the undivided support of all, or almost all, the women voters.

But the important and encouraging fact connected with the school committee vote in Massachusetts is its *quality*. The few thousand women who have annually taken the trouble to get their names registered have done so solely from public spirit, and have been without exception women of superior intelligence and character. They have for ever refuted the prediction that “only bad women will vote.” No sane man or woman will claim that the women have done harm or have lowered the standard of politics, either as voters or as school officers. On the contrary, it will be admitted that the more such voters the better. But in order to have more, greater inducement must be offered. Full municipal suffrage, on the same terms as men, as just granted in Kansas, will be the only fair test. When this is granted in Massachusetts, women will vote in large numbers; never till then.

Meanwhile, more than one hundred women are serving on school committees throughout the State—more than five times as many as before women voted. And wherever, as in Woburn, any attempt is made to control the public schools in sectarian interests, women will register and vote. In that town more than six hundred women have done so for several years past, and have saved the schools from being thus perverted.

A few years ago we had a special election in Boston for male citizens on the question whether a system of public parks should be inaugurated. It was far more likely to enlist public interest than the choice of a school committee, since it involved extensive transactions in real estate and an expenditure of millions of dollars. Only one voter in twelve voted for parks; yet the parks carried the day, because only one voter in fourteen took the trouble to vote against them. In the city of Toronto, where school committees have been chosen at a special election, it has just been found necessary to connect it with the general municipal election because only a handful of voters could be induced to come out. (Our School Committee election is a special one, so far as the women are concerned.) Are these facts an argument against manhood suffrage? Not at all. No more are the facts stated by “E. L.” an argument against woman suffrage.

H. B. B.

DORCHESTER, March 28, 1887.

### JOHN COTTON FINALLY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: “Pocomas” has written a second letter in regard to John Cotton, at much greater length and with much more rancor than one would suppose to be altogether necessary in reply to a “column or more of special pleading and irrelevant nonsense,” of which he says that I, in my answer to him, have been guilty. But I was glad to see his latest communication, because, however little most that he says bears upon the question really at issue, and however consistently he has misrepresented me throughout, he still does say one thing on account of which his letter is worth answering. The points to be indicated in reply are easily summarized.

(1.) Cases of “Pocomas’s” misrepresentation of me. (a.) He says that I “gravely state” that I “consider the three letters at the end of the inscription, viz., S. P. D., to be a misprint for S. T. D.” “Pocomas” must pardon the brusqueness of my denial. But I did not. (b.) He says that I said I thought P. M. stands for M. P., Member of Parliament. Again my reply is, I did not.

(2.) I am sorry to see that “Pocomas” does not understand Latin, although he tries to correct me. For he asks where, in the dedication, provided the letters S. P. D. are for S. T. D., *Sacrosanctæ Theologicæ Doctor*, the verb is to be found. Why,

it is a commonplace that the verb is often omitted in a Latin sentence.

(3.) "Pocomas's" discussion of the meaning of the letters P. M., if he will pardon the reference, like the flowers that bloom in the spring, planted by Mr. Gilbert, is interesting, but has nothing to do with the case. Whether P. M. means 'Pannoniensis Medicus,' or 'Post Master,' or 'afternoon,' really makes no difference whatever in regard to the question as to which John Cotton is meant. This device of treating the irrelevant as the relevant is a form of the *argumentum ad hominem* which is very serviceable at times, but does not apply here.

(4.) But "Pocomas," as I said, does say one thing which makes his letter really worth answering. He interprets D.D. as *dignissimo domino*. This, no doubt, is very plausible. But then his sentence would be left without a verb; and this is a state of things which, as pointed out under 2, he cannot allow at all. Now, as Jeffrey said, "This will never do." From a laudable desire to prove his point, he says that D.D. means *dignissimo domino*, but forgets that a rule which he has previously laid down should prevent such an interpretation on his part. The real reason for his choice of this interpretation thus clearly appears. He must retreat either to the interpretation *dono dedit* or to *dedicavit*. Better information about verbs in Latin sentences would have left open to him, as it does to everybody, not only the last-cited interpretations, but the *dignissimo domino* besides. *Dominus*, however, as I showed in my letter to the *Advertiser*, was a title frequently given to clergymen. And thus, even if "Pocomas's" suggestion (which he himself has no right to accept) be accepted, it leaves the case about the same as before. And arguments which, by the way, "Pocomas" conveniently ignored, make it still stronger.

I should not have ventured before your readers thus to state my case had I not been so strangely misrepresented, and had I formerly taken the opportunity of replying to my critic through your columns. Readers of my first reply to "Pocomas" and his to me must feel, I fear, that he slashes and thrusts with his sword in a manner not altogether in harmony with the generally accepted rules of polite warfare. Nor are duels fought nowadays with one contestant behind the arras.

"Pocomas," it seems to me, "doth protest too much."—Very respectfully,

W. M. FULLERTON.

[We must close this controversy here, but not without expressing our amazement that the statements *a* and *b* are charged against "Pocomas" as "misrepresentations."—ED. NATION.]

#### MEANS AND ENDS.

##### TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In an analysis of our political systems and methods a prominent place would have to be given to the investigating committee. It is a carefully adjusted arrangement by which inquiry is kept at a certain distance behind the facts without any danger of overtaking them. Whenever any exceptional public scandal or manifestation of helplessness comes to light, Congress, or the State Legislature, or the City Council appoints a committee to investigate it. This is generally a partisan body, determined in advance to declare the persons or things investigated either absolutely innocent or inexcusably criminal. If it does investigate at all, it does so by a process so cumbrous and tedious that the public and all concerned become utterly indifferent to the result; and lastly, as it has no punitive power, it can only report its discoveries to the body which created

it, and which, being tender-hearted towards offenders (generally for sound reasons), or too little interested in administration to care about reforming it, may be said literally never to take any action in consequence. Hardly anybody, therefore, reads in his newspaper of the appointment of an investigating committee without a smile of contempt.

This cannot be said, however, of Senator Cockrell of Missouri, who, according to the statement of a reporter, proposes to pass the next three months in Washington in getting up information for the select committee of the Senate which is to meet on June 20, and to try and find out "whether it is the Administration or Congress that is responsible for the arrears of work and for the slowness with which the work of the Government is performed." I will venture to offer to the Senator a bit of prediction which it may be interesting to verify. He and the Committee will probably do a great deal of hard work and will gather together a mass of information which they will regard as of the highest practical value, and which will be embodied in a report to the Senate. It will be ordered to be printed, and that is the last word that any mortal on earth will ever hear of it, so that, in fact, the time and labor and expense of the Committee might just as well have been spared. If it is asked why this is so confidently predicted, I will simply refer to the Senate Document Room as a catacomb of similar reports upon every conceivable subject from the beginning of the Government, of which, if it is too much to say that not one was ever acted upon, yet the percentage is so small as hardly to affect the result.

The reason of existence of the Committee, as stated at length by the Senator, is the fact that Congress makes its appropriations and gives its orders without any reference to the condition or organization of the departments, or, in general, to the practicability of carrying them out; while, for precisely that reason, the departments are staggering in hopeless confusion. If Senator Cockrell really wishes to see a practical reform in this respect, there is one way in which he can promote it, and that is by bringing the departments and Congress into public contact; by letting investigation and reform proceed side by side; by letting the heads of departments publicly state, and members of Congress publicly inquire, what changes and modifications legislation and administration may respectively need; in short, by vigorously supporting the Senate report of February 4, 1881, in favor of allowing the Cabinet officers seats, without votes, in both houses, with the right of sharing in debate and the duty of answering questions.

I observe that your correspondent, "R. F.," is distressed in mind at the sectionalism of Congress, and proposes that fifteen members at large from either party should be elected to represent the whole country. May I invite him to the wholesome process of thinking out what his idea involves? In the first place, there is a special constitutional amendment—no slight undertaking, and therefore not to be entered upon without a clear idea of how it would work. Then the members at large must come from somewhere, and therefore be just as local in feeling as any other members; they would have no more power over and no more responsibility for administration than any other members; their presence would in no wise affect the secret-committee system, which is the real source of trouble. As a matter of experience, moreover, "R. F." will find, if he will take the trouble to inquire, that in several cases of city and, I am inclined to think, in some of State governments, this very expedient has been tried of having members at large as a remedy for sectionalism, and always with complete failure.

I venture to suggest to him that there is a much more simple and effective machinery ready at hand for the same end. The President, and, through him, the Cabinet, do represent the whole country. Being intrusted with, and therefore responsible for, the national administration, they have a much greater interest in the success of that than in favoring any locality. By giving to the Cabinet officers a public share in the discussion of legislation, order and system would be obtained, and business brought out of the committee-rooms into public view, and thus the power of the nation be brought to bear against local and private interest. May I not hope to enlist "R. F." among the rapidly multiplying recruits in support of this as a real and practical remedy for the evil which we both deplore? G. B.

Boston, March 26, 1887.

#### A WORKINGMAN'S THOUGHTS ON LABOR.

##### TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As a workingman I have been amused at the many theories put forward as the cause and the remedy for the present unsatisfactory social condition of the working classes. The most common remedy for the troubles of the workman is that he must rise above it, and thus not be a workman. But, as far as can be seen, there will always be a working class; so that this remedy will not do away with the troubles of a class, but only of the individual. What the workingman wants is steady employment, with reasonable freedom of thought and action, and such pay as will allow him to provide the necessities of life for himself and family, and do it without excessive toil. In common with most workingmen, I felt that there was something wrong in our present condition, and examined the different theories put forward for our betterment, but have rejected all of them as impracticable. I then looked around me, and thought that if all the energy that is devoted to the production of luxuries was directed to the production of bread and other necessities, these articles would be so cheap and common that not a single person would want for them. To cheapen the necessities of life, then, ought to be the aim of the working classes. How can we cheapen them? By taking the tax off of them.

Take that most necessary article, bread; it is indirectly taxed on the farm, on the railroad, and in the elevator, and through every machine and article necessary to its production. It is the same with the cotton shirt of the workingman. It is taxed through the cotton-mill, railroad, and store. Thus we see the wheat that is so cheap to the farmer of the West is dear enough to the cotton operative in the East, and the cotton cloth, so cheap to the operatives, is dear enough to the farmer of the West. In this manner taxes hinder the natural working of exchange, and throw many out of employment by hindering profitable production.

We ought to do away with the taxes on the machinery of production, and make the rule that when a man invests a dollar in production, such money cannot be taxed. It is not the owner of the cotton-mill that pays the tax, but the person that consumes the cotton cloth. Taxes could be raised by dues on consumption, with the heaviest taxes on the greatest and most harmful luxuries. It seems to me that, with such a system of government, a single worthy workingman would not want for the necessities while a single acre of land remained uncultivated or luxuries were indulged in by any class of the community.

Much has been done in the past by improving the intelligence and morals of the working class,



but it can be easily seen that a man with a family living on nine dollars a week must suffer even if he has the intelligence of a statesman, the economy of a miser, and the morals of a saint. A country can only support so many people; if a large part of its energy is directed to the support of bread-wasting luxuries, the lower classes of that people must suffer for the necessities. Then let us not tax capital, the tool of labor, or the necessities of life, while there is a single luxury on which the tax can be saddled.—Yours,

EAST BOSTON, MASS.

E. A.

## THE WEST VIRGINIA SENATOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In West Virginia, after the Legislature failed to elect a United States Senator, the Governor appointed Mr. Lucas. An extra session of the Legislature has been ordered, but the design seems to be to prevent an election of Senator. Is the Democratic Executive of that State conscious of the very grave difficulties in the way of admitting to his seat an appointee selected under such circumstances? Or will the Democratic majority take the chance of having their State represented by a single Senator? Without considering whether a *vacancy* presupposes an *incumbency*, the practice of the Senate has, it seems to me, absolutely determined that the power of the Governor to appoint does not arise if a Legislature qualified to elect fails or refuses to elect.

The question arises upon the proper construction of the third section of the first article of the Constitution, which is: "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislatures thereof for six years." Then, after providing for classification and expiration so as to elect one-third every second year, this section proceeds: "And if vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, during the recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies."

Whatever may have been the practice of the Senate upon this question before 1825, it has been uniformly held since the Lanman case that a failure by the Legislature to make a choice of a Senator does not constitute the contingency in which the Governor may appoint a Senator. In other words, the Senate, in 1825, upon full consideration, deliberately determined that it was not within the constitutional power of a Governor to fill a seat for a full term by appointment; or, as the late Senator David Davis put it, in April, 1879, upon the question of admitting Mr. Bell of New Hampshire, the true interpretation of this section of the Constitution is: When the Legislature has an opportunity of providing a Senator and fails, the Governor cannot appoint.

This construction has been accepted by public men of all parties, and had been the uniform rule down to the year 1879, when, by the admission of Mr. Charles H. Bell of New Hampshire, it is claimed by some that the rule in the Lanman case was changed. This contention is not well founded, as a careful examination of the Bell case will at once make clear. Upon the admission of Mr. Bell the Senate divided, and not upon party lines, Mr. Bayard and Mr. Jones voting with the majority, and Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Conkling, and the present President of the Senate, voting with the minority. There were, of course, two reports. The minority report, signed by Senators Hoar, Angus Cameron, and Ingalls, favored the admission and was finally adopted.

We presume that certain parts of this report,

taken along with the contention of Senator Carpenter and others who opposed Mr. Bell's admission—that the New Hampshire Legislature which declined to elect had the constitutional power to elect—furnish ground for the claim that the Senate's action in this case reversed the rule established in 1825.

The minority report does say: "A vacancy happens and only happens when the Legislature fails to make due election, or the person chosen declines the appointment, or where the office once filled is vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise." Further on, however, and in explanation of the foregoing, the minority says: "Whether it so happens that the person once chosen is unable to remain in office, or it so happens that the Legislature cannot meet and choose, the contingency of a vacancy in the office has occurred."

Here was the exact point upon which the admission of Mr. Bell turned. The majority of the Senate thought, with the minority of the Elections Committee, that the Legislature of New Hampshire, which had failed to elect, did not have the constitutional power to elect, and therefore they distinguished that case from the Lanman case.

Mr. Bell was appointed under these circumstances: Mr. Wadleigh's term as Senator from New Hampshire was to expire on the 3d of March, 1879. A Legislature chosen in 1878 was to have its first session in June, 1879. By reason of a change in the Constitution of New Hampshire, there was in that State a Legislature whose term of office began in June, 1878, to terminate in May, 1879, which Legislature was in recess when Mr. Wadleigh's term expired. The Legislature last chosen before the expiration of a Senatorial term must elect a successor—by United States statute regulating the manner of election. On the 13th of March, 1879, the Governor appointed Mr. Bell. The minority of the Committee claimed that the old Legislature could not, for the statute just referred to, elect, because the new body was the one last chosen, and that this one could not elect because it had no authority, as a Legislature, under the State Constitution, until June, 1879.

It readily appears, therefore, that this action of the Senate in admitting Mr. Bell could not, by any fair rule of construction, be regarded as reversing the rule in the Lanman case. In fact, from the argument of the Senators who favored the admission of Mr. Bell, it is plain that they recognized the rule in the Lanman case as valid, subsisting, and binding. Mr. Rollins, arguing for the minority report, said:

"As we understand the Lanman case, Mr. Bell's application here does not conflict with it at all. It may be summed up in a few words: In that case a Legislature competent to elect had met and failed to elect a Senator. In this case no Legislature met prior to this appointment that was competent to elect. The Senate of the United States has so decided." (*Globe*, April 7, 1879.)

Further on in the argument Mr. Garland referred to an old case—the Kensey Johns case from Delaware—where a vacancy occurred by resignation in September of one year, then in January following a Legislature met and adjourned without choosing a successor in March, and, after adjournment, the Governor appointed, but the appointee was denied admission by a vote of 20 to 7. Thereupon Senator Angus Cameron, one of the minority, interrupting the speaker, said that the minority agreed to the principle enunciated in the Kensey Johns case, explicitly admitting the doctrine that if the Legislature had an opportunity to elect and failed, the Governor had no constitutional power to appoint.

In fine, all through the discussion on the admission of Mr. Bell, it was conceded on all hands that the authority of the Lanman case

was decisive upon any case presenting a like state of facts.

W. H. EFFINGER.

PORTLAND, OREGON, March 21, 1887.

## "BLIZZARD."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The third part of the Philological Society's Dictionary, just received, devotes considerable space to the word *blizzard*, but omits all reference to an early, perhaps the earliest, meaning. "Along the Atlantic Coast, among the gunners who often hunt in parties stationed near together behind blinds, waiting for the flocks of migratory birds, the word *blizzard* means a general discharge of all the guns, nearly but not quite together—a rattling volley, differing from a broadside in not being quite simultaneous. This use of the word is familiar to every longshore man from Sandy Hook to Currituck, and goes back at least forty years, as my own memory attests. This is undoubtedly the sense in which Col. Crockett used the word in the passage which the editors of the New Dictionary find so puzzling: "A gentleman at dinner asked me for a toast, and, supposing he meant to have some fun at my expense, I concluded to go ahead and give him and his likes a blizzard."

The longshore men of forty years ago were all sailors, and many of them had served in the navy. That they may have learned the word there is rendered probable by the rather notable accuracy with which they always distinguished between a blizzard and a broadside. This points to a nautical origin of the word, though it made no progress in general use till it struck the Western imagination as a term for that convulsion of the elements for which "snow-storm," with whatever descriptive epithet, was no adequate name, and the keen ear of the newspaper reporter caught it and gave it currency as "reportorial" English.

Blizzards and broadsides have gone out of fashion in the navy, together with seventy-four-gun frigates, but there may be still an old salt among your readers who passed his early days in a three-decker, who may be able to give us more light on the early use of the word. J. T. M.

PHILADELPHIA, March 24, 1887.

[Our readers may be referred to the discussion of this subject, at the time the new sense of blizzard came into vogue (in the winter of 1880-81), in the *Nation*, vol. xxxii, pp. 184, 208, 220, 260. The weight of evidence was in favor of the explanation given above, and the most plausible etymology connected blizzard with *blaze* (away). Bartlett, in his 'Dictionary of Americanisms,' cited Crockett as above, and rendered blizzard by 'poser,' but he was evidently drawing on his inner consciousness.—ED. NATION.]

## ANGLO-SAXON PIRATING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just seen an English despatch about Mr. Ruskin's copyright profits, in which it is said that "America lives on its pirated editions." It is usual for Englishmen thus to express themselves on this subject. Does it not seem to you that it is time that the fact should be recognized in England that there is not an American author worth "pirating" whose works are not reprinted by English publishers, and that the books are not seldom altered in very disagreeable ways from the form given them by their writers?

Whatever you may think, it seems to me that Englishmen should be ashamed of making such disingenuous remarks about Americans.

ARTHUR GILMAN.

CAMBRIDGE, March 25, 1887.

## TRANSFORMATION OF SURNAMES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondents have given a number of amusing instances of the transformation of surnames; the last being the degradation of Papillon into Mr. Fly. Some of the most singular ones have occurred among our mixed and cosmopolitan population. A man's name often changes as he moves from the French quarter, below Canal Street, to the American quarter, above Canal Street.

Some years ago a German took up his abode in the French quarter whose name was Fritz Feuerstein. His Gallic neighbors could not frame their tongue to pronounce it aright, so they called him Monsieur Pierre-de-Feu, and this soon degenerated into simple Monsieur Pierre. Moving into the American side, he became Mr. Stone. Again he moved into the French quarter and sought to reestablish his old name of Feuerstein, and they reestablished the name of Pierre-de-Feu, which, on a residence among Americans, became Mr. Flint. Another residence among the creoles, in a new neighborhood, produced Monsieur Pierre-de-Fusil, and, going in advanced age to end his days above Canal Street among the Americans of English parentage, his name became Peter Gun.—Very respectfully,

B. R. FORMAN.

NEW ORLEANS, March 23, 1887.

## Notes.

A VERSATILE writer and scholar, Prof. Josiah Royce of Harvard, has written a novel of Californian life, called 'The Feud of Oakfield Creek,' to be published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. They also announce 'Daffodils,' poems by Mrs. A. D. T. Whitney; 'A Club of One: Passages from the Note-Book of a Man who might have been Sociable'; and 'His Star in the East, a Study in the Early Aryan Religions,' by the Rev. Leighton Parks.

Lee & Shepard will publish 'Natural Law in the Business World,' by Henry Wood; 'Bridge Disasters in America: Their Cause and the Remedy,' by Prof. George L. Vose, President of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers; 'Later Lyrics,' by Mrs. Julia Ward Howe; 'Buds for the Bridal Wreath,' by the Rev. Wm. P. Tilden; and 'The Hidden Way across the Threshold,' by Dr. J. C. Street.

'The Church and the Faith: A Philosophical History of the Catholic Church,' by the Rev. W. B. Bolmer, is in the press of E. & J. B. Young & Co.

'These Degenerate Days,' a poem already printed in the daily press by the Rev. M. J. Savage, in response to Mr. Lowell's "Credidimus Jovem Regnare" in the February *Atlantic*, will be made into a 16mo volume, and issued by Geo. H. Ellis.

D. C. Heath & Co. promise for May 1 'The Earth in Space: a Manual of Astronomical Geography,' by Edward P. Jackson.

'The Volunteer Soldier in America,' a posthumous work of the late Gen. Logan, is to be published by subscription by R. S. Peale & Co., Chicago. It will contain a biographical memoir.

Mr. H. Morse Stephen's 'History of the French Revolution,' lately reviewed by us on the appearance of the first volume, is well advanced. The second volume is in the press, and the third ready to be brought out.

It must suffice at present that we acknowledge receipt of Part 3 of the Philological Society's 'New English Dictionary' (Macmillan). For reasons already given, it offers unusual interest to students of the origin and development of the language, and a careful examination must precede our customary report upon the progress of

this enduring work. The closing word is Bozom.

Macmillan & Co. send us the twenty-fourth issue of their 'Statesman's Year-book,' for 1887. On page 668 one will find that the editor has taken cognizance of the recent change in the law of the Presidential succession. His list of "non-official publications" concerning this country would bear freshening. He has not kept pace with Von Holst's histories. McPherson's annual 'Hand-book of Politics' is ignored. Woodrow Wilson's 'Congressional Government' deserves mention, and so eminently does Schouler's 'History of the United States.' Among the official publications, Dr. Wharton's new 'Digest of the International Law of the United States' should hereafter be included.

Macmillan & Co. have published in their "Foreign School Classics" an edition of the first part of "Faust," edited by Jane Lee, lecturer in German literature, Newnham College, Cambridge. There is no satisfactory edition of "Faust" with English notes presenting the highest and most recent criticism, and this work has unusual merits, yet is open to one serious criticism. It is, in the main, a translation and skilful adaptation of Schröder's German edition of "Faust," without any proper recognition of the sources from which the notes have been derived. Many of the comments are exact translations from Schröder, containing not only his explanations, but his philological comments and numerous citations and comparisons from other German authors. It is true that Von Loeper and Düntzer are laid under contribution, and at the end of the notes there is a list of books which the author "has used in preparing this edition;" but such acknowledgment is inadequate. There are introductory chapters on Goethe's life, the "Faust" legend, and Goethe's "Faust," and an appendix containing an outline of the second part.

'Cassell's Complete Pocket Guide to Europe' bears a new imprint, but has been long and favorably known as one of the publications of J. R. Osgood & Co. Its handy form, large type, frequent maps (not folding), and flexible binding are its meritorious points. A table of climatic health resorts and a special travellers' telegraphic code are the chief original features of the contents. On p. 484 the word "Osgood's" has perhaps been overlooked. Under Vienna one would have expected mention of the Grand Hotel.

Barrow's 'Sermons on Evil-Speaking,' a third instalment of Pepys's Diary, and Shakspeare's "Tempest," are the latest continuations of Morley's "National Library" (Cassell).

The 'Shelley Primer,' by H. S. Salt (London: Reeves & Turner), aims to supply in a small space the facts most necessary to the study of the poet's works. It consists of a very slight biographical sketch, an abstract of Shelley's opinions, an account of the works severally and of the circumstances of their composition, and some other matter. It is not a conspicuous success. There are loose statements here and there in regard to facts, and the analysis of the poems and the opinions of Shelley are lacking in insight and comprehensiveness. It would certainly have been much better to have said nothing of his "influence in literature and thought" than to have said so little so aimlessly. The principal value of the Primer consists in its bringing together, in a way convenient for quick reference, the facts that belong to each work taken by itself.

Mr. Austin Dobson's 'At the Sign of the Lyre' appeared in America nearly a year before it was published in London, and so did Mr. Lang's 'Books and Bookmen,' just published in London by Longmans, Green & Co. Mr. Lang has followed Mr. Dobson's example in not reprinting in England all the pieces which appeared

in the American edition. The papers on "Book-Binding" and "Bookmen at Rome" give place to essays on "Lady Book-Lovers" and "Old French Title-Pages"—a delightful essay with rubricated facsimiles. In general, however, the printing of the English edition is inferior to that of the American (done by the Riverside Press).

A good idea of the nature and extent of the facilities offered for research at the Physiological Laboratory of the Harvard Medical School may be gained from the octavo volume ("for private circulation") of over 200 pages, with many illustrations, embracing twenty-two papers by eight individuals. Several are wholly or in part the direct product of the Professor of Physiology, Dr. H. P. Bowditch, whose admirable paper, "What is Nerve Force?" the vice-presidential address in the Biological Section of the American Association for Advancement of Science last summer, is included.

The Proceedings of the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association in Washington a year ago (February 23-26, 1886) have but just been published in Circular No. 2, 1886, of the Bureau of Education. The leading papers of interest were on mixed education of the races, with a special bearing against the Chinese; on negro education; and on the Blair Bill, to which the papers read were decidedly favorable—but happily without insuring its success.

More profitable, in our opinion, than anything in the foregoing document, is a paper read by President Dreher of Roanoke College, Va., before the Department of Higher Instruction of the National Educational Association at Topeka, Kan., on July 16, 1886—also only recently put in print. Its title was "Colleges North and Colleges South." The author, a Southern man, frankly considers the educational defects of his section, as shown by its multiplicity of "universities" and "colleges," out of all proportion to population and material resources; the confusion of courses and standards, as well as of names; the absurd degree-giving; the competition of institutions really of different grades; the frequent attempt to maintain a State university, with all the needful preparatory schools, following an occasional Northern example, etc., etc. Incidentally, President Dreher argues that the scheme of instruction of the University of Virginia—the school-and-lecture system—has furnished an unfortunate model to other institutions at the South. As this system has lately been under discussion in these columns, we may refer our readers to Prof. Garnett's exposition of it in the *Andover Review* for April, 1886—one of the papers called out by Prof. Palmer's advocacy of the Harvard elective system.

The March *Academy* (Syracuse, N. Y.) prints, with editorial comment, Prof. Poland's report in January to the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, on behalf of the still youthful "Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations." This body has been created experimentally to bring about uniformity of preparation and requirements for admission to college—uniformity, that is, "in the minimum requirement," as Mr. Bacon points out. Its functions are purely advisory, and not binding, and its achievements will be watched with curiosity and no little interest and hopefulness.

The October-December number of the *American Journal of Archaeology* closes the second volume. The opening paper, on some unpublished white *lekkythoi* from Attica, is accompanied by plates. Dr. Alfred Emerson follows with a first article on the "Portraiture of Alexander the Great," which does not reach the critical and comparative stage. Prof. Frothingham's "Notes on Christian Mosaics" relate this time to the portico of the Lateran Basilica. The other de-