

aggrate the possible danger. On the other hand, they see no danger in an alliance with Germany, especially if poor "Fritz" (so really liked by Italians, who also are charmed with his wife for her interest in social questions) should live for some years; then, in case of a war, there is the chance of getting back the Tyrol and Trieste, the unredeemed provinces of Italy. In my humble opinion, Italy need not have entered into an offensive alliance with any nation. Her interests on the Mediterranean are identical with those of England, and there is no doubt that the unwritten Anglo-Italian alliance is really stronger at the present moment than any parchment bond between Bismarck and the Italian Minister. He will do well to remember that Italians are not Germans, and that, while they may worship a Cavour, they would not tolerate a Bismarck in duodecimo for a moment. But Crispi is still on his trial, and if ever a man had a fair field and all favor, it is he. Saffi applauded his Vatican policy, which is his strong point.

At the end of our long interview, the students asked him if there was any truth in the rumor that the University centenary was to be celebrated in a church, and inaugurated by a Te Deum? "Not if we are to have anything to do with it," answered Saffi. "It may be held in a church which is municipal property, if there be no other safe building large enough; but no religious color can be permitted." Then, on the students' saying they wished to invite Bovio (the celebrated Professor of Philosophy at the University of Naples and head of the Democrats in Parliament) to hold a Democratic conference, Saffi said: "That is good, and I will sign the invitation as I signed that to the King. Let us avoid any appearance of party spirit in this commemoration of our dear old University."

Long may cruel death, which has devastated the ranks of the "Old Guard," leave us this true heir of Mazzini's spirit, the true interpreter of his life and work.

J. W. M.

Correspondence.

JOURNALISTIC PURIFICATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The question of how to obtain the news in a form fit to be delivered at home, has troubled me not a little, as it has troubled thousands who have families with children growing up to the reading age. I can see no solution unless some of the technical journals—noticeably those devoted to architecture—furnish the model. Some of them publish two and one as many as three editions, differing in the number and costliness of illustrations, in the "supplement" form. Why cannot our dailies publish a regular edition which shall be such as decent people may read and have delivered at their homes without offence; then another edition with a supplement containing the "sporting events," lottery "ads," the illustrations, etc.?

A really enterprising journal would find opportunities for contracts to deliver the regular edition at the homes and the supplements at the down-town offices, at a profitable advance on the usual subscription rates. Able editors might vie with each other in getting up these supplements so that bound volumes of them would sell. The more costly edition might attract wide attention under some such name as the "Sport's Own" or the "Prize Ring" edition, or, perhaps, without entire inappropriateness, might adopt the names in use by some of

the architectural journals referred to, as, the "Imperial" or the "Royal" edition.

Yours, etc., A FOGY.

APRIL 8, 1888.

PENSIONING SUBSTITUTES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the discussion of the various pension bills, one feature has, I think, been overlooked, which allow me to present. Its consideration may perhaps serve to convince even those who honestly advocate indiscriminate pensioning, of the injustice of putting on the same plane those who went into the war from patriotic motives and those who went into it for gain.

In 1863 and 1864 I served for the Government as examining surgeon for drafted men and substitutes in one of the largest districts of the West, and thousands of that class came under my eye and personal observation. It was at a period when State, city, and county bounties were plentiful, when the bone and sinew of the country was already in the field, when the Government ordered drafts from among all able-bodied citizens up to the age of forty-five, and when it may be said that every man passed by the surgeon and recruited into the ranks was, paradoxical as it may seem, an involuntary volunteer—that is, he was either a man who was forced into the ranks because he was too poor to buy a substitute, or he was a substitute who sold himself into the army for big money. I kept a private record at the time of the percentage of these two classes, which is now lost, but I venture to say from recollection that not 10 per cent. of the accepted belonged to the former class, and that 90 per cent. were substitutes.

The scenes which presented themselves at the examining surgeons' offices at those times were sometimes ludicrous (because of the attempted simulations), sometimes pathetic, but in the main disgraceful and disgusting. Dealers in substitutes were on hand with their stock in trade ready for inspection. These dealers (brokers they called themselves) sprang up like mushrooms—a sharp, conscienceless, unscrupulous class, ready for cheat, bribe, or any kind of deceit to sell their man. They scoured the lowest dives of the cities and towns for material. They watched all the steamboat landings for contraband and plantation negroes, such as poured out into the North and West from the rear of our advancing armies. They rented large apartment houses whereto they took these men, boarded them, gave them clothing, got them drunk, and made them sign a printed blank agreeing, for the consideration therein mentioned, to serve as substitutes. The consideration generally was small; if the man was rejected, the dealer lost his advances; if accepted, his profit was immense. In these houses they held them as prisoners until they could sell them. The market price for substitutes changed with the supply and demand, varying from five hundred to two thousand dollars apiece, and the brokers all over the country had a regular system of exchange in this commodity.

The substitutes offered were nearly all either foreigners recently landed, bounty jumpers, or negroes recently freed. The scum and the dregs of Europe, attracted by the bounties, dumped themselves into this country for sale into the army. The devices resorted to for hiding physical defects that would cause rejection were sometimes ingenious. The lying, especially as to age, was tremendous. As fast as a substitute was rejected by one surgeon, he was taken or sent by the broker into another

district to a more facile officer, and there, in many instances to my own knowledge, accepted. The bribery and corruption in this traffic were scandalous.

As a rule, the white men presented (at least in my district) were unfit—though many were accepted—while the negroes generally had a splendid physique, except that, strange to say, the larger portion had a loathsome complaint, which, however, under instructions from the General Army Surgeon, if of a mild character, did not disqualify them from being accepted.

It would be interesting for a war statistician to ascertain from the enlistment records the number of men who entered the army as substitutes. It seems to me that the ardor, as to pensions, of the most patriotic G. A. R. man would cool down when it is proposed to put men who were sold into the service like cattle on a level with the honest, sturdy, noble volunteer who entered the ranks for his country's sake and not for the sake of money. I have no doubt that there are many still living who served as examining surgeons at the time of drafts, and whose experiences in this particular were similar to mine. Statements and discussions on that point might perhaps bring the facts here set forth so strongly before the public and Congress that, if not resulting in a halt to indiscriminate pensioning, it may lead to an adoption of the principle that the man who sold himself into service is not entitled to the same consideration as the man who entered it from patriotic motives.

J.

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS IN WOMEN'S COLLEGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation* for March 20 appears a communication upon entrance requirements in women's colleges. May I be permitted to call attention to one or two suggestions of the writer which seem to me to be misleading?

The statement is made that "admission on certificate was followed by an eleven-fold increase of students at Smith." That certainly strikes one as worthy of remark, but sequences are not always consequences. Smith College began its work with one class of twelve students. In the fourth year, when three more classes had been added, it is true that there were 133 students in the institution. To give the credit of this increase, however, to the system of admission by certificates is entirely gratuitous, and would imply very small appreciation of the rapid growth of interest in woman's education. Each succeeding class has been larger as the public has learned to appreciate the value of higher education for women, and as the preparatory schools have become accustomed to send students to these colleges. The matter of certificates has probably had very little influence upon the numbers attending Smith, and we are confident that students have not on this account been admitted with any less thorough preparation. The standard of the College was never before as high as it is now, and the President and Faculty were certainly never more ambitious to keep it at the highest possible point, and fully on a level with the best institutions of the land.

The writer of the article referred to goes on further to say:

"An examination of the forms of certificates discloses how cumbrous the system is, how many exceptions to the rule prevail, how easily the instructor may shirk responsibility for a student's failure after she has entered college, and how numerous are the opportunities for abuses to creep in. Stated generally, certificates are now accepted from 'approved'

schools and individuals. This approval has been based upon actual experience in educating pupils prepared at the school, or a visit by one or more of the College Faculty, the recommendation of a trustee of the College, or a self-appointed committee of alumnæ, or even a mutual friend. These visits, it is said, have sometimes proved purely social in their nature."

These statements and implications are of considerable variety, and lead the writer to the conclusion (whatever may be the conviction of the reader) that it is a "baneful" system, fit only to be met by protests. Without proposing to discuss the question, it is fair to enter a reminder that the best educators of the older institutions are far from being all of one opinion, and that the system is not by any means confined to colleges for women. I am, furthermore, confident that it need not, and should not, result in any lowering of the standard for admission. I may add, inasmuch as Smith College has been especially alluded to, that, as a matter of fact, very rarely, under present usage, is a school added to the list of those from which we will accept certificates until sample examination papers, with the actual answers of the pupil, have been sent to the examiners, and in all cases valid evidence must be given that the full requirements have been met. I may add, further, that by no means have examinations been given up, and that we have every year opportunity to compare students who enter by the different plans, and have not been able to discover that students are more apt to come inadequately prepared under the one method than the other. Those who have to be warned or conditioned for poor scholarship after entering, come in quite as large a proportion from those who are examined as from the others.

There are many possible objections to any scheme which can be devised. All must depend in the end upon the members of the Faculty who have the responsibility of admitting the new students. It is, apparently, an opinion prevalent in some minds that the plan of accepting certificates is adopted with the simple aim of gathering students at the expense of the scholarship of the college, and that any such purpose would be thwarted by substituting examinations. It is manifest, however, that under either plan the college can degrade itself, if it will. Conscientious care can, on the other hand, with either system, protect and sustain the highest standard of scholarship. The students of all institutions are sure to come into comparison, and we are willing to accept the verdict of results.

HENRY M. TYLER,
Chairman of Board of Examiners.

SMITH COLLEGE, NORTHAMPTON, April 9, 1888.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It seems to me that a good deal of the discussion in your columns on admission to colleges by certificate has not shown a good grasp of the real question at issue. When there are three possible ways of accomplishing an object, it is not sufficient, in order to recommend a certain course, to show that it is superior to one of the others; it must be shown to be superior to both of them. This looks like a very simple rule of logic, but it has been very much sinned against in your columns.

The question is, in the first instance, not a question that concerns women more than men, since such important colleges as Michigan University and Cornell have adopted the plan of certificates. Hence I shall make use of the common pronoun *he* in what I have to say.

There are three ways, all in actual use, by which students may be admitted to colleges: (1) by an examination at the college, (2) by local exami-

nation, (3) by certificate. The first method, which has been the only one until recent years, is open to two plain objections. If the candidate comes from a distance, a considerable expense is incurred for the journey, which is money thrown away in case he proves unsuccessful; and the fatigue of the journey, the strangeness of his surroundings, and an incipient homesickness make the student more or less incapable of doing himself full justice. These are real objections to the first method. They are completely obviated by both of the other methods, and yet one at least of your correspondents seems to think that it is only necessary to insist upon these two objections with sufficient force in order to prove the desirability of admission by certificate. The only allusion he makes to admission by local examinations is to say that it "seemed undesirable." But the only interest in the discussion lies in the full and complete statement of the grounds for choosing either plan (2) or plan (3) in preference to the other; everybody is agreed—Harvard, Yale, and Princeton included—that plan (1) needs to be supplemented by at least one of the other plans.

The arguments in favor of the system of local examinations rather than that of certificates are these:

(a.) They relieve the teacher of a serious responsibility which there is no reason for his being required to assume. The distinction which his school acquires from having well-prepared pupils is even more marked if they pass good examinations than if they merely enter college on his recommendation.

(b.) They relieve the student of the anxiety of not knowing for a whole half-year whether he will be allowed to continue with his class or not, and they save him from the mortification of being, in a sense, expelled on account of insufficient preparation. There is far more publicity and disgrace attached to being sent home than to simply failing, in the first place, to pass an examination.

(c.) They furnish, from the nature of the case, a far more satisfactory test of the real acquirements of the pupil than can be had from the opinion of any teacher, however honest and capable he may be. It is impossible that the teacher in every school, taken at hazard, should have as exact an idea of what constitutes a sufficient preparation for entering upon a given study as the head of the department in the college in which that study is to be pursued.

(d.) They are not liable to abuse, as the other plan plainly is in the hands of dishonest and incapable teachers.

(e.) The most important reason in their favor is that they furnish a far more effective means of raising the standard of the preparatory school than the plan of admission by certificate. To pass the examination is a test that can only be met by a thoroughly good school; the privilege of getting students in by certificate is always open to the charge, of favoritism. The local examinations might be taken by many members of the school besides those who are expecting to go to college, and they would thus furnish a general test for the school, and not simply for those students upon whom special pains have been expended. The Bryn Mawr circular expressly states that "the examination for matriculation will be open to those who wish to take it as a test of proficiency in elementary studies, but have no intention of entering the college."

Your correspondent, "M. A. W.," is of the opinion that the certificate system has been the cause of an improvement in the preparatory schools from the fact that the certificate system and the improvement have existed side by

side. This sort of argument is one which it is very hazardous to make use of. There is every reason to suppose that the schools would have improved in any case, as they became more familiar with the requirements which the colleges made of them. The most that can possibly be shown by the facts is, that the effect of the certificate system has not been so bad as to counterbalance whatever improvement would naturally have taken place in the schools in the same time. It remains to be shown that a much greater improvement would not have taken place if the system of local examinations had been chosen instead. This is, again, a simple matter of logic, which, however the discussion may turn out, it is a pity not to see attended to.

Local examinations are not difficult to have well conducted. They are already held by Vassar at nine regular centres—Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, St. Louis, Detroit, Louisville, Omaha, Denver, and San Francisco—and provision is readily made for special cases as they arise. The plan recommended by Mr. Beckwith of having a joint local examination-paper prepared which could be accepted by a large group of colleges (for both men and women) would seem to be an admirable one.

C. L. F.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The remarks of Mr. Beckwith in regard to the admission of students to college on certificate must have appealed to many teachers. If I can judge from my own experience, it is not agreeable to a teacher in a preparatory school to decide himself whether his pupil is fit to enter a particular college. Aside from the difficulty a teacher may find in keeping himself informed of the exact standard maintained at each college, many teachers feel that they are constantly liable to overrate the acquirements of their pupils. Furthermore, when a teacher comes to draw the line between those of his pupils who are prepared for college and those who, having studied an equal length of time, are, through lack of ability or of diligence, not yet fit to enter, he exposes himself to the suspicion of favoritism or prejudice. This is just what the Harvard examiners seek to avoid when they require the examination-papers to be signed with numbers instead of names, so that they do not know whose papers they are marking.

Mr. Beckwith's suggestion that a common entrance examination be given by a committee representing the New York and New England colleges seems worthy of attention. It would help to bring all the Eastern colleges up to the same level. As it is now, no one can tell how much a man's degree represents till he knows at what college he received it.

But even when the requirements for admission are nominally equal, we cannot tell whether two colleges are on the same footing unless we know how rigidly the requirements are enforced. The smaller colleges are constantly tempted to lower the standard of admission in order to let in more students. Some of the readers of the *Nation* may know what pressure is sometimes put upon instructors to pass men insufficiently prepared. This is done by the President or by trustees who want students, and do not realize the necessity of exacting a certain amount of technical attainments. Why do Americans always gauge the success of a college by the number of its students?

Let me say here a word about the results of admitting students inadequately trained to the Freshman Class. It must be remembered that a good teacher suits the pace to the average

ability of his class. If the class contains many poorly grounded members, he either has to go back and spend time in reviewing the elements, or, at any rate, he is forced to proceed with a slowness which needlessly keeps back the better prepared part of the class. These inequalities are particularly injurious where the class is too small to be divided into two sections.

As for the unfortunate youth himself who enters college with insufficient training, he goes through the first half of his course with, as it were, a millstone tied around his neck. In his case, how many of the professor's remarks fall on deaf ears, because he is not prepared to appreciate their force. I lost, I believe, half the benefit of the excellent instruction in Greek we received at the small college where I spent the first years of my student life. And why? It was because, although I had never been properly grounded in the elements of that language, I was yet suffered to enter college. It was no kindness to me, was it? Under such circumstances an ambitious student is likely to injure himself by overwork, while one of the ordinary sort becomes permanently discouraged, and goes through his tasks as a kind of drudgery in which he can never take any real interest.

C.

ANNANDALE, N. Y., April 15, 1888.

A QUESTION OF INDEBTEDNESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Seligman's answer in the *Nation*, No. 1187, to the notice of his book in No. 1185, only strengthens the impressions and conclusions of the reviewer. At the outset he admits his great obligations to Gross, and yet he devotes a later portion of his letter to a denial of this fact. "I should be sorry to under-rate my obligations in chapter i. to Dr. Gross," does not square with "It was only when the chapter had been substantially written that Dr. Gross's essay appeared." This self-same contradiction appears in Mr. Seligman's Preface, and hence the reviewer called the acknowledgments of indebtedness to Gross equivocal.

Mr. Seligman evades the issue when he denies that he blindly copied references, without consulting the works referred to; he was not accused of doing this. The real question is this: Did not Gross furnish Seligman with the clue to more of those references than the latter acknowledges? The few authorities which Mr. Seligman in his letter says are not mentioned by Gross, are, in part, actually to be found in the latter's treatise (*e. g.*, 'Historic Documents of Ireland,' Gross, p. 56); the others are, in great part, local histories substituted in Mr. Seligman's book for other, mainly superior, works cited by Gross on the same subjects. The contention of the reviewer was, that Mr. Seligman added no important references—none that advanced our knowledge of the subject by giving materials not presented by Gross. A sprinkling of new but unimportant references can be added to almost any treatise; but the former will not transform a compilation into a book of original research.

Mr. Seligman contends that the references common to the two books "are the common property of all scholars, and are mentioned almost without an exception in the works of Brady, Madox, Thompson, Stubbs, Merewether, and Stephens." The latter part of this statement we emphatically deny. In which of these authors did he find the references to the very important Southampton Gild Ordinances, the 'Historic Documents of Ireland,' Barrett's 'Bristol,' and the valuable passages relating to the gild in the 'Abbreviatio Placitorum,' 'Placita de quo Warranto,' Blomefield's 'Norfolk

(Lynn),' etc., etc.? Mr. Seligman talks as though he and Mr. Gross both exhausted the printed sources independently. But this is far from being the case. The striking sins of omission in both works are identical—another strong ground for our believing that the one was based mainly on the other. In the following printed books Mr. Seligman will find much very valuable "common property of all scholars" which both he and Mr. Gross failed to discover: 'Record of Caernarvon,' 158-198; Battely, 'Antiquitates Sancti Edmundi,' 159-160; 'Chartae, etc., Hiberniae,' *passim*; Gale, 'Inquiry into Corporate System of Ireland,' Appendix; 'History of Guildford,' *passim*; 'Rotuli Hundredorum,' i., 332-334, 461, etc.; Lascelles, 'Liber Munerum,' parti; Devon. Assoc. for Advancement of Science, etc., Trans., xi., 191-212; Wilts. Archaeol. and Nat. Hist. Soc., Magaz., iv, 160-174; and, above all, the reports of the Municipal Corporations' Commission of 1835. If Mr. Seligman will digest these references, he will be able to add some new sections to his book; and it may dawn upon his mind that in historical research the sources are like rich beds of ore—valueless until discovered and exploited. In original investigation on such a subject as the gilds, to bring together passages from widely scattered sources is half the battle; and he who does it ought to get full credit for his labors from his successors who write on the same subject and make use of his work.

Mr. Seligman's enumeration of the new arguments contained in his book is a confession of weakness. Sifted down it amounts to this: he actually differs with Gross on a single point—one which the latter advances, with much diffidence, as a conjecture. As for the relation between the gild merchant and the crafts (Seligman, pp. 58-60), that, we admit, is not given by Gross, who postponed his treatment of this subject for a future time. But the substance of it is to be found in Stubbs. Had the work of Mr. Seligman been one of exhaustive original research, he would have treated this topic in a fuller and abler manner. We reiterate that the kernel and substance of Gross's book is contained in that of Seligman, with only unimportant additions. This the latter practically admits in his letter and in the preface of his essay.

Mr. Seligman has this to learn, that if he prints an essay containing substantially the same materials and results (including many peculiar turns and ramifications of thought) as are contained in a work of original research printed four years before his own, he must be prepared to acknowledge his obligations to his predecessor fully and unequivocally. If he does not do this, he must expect either that reviewers will berate him, in most cases, more severely than did the critic in No. 1185 of the *Nation*, or that psychological societies will discuss the wondrous similarity of cerebral movement and cerebral sinuosities displayed by him and his predecessor. THE REVIEWER.

LONDON, April 6, 1888.

Notes.

WM. R. JENKINS will shortly publish the first part of Prof. M'Fadyen's 'Comparative Anatomy of the Domesticated Animals.' He has just issued Victor Hugo's 'Quatre-vingt-treize,' uniform with his handsome reprint of 'Les Misérables,' and announces his intention to continue the series till it includes all of Hugo's novels. To his 'Théâtre Contempo-

rain" he has added Erckmann-Chatrian's 'L'Ami Fritz.'

Mr. F. W. Taussig's 'Protection to Young Industries' and 'History of the Present Tariff,' enlarged with new matter, will be consolidated into one volume of present interest and value, 'The Tariff History of the United States (1789-1888),' and published by G. P. Putnam's Sons. The same firm announce further 'A Sketch of the Germanic Constitution' to 1806, by Samuel Epes Turner; and 'The Present Condition of Economic Science,' by Edward C. Lunt. Their issue of Franklin's Works, edited by Mr. John Bigelow, is now nearly completed, and will be followed by a uniform edition of the 'Correspondence and Diaries of Washington,' edited by Worthington C. Ford.

Paolo Mantegazza's 'Testa; a Book for Boys,' translated by Prof. L. D. Ventura, is in the press of D. C. Heath & Co.

The fourth volume of 'Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography' has made its appearance (Lodge-Pickens).

Ticknor & Co. send us a new edition, revised, of Laurence Hutton's 'Literary Landmarks of London.' The book, though reduced in quality of manufacture as in price, is still both presentable and readable. Its arrangement is by authors in alphabetical order. The supplementary notes show what havoc time is making with the monuments extant when the first edition was published.

Mr. T. W. Knox's 'Pocket-Guide to Europe' (Putnam's) renews itself with a list of cures, baths, and springs, having their several medicinal properties indicated; and with tabulated "Travel Talk" in four languages—English, French, German, and Italian. This is rather a vocabulary than a phrase-book. There are very few complete sentences, and the editor's imagination is very meagre. Ten nouns, one adverbial phrase ("on board"), and one interrogation ("Does the train stop at intermediate stations?"), form the complete linguistic outfit for "travelling by railroad and steamboat."

The success attendant upon their large-paper edition of Dean Stanley's 'Memorials of Westminster Abbey' last autumn, has encouraged Messrs. A. D. F. Randolph & Co. to bring out the work from the same plates in a popular duodecimo form, handsomely printed and bound in green cloth. The price now asked for the three volumes is as low as would be thought possible for such excellent make. The etched frontispieces have given way to process cuts, but in the case of the Poets' Corner this will hardly be accounted a loss.

'Alden's Manifold Cyclopædia of Knowledge and Language' (New York: John B. Alden) is avowedly an abstract in the main of Chambers and of Stormonth. It includes men of the time. The form is handy, and a single column is employed. The sparse illustrations have been borrowed from Chambers and from other sources. Vol. 1 extends from A to America.

Dr. C. W. Larison of Ringoes, N. J., whose independent phonetic labors we have frequently remarked upon, has just published 'Solomon's Song, with an Introducshun and Nots,' in a type which we cannot imitate here. He has cast the Song in a dramatic form, with stage directions, as, "The Brid stats," "The corus ov attendant virjinz appruvingli ecsclam," "The Brid relates a circumstans ov inattenshun to her Bridgrum," etc. The commentary is copious. Having made the above innovations, Dr. Larison might properly have gone further, and adopted the text and the poetic arrangement of the Revised Version, instead of following the old.

Miss Nina Moore has, with no little dexter-