

up with politics; he was deep in the study of philosophy, for he never really learned it till he had to give lectures on it. He went to Germany and tried to understand Hegel; he saw Jacobi and Schelling at Munich. On his return he gave lectures on their philosophy. His great eloquence, his fire, his inspired look (I saw him only in his old age, and he had still kept the look of a prophet), drew round him the ardent and intelligent youth of the Restoration. Cousin, though he was at heart a Conservative, made parade of Liberalism. He spoke on religious subjects in a manner which displeased the "Congregation"; he sometimes had words of admiration for the French Revolution. He was the most brilliant personification of the young University and of the Normal School; his lectures were stopped by the Government. Two years afterwards Guizot, whose professorship was history, was the victim of a similar measure. The Normal School was suppressed. Cousin was obliged to accept the humble post of preceptor of a son of the Duke of Montebello. For eight years he spent his leisure hours in preparing a complete edition of Descartes and a translation of Plato's works. These two works, with his historical studies on Madame de Chevreuse and Madame de Longueville, will be consulted long after the eclectic philosophy is forgotten.

In 1824 Cousin travelled with his pupil in Germany, and, through a strange mistake, he was arrested by the Prussian police, who took him for a Carbonaro and a conspirator. He remained six months in prison, and was only released by the influence of Hegel. Jules Simon relates that Cousin often spoke to him of his sufferings in prison, but added stoically: "One thing only reoccupied me—the translation of Plato was not finished." When Cousin returned to France, M. de Martignac allowed him to recommence his lectures. He reappeared before his public as a victim of absolutism and as a representative of free thought, but he triumphed modestly, and publicly expressed his gratitude to the King and to M. de Martignac.

The Revolution of 1830 did not fill him with joy. "He often," says Simon, "said to me that a change of Cabinet would have been enough, that the Revolution had given a fatal blow to the monarchical principle." He could not, however, be hostile to the new régime, and, as he had been a victim under the Bourbons, he was laden with honors—he was made Councillor of State, member of the Royal Council of Public Instruction, a member of the French Academy, a member of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences (an academy founded in 1832), a peer of France. In 1840 he became Minister of Public Instruction in the Cabinet of M. Thiers, which was of but short duration. "This little professor," says Jules Simon, "born in a garret, became a *grand seigneur* without any interval. He pleased the people in this new incarnation. He was one of the forms of the victory."

Cousin used to say that the professors of philosophy formed his regiment; and Jules Simon gives to one of the chapters of his book the title "The Regiment." He describes in it the great power, we might almost say the tyranny, which Cousin exercised during the Government of July over the French University. He was the leading spirit of the Royal Council of Public Instruction, of the Normal School, where all the professors of the higher schools received their instruction. Jules Simon knew him first at the Normal School, and describes him very vividly:

"We ought to have adored him, but he had something indescribable which repelled friendship; we were, I believe, a little afraid of him. As for our admiration, it was boundless. Sometimes, often, he seized an idea which chance brought to him, and then came an endless series of new and marvellous thoughts, comparisons, pictures, anecdotes.

Never shall we see again, in the conversation of a man, such an abundance of fine things. The lecture began at eight; it was to last an hour and a half; we were still there at one o'clock. Suddenly he took his hat and said: 'Let us go to the Luxembourg.' (I will say in parenthesis that I had to go without a dinner.) Once in the Luxembourg, he recommenced speaking, for me alone. I believe that he entirely forgot to whom he spoke—he spoke for himself. He was indefatigable. He left me when the day began to end, and dressed himself to go to some great dinner. I wandered in the streets till the supper hour of the Normal School, at eight in the evening, when I arrived dying with hunger, having eaten nothing but a piece of dry bread since seven in the morning."

The book is full of such anecdotes. Jules Simon clearly makes you understand that Cousin was very ignorant of other people's needs, and that the study of the *moi* and the *non moi* had not destroyed his egotism. He was very arbitrary and tyrannical, very intolerant. "If you emancipated yourself a moment, the claw showed itself at once." He was imperious, but he never forgot one of his pupils; he followed them from year to year, from school to school. He did not, perhaps, much like the soldiers of his regiment, for he was not tender; but he passionately loved talent and philosophy. "Cousin was not good nor tender, but he forced you to believe in yourself; he shook you, he made you work. He was a master, and what a master! I think now that we were not grateful enough; the little sides of his character concealed from us the great ones."

The Revolution of 1848 was a terrible blow to him: he lost all his places, and resigned even his professorship in the Faculty of Letters after the *Coup d'Etat* of 1851. He was not among the open enemies of Napoleon III.; he took no further part in political struggles, and entirely devoted himself to historical researches in the seventeenth century. His volumes on Mme. de Chevreuse and on Mme. de Longueville are excellent studies of the society of the time of Louis XIII. and Louis XIV. His articles on the Comte de Luynes are much inferior; he tried vainly to rehabilitate Luynes, who was a very ordinary personage. Cousin had become a bibliophile at the time when good books could be had for a trifle; he left his fine library to the Sorbonne, where it remains now under the care of his old friend, the translator of Aristotle—Barthélemy St.-Hilaire. He died at Cannes on January 13, 1867.

Correspondence.

JUDGE JAMESON'S ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of the 29th of September last, in a notice of the fourth edition of my work on 'Constitutional Conventions,' referring to my discussion of the weight to be given to the opinion of the judges of Rhode Island on a question submitted to them, in 1883, by the Senate of that State, as to the power of the Legislature to call a convention, you say: "The author sustains the doctrine of ex-Chief-Justice Bradley and other eminent lawyers of Rhode Island, as against the advisory opinion of the judges, . . . who denied the constitutionality of such a call." You then proceed to censure me as follows: "We do not observe, however, any citation of Judge Bradley's pamphlet on 'Methods of Amending Constitutions,' from which the author appears to have drawn valuable material."

My answer to this charge is, that the only indebtedness I am under to the pamphlet of Judge Bradley is for a reference to legal decisions, found, most of them, in an *addendum* to it prepared by Prof. J. B. Thayer of the Harvard Law School, and that in a note to Appendix E,

where I discussed the weight to be given to extrajudicial opinions of judges in such cases, I cited this *addendum* by its full title, as one of my authorities. For the few cases derived from the body of the pamphlet, as well as for the aid and comfort its author gave me in quoting and approving conclusions as to the methods of amending constitutions which I had announced in all the editions of my work, I deemed my reference to him by name, in the preface, as one of the numerous gentlemen to whom I was indebted for valued courtesies in supplying me with information and documents, a sufficient acknowledgment.

I may add, that Judge Bradley has not appeared to think me indebted to him for unacknowledged drafts of material from his pamphlet, since, months before the publication of my work, he asked for and received advanced sheets of that part of it relating to the Rhode Island case, for use in the discussion of the question soon to come on in the Legislature of that State. For these sheets I have received, through a gentleman associated with him in the discussion, the thanks of both, but no complaint that I had appropriated, without acknowledgment, valuable material from the Judge's pamphlet. JOHN A. JAMESON.

CHICAGO, October 11, 1887.

[Judge Bradley's pamphlet was issued more than two years before this last edition of Judge Jameson's book, and it was an important contribution to the subject with which it dealt. The *addendum* to which Judge Jameson refers was a part of it. In view of the considerable changes and additions made by Judge Jameson in this new edition, on the very points handled by Judge Bradley (he has added eighteen new pages), we must still think it inexcusable to have omitted any specific reference to the pamphlet. It is true that in the preface Judge "C. I. Bradley" [C. S.] is misnamed as one in a list of forty-seven persons to whom general thanks are rendered. We had not overlooked that; but it does not really affect the question. —ED. NATION.]

ANOTHER VIEW OF HIGGINS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You seem willing to print the actual facts in the case of the People against "Higgins." The writer is an "Independent Democrat" and a "Civil-Service Reformer," and hence no friend of Higgins; but the facts have never been fairly stated yet, so far as I have seen.

Some five or six years since it became necessary to elect new judges for the city of Baltimore. The Independent Democrats and Reformers concluded to put in the field a ticket of entirely new men, against the old judges, who were put in nomination by the regular Democratic party. After the issue was joined, Mr. Higgins approached the manager of the Reform movement and said that he had been a pretty bad fellow in politics, and made full confession of all his iniquities, and expressed a desire to work for the "new judge" ticket. His services were accepted, and he did work for and with the managers of the Reform movement. The Reform ticket was elected, and nothing was heard of Mr. Higgins until the Cleveland campaign, when he appeared in New York as one of the clerks of the National Democratic Committee, and did what he could to promote the election of Mr. Cleveland. Mr. Manning saw his value as a clerk during the campaign, and when he took office in Washington he gave Mr. Higgins a good clerkship. The appointment was probably made by request of Mr. Gorman.

Now it is submitted that the Reformers of Bal-

timore at least have no cause of complaint. They accepted his confession and repentance, and made him one of their number, and it surely is not fair to punish him now for sins which they only knew through his confession, and which they condoned when they made use of his services.

W. JOHNSTON PRESTON.

[We believe it to be true, beyond question, that in 1882 Senator Gorman and Higgins did quietly afford whatever assistance they could, without exposing themselves publicly, to the new-judge movement. But Mr. Gorman's object, as we understand it, was to break down Whyte's influence in Baltimore, since the latter was responsible for the nomination of the old-judge ticket; and the election of the new judges would, therefore, tend to destroy his influence. These tactics were completely successful. Higgins's assistance and advice concerned the prevention of fraud, and could be properly accepted. In no other sense have the Reformers of Baltimore made Mr. Higgins "one of their number." In the course of the campaign Higgins confessed the details of the burning of the ballots in 1875; and our information does not lead us to believe that his sins came to an end in that year or in ten years. But we cannot here go into particulars.—ED. NATION.]

ONE MODEL TOWN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The conditions which make up a model workingmen's town are manifold and complex as life itself. In view of your able and interesting comments on paternal experiments in town building, as in Mülhausen and Pullman, I would call attention to the town of Millville, where some of the elements of an ideal town have been evolved from the natural desire for self-betterment in the people, under conditions so far favorable that they were not hindered by idealists or capitalists, but were mercifully let alone.

Twenty-five years of building associations and fifteen years of enforced prohibition of saloons have produced a material prosperity which is of a different kind from the prescriptive goodness of the made-to-order towns. It is founded in the moral character of the men and women who have created it, and is correspondingly secure and permanent.

A generation of no saloons and easy home-building facilities has changed the character of the place from a town of factory tenements to one where over one-half of the working people live in their own homes. These homes are not crowded either within or without. They are comfortable cottages, with porticoes and gardens, costing from \$1,000 to \$5,000 each. Six building associations, now issue about \$100,000 annually for this purpose, and a large amount is spent from other sources. One hotel provides better accommodation for the travelling public now than four licensed taverns did with half the population in "license" days.

If Henry George wants to know how people value a freehold who have conquered a vice and built such a monument over its ashes, let him come down and try to disturb the "remains."

R. M. A.

MILLVILLE, N. J., November 15, 1887.

CHEER FOR PHILANTHROPISTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Over against Mr. Sedgwick's doleful tale (*Nation*, No. 1161) of the insensibility of poor people to improved tenement-houses in Boston

may be set a very different story told by Mrs. Backus in a paper on "The Need and Opportunity for College-Trained Women in Philanthropic Work," read before the New York Association of Collegiate Alumnae last spring and recently printed. She describes tenement-houses erected in Brooklyn in 1877 and which observe every written and unwritten law for the comfort, safety, and moral purity of their inmates, which are filled the year round, paying returns of more than 6 per cent. upon the original investment, and which contribute—though they house 1,100 souls—not one feather's weight to the city's annual burden of crime and pauperism.

There must be some cause for this different state of things; it can hardly be taken for granted that human nature is all right in Brooklyn and is in need of a radical change in Boston. Mr. Sedgwick says that he has been an attentive observer of the experiment in Boston, but he does not say that he has questioned some of the families who have lived in the houses, and who have afterwards moved out of them, as to the causes of their dissatisfaction. To a scientific observer this would seem to be the natural way of getting at the reason of the failure. But even if such families are fond of darkness and dirt and publicity, it is not a change of human nature into some hitherto undiscovered species that is called for in their case, any more than in the case of so-called decent people who are fond of the common run of comic operas. It is merely the raising of one rank of people into the rank which is just above them, and whose example is constantly before their eyes, that the lover of his kind hopes in either case to accomplish. H.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A few days ago a cutting from a recent issue of your paper was sent me, with a request that I would answer the article on tenement-houses which it contained. Without in the least wishing to throw discredit on the kindly and conscientious efforts of those gentlemen to whom the writer of the article refers, I should be very glad to present a different view of the subject of tenement-houses, and to show wherein my experience in the management of them has been of a more encouraging nature than that of Mr. Sedgwick's friends.

To do this it is necessary to recall the work which was attempted. Five years ago it seems that a block of wooden houses was built by two gentlemen, one of them a physician, for a class of tenants who are obliged to live in tenements, not being able to afford separate houses. Every effort was made to secure the comfort and privacy of the tenants, and the tenements were offered to them at a very slight increase in price over what they would have had to pay for such accommodations as an ordinary tenement-house affords. As a result, Mr. Sedgwick tells us that the tenements have never been appreciated and are not sought for, and he gives us to understand that after five years, in which the owners of the property have spent both time and money in vain, they have become convinced that people of this class like to live in dirt and publicity rather than in cleanliness and privacy.

Now may I present my side of the question, and tell my story also? Nearly nine years ago a friend agreed with me that we would hire a large and much neglected tenement house in Boston, and see for ourselves whether its condition could be improved. As a result we have found that tenants care very much to have rules enforced in regard to cleanliness and privacy; that they greatly prefer good management and careful supervision of the property to an easy-going or indifferent rule; that they are ready to help us to keep up the character of the house; and that they will put up with inferior accommodations

for the sake of living in a tenement-house where rules are made and enforced.

Here is an entirely different state of things from that represented by Mr. Sedgwick, yet his expression of opinion is an honest one, and is entitled to consideration. Why has the experience of my friend and myself been so entirely different from that of Mr. Sedgwick and his friends? It seems to me that the answer is a very simple one. We did the work ourselves. We made no plans how the poor ought to live; we provided no houses which we thought exactly what the poor needed (though such houses have been the later outcome of our work). We went among them to collect our rents, and to oversee our house, and trusted that in time we should learn in just what direction we could be of use to our tenants. Only by daily and often almost hourly intimacy with their lives, could we hope to find out how to help those lives to be less cramped and degraded by the pressure of outward circumstances; only by being constantly on the spot could we learn how to be good landlords. This required greater leisure than a busy physician could probably afford.

Looking back over the nine years, I can still remember how at first our well-meant efforts were regarded with suspicion, but I can also remember gratefully the way in which that suspicion was gradually overcome. I can recall the pleasant thrill it gave me when the tenants first began to take a pride in the house, not merely in the care of their own rooms, but in the general aspect of the building. It is a small matter to mention, but it was no small evidence of good feeling when one woman, out of her own means, provided curtains for the windows of the common hall. It may seem of small importance, but to me it is worth remembering, that after the first year or two the wreaths which we hung in the corridors at Christmas remained untouched until Easter, and that, too, in a house where there are always eighty people, more or less.

Of far more importance was the improvement in the cleanliness and *quietness* of the house. Instead of the noise of brawling and drunkenness which prevailed before we took the building, a sense of order and quiet began to make itself felt, and I can remember such expressions as these: "I'm sure this house is like a palace to what it was." "You could hear a pin fall here now!" Yet we had attempted no rigorous reforms—the change had come gradually. We had insisted, quietly but firmly, on observance of rules—on cleanliness, on sobriety, on privacy; and, in time, the tenants themselves had come to desire these things.

Perhaps the whole matter can best be summed up in one word—we had taken an *interest* in our tenants and in their lives. No one can know, who has not been among them, how much it means to these people to have a friend, as well as a landlord, with whom to deal.

On one point only do I agree with Mr. Sedgwick, and that is in acknowledging that tenants of this class "prefer the fellowship of the crowd more than the retirement of the home"; and can we wonder at this? Is it strange that people who have many of them never known books, never heard good music, never had any rest or refreshment after the hard routine of their daily lives, prefer the slight excitement or amusement which comes from contact with their fellows, from some slight share in the give-and-take of the great world, of which, during their working hours, they form only a mechanical part? It has always seemed to me most natural that tenants should prefer small front rooms on crowded thoroughfares rather than better quarters in a more secluded situation. Why, the street is their theatre, their stage, almost their world! And it is surely better for a man to see it from his win-

dows than to leave his family to go in search of it.

Such are some of my views in regard to tenants and their needs. If Mr. Sedgwick differs from me, I can only wish that it was in his power to hire a tenement-house for a year, and to see for himself whether there is not much truth in my side of the question as opposed to that of his friends.

In conclusion I should like to add that I have seen the same rules applied to twelve houses—some new, some old—and everywhere with equal success; and that this success I believe to be largely due to the keynote of *interest* which was struck in the beginning.—Very truly yours,

ALICE N. LINCOLN.

BOSTON, October 17, 1887.

CRUELTY TO WILD FLOWERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you permit me, through your columns, to speak a word in behalf of the wild flowers that are perishing from the face of the earth?

Many charming varieties once found in this neighborhood have vanished from their accustomed haunts, and the same sad story may be repeated everywhere. Like "les neiges d'antan," they have passed away for ever—fallen victims, perchance, to the greed of gain, which strips the ponds of the water-lilies so thoroughly that none are left for seed, and despoils the fields and brook-sides of their flowery treasure to sell in the streets of our great cities; or to the carelessness and folly of amateur botanists, or even of genuine flower-lovers, who dig up *all* the roots and pull *all* the flowers in the unlucky spots they visit.

The State of Connecticut, some time since, passed a law for the protection of the climbing fern; cannot there be some legislative action for the benefit of the yet fairer wild flowers? The wholesale destruction of birds for hat-trimmings has roused general indignation, and "Audubon societies" have been formed to save the feathered beauties from annihilation; why should not "Linnean societies" do as much for these children of the woods and meadows, and save them and us from the fate that is impending?

N. W.

NEW BEDFORD, October, 1887.

BORROWED CRITICISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your paper of October 6 you speak of a "singularly thorough criticism" of Jean François Millet which appeared in the *Atlantic* for October, and which you say is called out by the recent exhibition of his works in Paris. You do not seem to have noticed the remarkable similarity between the conclusions of the writer in the *Atlantic* and those of the French artist and critic, Eugène Fromentin. On page 205 of his book on the old masters of Belgium and Holland, called 'Les Maîtres d'Autrefois' (E. Plon et Cie., 1876), Fromentin has the following paragraph:

"An extremely original painter of our time, a man of lofty enough soul, of melancholy temperament, of good heart, a true countryman by nature, has said about the country and about country people, about the hardships, the cheerlessness, and the nobility of their labors, things which a Hollander would never have thought of saying. He has expressed them in language slightly crude, and by methods in which the thought is clearer and more vigorous than the execution. His turn of thought has been immensely applauded. In it has been found in French art something of the sensibility of a Burns, less apt in making himself understood. To sum up, has he or has he not painted and left beautiful pictures? His manner, his utterance—I mean that exterior form without which the creations of the mind have neither being nor existence—has it the qualities necessary to stamp him a great artist and to give him the certainty of living long? He is a

profound thinker measured with Paul Potter and Cuypp; he is a captivating dreamer compared with Terburg and Metz; he has certain qualities undeniably noble when we think of the vulgarities of Steen, of Ostade, or of Brouwer. As a man he can put them all to the blush; as a painter, can he equal them?" G. A.

SUPPRESSIO VERI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, who had already written the 'Life of James Buchanan,' has furnished to 'Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography' the sketch of that President. It occupies seven and a half double-column closely-printed pages, yet in it all Mr. Curtis never mentions or alludes to the most memorable and characteristic act of that statesman's career—the Ostend Manifesto. The Ostend Conference was the culmination of Buchanan's diplomacy, and gives the positive side of his life long policy, as his conduct in the closing months of the Presidency shows its negative side. Mr. Curtis glazes over the latter and totally omits the former. Is not this a serious literary offence? Are not the editors also to blame for allowing such omission of important fact?

J. P. LAMBERTON.

PHILADELPHIA, October 10, 1887.

"IS BEING BUILT," ETC., ONCE MORE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: After some delay, I am now enabled to write conclusively respecting two points touched on in a communication of mine published in No. 1143 of your paper.

Mr. T. L. Kingston Oliphant, in his 'New English,' ii. 58, alleges that he finds, early in the seventeenth century, the phrase, "*Italy is being held dangerous*." Having lately succeeded in referring to the book which he loosely quotes for it, I there read: "For Italy begins to grow out of request; it *is being held* dangerous to our nation both for health of body and soul" ('Court and Times of James the First' [1848], i. 138).

Now that idioms of the type of *is being built*, in substitution for the simple indicative present passive, are occasionally met with, "*is being held* dangerous" would not strike one, if coming from a careless writer of our own age. But the date of the letter quoted is 1611; and it occurred to me, at once, that the passage given above, if not the result of tampering, curiously, and next to incredibly, offered an instance of the misuse of a locution antedating the ascertained existence of its use.

Its punctuation included, the sentence in question has been adulterated, faithless editing not having been content with "grow out of request, *as being held dangerous*" (Sloane MS., Mus. Brit., 4.173, fol. 253). For this information I am indebted to my obliging friend Dr. Charles Gross, who tells me, in his letter received this day, that the writing of the MS. "is very distinct."

As regards another matter which I previously spoke of, the printed "was being seducyd"—professedly occurring in a MS. written about 1534—it turns out that "was" there reproduces a word unmistakably marked for erasure. Of this I have satisfied myself by personal inspection, which, however, was hardly necessary, after I had seen the Latin original: "His Ioannis vocibus . . . qui . . . vel pecuniâ ab honestate, fide, probitate deductus, quid deceret, non consideraverat," etc. The English of this, with my own punctuation, runs: "With these words of John Chenelet, who . . . ether els, [was] being seducyd, by many, from honestie, fayth, and good dealing, had not consyderyd," etc. ('Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History' [1844], p. 166.) In passing, the MS. is imperfectly indicated by its

editor, Sir Henry Ellis, as "MS. Reg. C. VIII. IX." This should be corrected to "MS. Reg. 18 C. VIII. IX."—Your obedient servant, F. H.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, September 30, 1887.

Notes.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS will add to their present list of Robert-Louis Stevenson's works his 'New Arabian Nights,' 'The Dynamiter,' and 'Familiar Studies of Men and Books.' They announce the following new publications: Mr. Stevenson's 'Essays,' including in the first volume the 'Virginibus Puerisque,' which has been for some time out of print; 'Sermons for Children,' by Dean Stanley; an 'American Girl's Handy Book,' by Misses Lina and Adelia B. Beard, with numerous illustrations of sports, games, and work; and 'Frau Wilhelmine,' a third volume of the 'Buchholz Family.'

Mr. Charles Carleton Coffin, the well-known writer for the young, has begun the preparation of a series of books giving a history of the late civil war. The first of these, entitled 'The Drum-Beat of the Nation,' will be published immediately by Harper & Brothers. They also announce 'Horse, Foot, and Dragoons,' by Mr. Rufus Fairchild Zogbaum, being sketches of army life in France, Germany, England, and the United States, profusely illustrated by the author; Miss Blanche Willis Howard's story, 'Tony the Maid'; Col. G. W. Williams's 'History of the Negro Troops in the War of the Rebellion'; and a book of fairy stories for children, called 'The Wonder Clock,' told and illustrated by Howard Pyle, with characteristic decorations by his sister, Miss Katharine Pyle.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. issue as a holiday volume Hawthorne's 'Tanglewood Tales,' with illustrations by G. Wharton Edwards; a 'Book of Folk Stories,' the old favorites for children recast by Horace E. Scudder; and 'Hymns of the Faith,' by Profs. Harris and Tucker of the Andover Theological Seminary.

Estes & Lauriat, Boston, have in preparation an expensive gift-book, Keats's 'Endymion,' profusely illustrated with photo-etchings and wood engravings after paintings by W. St. John Harper.

T. Y. Crowell & Co. have in press 'Burnham Breaker,' by Homer Greene; and 'Fairy Legends of the French Provinces,' translated by Mrs. M. Carey.

D. Lothrop Co. announce 'The Ignoramus,' by Mary Bradford Crowninshield, author of 'All Among the Lighthouses'; a 'Life of Robert Southey,' from new material by John Dennis; and 'The Old Farm Home,' by Abbie M. Gannett.

'A Cyclopædia of Diseases of Children and their Treatment, both Medical and Surgical,' edited by Dr. J. M. Keating, will be published by J. B. Lippincott Co., the first volume being expected to appear in the early autumn of next year. The work will be of a "thoroughly practical character."

'Grant in Peace: from Appomattox to Mt. McGregor,' by Adam Badeau, will be a subscription-book published at Hartford.

A year ago (*Nation*, No. 1093) we had occasion to praise Mr. D. H. Montgomery's little textbook, 'The Leading Facts of English History.' Ginn & Co. have now brought out a revised edition, in which the slight criticisms we bestowed upon its predecessor have all been heeded. The maps and tables have been multiplied, and the book still more deserves the attention of teachers.

It is a gratifying thing to see so careful an historical student and accomplished a writer as Mr. Arthur Gilman employ his powers in the pre-