

plunder with the officials and go scot-free wherever they please. An incident illustrating their methods was told me on good authority. There is an old law, according to which a foreign vessel that enters the harbor of Cadiz without having undergone certain formalities of registering at a certain place, can be seized and fined to the amount of ten times the duty that would be levied on the goods. One day a German vessel entered the harbor without having complied with these regulations, through no fault of the captain's, but because the official could not be found. Although the vessel was not bound for Cadiz, but simply stopped there to wait for telegraphic orders before proceeding on its course, it was seized, and the captain was informed that he would have to pay a fine running into the hundred thousand. He appealed to the consul, who immediately went to Madrid, where he found that the officials, from lowest to highest, had already figured out what would be their share of the plunder; and if he had not been backed up by the embassy of his country, and assumed a threatening attitude, his mission would have been a failure.

From time immemorial it has been the custom in Spain for every one, beginning with kings and ecclesiastics, to plunder and cheat subordinates, who in turn could hardly avoid following their example; and thus the thing has gone on from one end of the chain to the other. My own experiences having been entirely of an unofficial nature, my impressions of the Spaniards are almost all of a favorable nature, except in the matter of bull-fights and occasional instances of stupendous ignorance—which the present methods of education are hardly likely to modify; for I am told that even in Cadiz, cultivated by constant contact with foreigners, boys of six and of sixteen years are put into the same classes, studying the same lessons. Yet the kernel of the Spanish people is sound and sweet. I have travelled a good deal, but nowhere have I found well-dressed people so willing to go several blocks out of their way to direct you to a certain street. They constantly do it, however much you may protest. At the popular festivals, again, the most perfect order prevails, and one never sees so much as an angry look. The peasants are extremely polite and good-natured. When I left Seville, a score of peasants waited until a dozen foreigners had bought their tickets, although they were at the window first. I do not think such a thing would happen anywhere else, nor do I believe that, in the same class, one could witness in any other country a little idyllic scene such as I saw one day in Seville. I was sitting in the Alameda, and on the opposite side of the bench sat a nurse with a lovely black-eyed boy of seven years. Presently three ragged boys, a year or two older, came along, one of whom held a rose in his hand. Seeing the boy in the nurse's lap, he approached him, put the rose in his hand, and rejoined his companions, smiling, before the nurse had time to say, "Gracias." Such abundant instances of amiability and innate love of beauty could not be found in a nation which is corrupted in its core.

HENRY T. FINCK.

Correspondence.

POLITICAL COURAGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: An editorial in *Puck* (a journal which has done the cause of reform yeoman service) justifying, while regretting, the President's

civil-service reform course, seems to me to mark a departure from the Independent standpoint too decided to remain unnoticed. That the President's course in this matter has been unfortunate, if we entirely ignore his relations to his party, and look only to his full patriotic duty—and to this alone he should have looked—I presume that every Independent would admit; but, placing the matter upon the far lower ground of party expediency, it seems to me equally unfortunate and indefensible. I hold that the history of Mr. Cleveland's Presidency demonstrates beyond question that political courage is not only good statesmanship, but good "politics," in the vulgar sense of that word; and it is so proved, no less by his unequivocal record on the silver, tariff, and pension questions than by his doubtful record on the question of civil-service reform.

(1.) Very shortly after his election, and, I think, before his inauguration, the country was surprised, the Democratic party was dumbfounded, by a letter on the silver question advocating fearlessly views opposed to those held by the large majority of the party leaders. If my memory serves me, Mr. Henry Watterson, in a double-leaded editorial, characterized the step as a dangerous and reckless proceeding, and as calculated to disrupt the party. What has been the outcome? The silver question is fast taking its place with the Southern question and the Greenback question as a dead issue; it has given in the Senate but one spasmodic kick since, and the Great West, the home of the silver "idea," joined clamorously in the cry for the President's renomination.

(2.) A little later, the President is confronted by a pension bill, reported by a Democratic Committee and passed by a large majority in a Democratic House. Without a thought of political expediency, with a certainty of running counter to a large-organized body of those directly interested, he vetoed the bill. Then followed the same kind of outcry he had heard before: he had imperilled his chances for renomination; he had imperilled his chances for reelection. Undaunted, he applied the same unsparing veto to numerous bills for public buildings, etc., every one of which angered some community where votes will be needed in November. What has been the outcome of this? After a few months, his party has caught up with him, and, in National Convention assembled, sustains his action unanimously.

(3.) A third time he had and seized the opportunity to demonstrate a leader's powers. I dare say that, had he submitted his memorable tariff message to a party caucus, and asked an opinion as to the advisability of sending it, a decided majority would have requested him to retain it—at least until after the election. Upon several occasions the Speaker of the House had lost the golden opportunity of proving his statesmanship by rising to the same great occasion. Not so the President. The message was sent; Democratic protectionists and Democratic reformers with a decided predilection for party success alike deplored his rashness; it was the old story—party disruption, a sure election needlessly endangered, a tyro's bravado. And now, finally, what has been the outcome of this? With a bare working majority—a majority far less than that held in either of the two preceding Congresses in which even all consideration of a tariff bill had been defeated—a tariff bill more pronounced in its nature than any yet offered, though still a moderate measure, passes with ease and certainty.

The explanation for this is to be found in the

fact that a great unorganized mass will quickly assume definite shape when once it becomes conscious of a purpose. Within large limits, it was the President's privilege and opportunity to develop his party's policy, and, except in one case, he has done his duty manfully. The great mass of his party, originally indifferent, have quickly recognized his leadership, and the so-called party leaders have had to follow. I firmly believe that the President's career shows conclusively that he has frittered away the opportunity to range his party at his back on the question of civil-service reform, as he has ranged it on other questions. I realize the difficulty of procuring competent and honest assistants; I realize that he has done the cause, as it is, substantial service; but I still believe that had his own practice been as emphatic and unmistakable as his utterance, had the early lapses been met with his native vigor, the reform sentiment would have spread with a rapidity exceeding all expectation.

When I say that his fragmentary reform is not only bad statesmanship, but bad "politics," I have in mind especially Indiana. I am told that the State is considered very doubtful. It is a serious thing, if true; and if true, it is due to two causes: first, the alienation of the Independent vote; second, dissatisfaction over the distribution of offices. In the very State where the most astute means were taken to make the result a foregone conclusion, the inevitable weakness of "politics" has been most thoroughly exposed.

Nevertheless, on a review of the entire field, with a full admission of the President's shortcomings and errors—and he has made other errors to which I have not alluded—I still cannot see how any Independent can hesitate as to his duty. The President's personality has been the most healthful influence our public life has felt for years. He has done a service which may be justly compared to that of the Supreme Bench in bringing back our minds to the fundamental principles of the Constitution. In homely rhetoric, but with irresistible clearness and force, he has opened to us paths that have long since been blocked and forgotten. The political atmosphere has been purified in a way that will make Blaine, paternal government, limitless extravagance, bloody shirt, absurd four years hence—if, indeed, the sudden change of base in the Senate on the tariff does not make them partly so already. And, whether the President be reelected or not, the long run will conclusively prove that, throughout his career, political expediency has uniformly coincided with the highest demands of public duty, and that his strength is due as fully to his fearless attitude on the tariff, the silver, and the pension questions, as his weakness is due to his vacillation on the question of civil-service reform. F.

LOUISVILLE, KY., August 14, 1888.

A MORAL CONTEST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the course of time political questions are decided by their moral weight. The foundation of national life is morality, and its vitality depends upon the strength of this foundation. Free institutions are of a higher value only for the reason that they allow a freer scope of development to all the nobler moral qualities of man. The greatest danger threatening such institutions springs from sins against the moral law. There is no amount of wealth in this world, there is no protection afforded by political powers, that could guard against ruin a nation whose life-blood was poisoned by corruption. The economic questions that at present

agitate our social and political life are not merely questions of dollars and cents. There is a moral side in them that makes them all-powerful enemies of existing wrongs; it is their moral weight that warrants victory to them and causes waste of life to those who venture futile struggles against them. It is through their moral side that they are intimately linked with the happiness of each individual, with everything that is most dear to us, with the welfare of this nation and all the grand possibilities of its future.

Expressions such as "A reduction of the tariff will ruin the people," really mean nothing. They are convenient bridges for those who cannot swim in the sea of argument. They are used by people who do not think, or else they would not dare to utter such a despicable opinion of the vitality of this nation. They are the greatest *testimonium paupertatis* for those who have the courage to utter them; they are an insult to the pride of the nation. A nation like the United States never will be ruined by the loss of a few dollars. The real issue of the present campaign is not a tariff reduction of either $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or 2 per cent., but it is the same issue to-day that it was yesterday and four years ago: it is the fight for or against corruption. Everything that relates to protection means corruption. The history of the tariff is a history of corruption; the system of taxation on which it is based is a system of corruption, beyond the control of the Government and the people; its result—the surplus—is a continual source of corruption; and its most conspicuous advocate is the very prototype of corruption. No industry, nay, no species of life whatever, can thrive under a protection that is a synonym of corruption.

The present campaign is not merely a contest for less taxation, it is a contest for the purity, the glory, and the liberties of the nation that shall not be thrown as a carrion to a few crows; it is a fight of law and justice against the anarchy of dishonesty; it is the fight of the patriot who would sacrifice everything, his life and his property, to the welfare of this country, against the friend of prostitution, who would sell for money the most precious possessions of humanity.

Who will be the victor? LOUIS KA.
BALTIMORE, August 13, 1888.

PARTY NAMES AND PARTY AIMS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation* of the 9th inst. contained two articles of special interest, which made me wish they could be read and laid to heart by every man who has brains enough to do his own thinking, or who dares to say his soul is his own. I allude to those entitled "Laodicean Politics" and "Campaign Lying."

Every man who has any just conception of his duties and responsibilities as a citizen must be often tempted to lift up his voice against the endless devices of demagogues for influencing the popular vote. But while his indignation is excited by the thought that great masses of people can be swayed by the mere utterance of plausible lies, which would be transparent if men would but take the trouble to think for themselves, yet the obvious fact that they will not do so, but will greedily swallow any garbage their party leaders deal out to them, but refuse to taste of the most wholesome food without their sanction, makes him despair of effecting any good result by addressing them as reasonable beings. He feels, too, that any attempt he may make to set them right by a simple statement of obvious truths, will be attributed to precisely the same spirit of one-sided

partisanship which he condemns in others, and he shrinks from the thought of thus demeaning himself.

The blind attachment to a mere party name, without investigation of the objects of its leaders, is productive of more real injury to the cause of just and wise government than any other source of evil. As long as a mere party name has weight in the popular mind, it will be made use of by knaves as a motive power for the accomplishment of their ends. A moment's thought should suffice to convince any one of the truth so ably set forth in the articles alluded to, that a "party" is only to be judged by its avowed policy. If its objects are changed, it is worse than folly to cling to the vehicle which new leaders are dragging to destruction, after working their way into the harness, like Munchausen's wolf, by devouring the horse. And yet there are tens of thousands of men clamoring to-day for measures which the original Republican leaders would abjure, but which those who have assumed their places are hoping to carry through by putting them forward as the policy of the Republican party.

A party is like a wave of the sea. Its power is as irresistible for evil as for good, but every individual drop of the human wave bears a weight of responsibility, born of the God-given power of judgment, which he is bound to exercise, instead of suffering himself to be blindly driven by the tempest of party spirit.

C.

MINNEAPOLIS, August 13, 1888.

MR. BLAINE "COACHING" THE VOTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Surely no more friendly wish was ever uttered in behalf of the workingmen of the United States than that of Mr. Blaine at the ovation given him in New York upon his return from England. "The campaign on which you are about to enter should be prefaced, if that were possible, by every voter in the United States seeing what I have seen," etc. Mr. Blaine saw one of the most beautiful of countries in the pleasantest of manners. What voter but could wish to pass by easy stages through the green lanes of England to the hills and lakes of Scotland? Then how merrily must the horn of the coachman have sounded as Mr. Blaine and his party wended their way through the Trosachs. The trip down the Caledonian canal, the Trosachs, and the Scottish lakes is, perhaps, the finest of its kind in the world. I would recommend it to the voter as being far finer than the trip up the Rhine. But it is probable that Mr. Blaine had in mind something else than the scenery of the country through which he lately coached with Mr. Carnegie, and that he referred to the industrial conditions of England. Mr. Blaine did not satisfy the curiosity of his hearers in this matter of what he saw, and so I beg leave to supply the want in the language of Thomas Erskine May:

"The fruits of free trade are to be seen in the marvellous development of British industry. England will ever hold in grateful remembrance the names of the foremost promoters of this new policy—of Huskisson, Poulett, Thomson, Hume, Villiers, and Labouchere—of Cobden and Bright—of Peel and Gladstone; but let her not forget that their fruitful statesmanship was quickened by the life of freedom."

That is what Mr. Blaine saw as the result of free trade. Had Mr. Blaine seen England before the advent of the policy of free trade, and while she was still shielded by walls of protection, this (I again prefer Sir Erskine's language) is the scene he would have pictured to his hearers:

"Our former commercial policy was founded

on monopolies and artificial protections and encouragements—maintained for the benefit of the few, at the expense of the many. Every produce and manufacture of England was protected, by high duties or prohibitions, against the competition of imported commodities of the like nature. Many exports were encouraged by bounties and drawbacks. Every one sought protection or encouragement for himself—utterly regardless of the welfare of others. The protected interests were favored by the State, while the whole community suffered from prices artificially raised and industry unnaturally disturbed. This selfish and illiberal policy found support in erroneous doctrines of political economy; but its foundation was narrow self-interest."

The policy here described is the one that Mr. Blaine is so anxious to champion. Certainly he is the best-fitted man in the country to set forth the merits of this defunct British policy. Is it a compliment to American workingmen to tell them that the one thing to save them from pauperism is to adopt the very policy that did make of English workingmen paupers? Even a sea voyage is not sufficient to make this policy healthy in America.

Mr. Blaine also said that the wages of the American workingman could not be reduced without his consent. And, pray, why not? If they cannot be reduced without his consent, how is it that the wages of American iron-workers are only about one-half as much in and around Pittsburgh as they are at Chicago? One of two things must follow from such a condition of things. Either the iron-workers of Pittsburgh are paupers or those of Chicago are aristocrats. A student of political economy would explain the difference of wages in Pittsburgh and Chicago by the natural law of supply and demand, but such a student would be reminded that the laws of nature find no place under a protective policy. There is something rotten in Denmark when such conditions arise under a protective tariff of 47 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. Blaine reminded his hearers not to forget the true issue of this campaign. This is what he said, but in saying it he sought to raise a cry and not to meet an issue. Mr. Cleveland has done the country one of his greatest political services by making a true, live issue for both parties, and Mr. Blaine will also render the country a service if, in his campaigning, he will meet that issue fairly and squarely.

In conclusion I will say that if every voter, even after the campaign is over, can go and see what Mr. Blaine saw before it, he will find it most refreshing and pleasing, and perhaps learn that a protective tariff is not a cure-all.

Y.

CHEAP CLOTHING AGAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Gen. Harrison's objection to cheap clothing (that it would reduce wages) seems to you hard of comprehension for the reason which you state in the *Nation* of August 9, in an editorial entitled "The New View of Cheapness." This reason, as I understand you, is that clothing has, been very much reduced in price during the last twenty-five years and wages not reduced in the same time. But certainly Gen. Harrison would not object to such a reduction of price, for it is due to improved methods of transacting business and to the invention of labor-saving machinery, and does not involve a cheaper man or woman under the clothing.

But the reduction of price which you desire to procure by a reduction of the tariff, and to which Gen. Harrison objects, must be obtained, it seems to me, either by going to a foreign country for clothing, in which case some one

here is thrown out of employment; or by paying a less price here, which means that some one here receives less. In the latter case I should like to ask you who is to receive less if not the laborer? Do not all advocates of free trade for this country desire to purchase various articles (except sugar) for less than they can be produced by American labor as at present rewarded, and therefore do they not wish to either reduce wages or expel industries?

A. H.

BOSTON, August 11, 1888.

[No, kind friend to American industry. It does not follow at all that we should go to foreign countries for clothing, or even for cloth. In order to get cheaper clothing, it is only necessary to get cheaper wool. In point of fact, we import the cloth pretty liberally now. We imported of woollen goods last year (exclusive of carpets) \$43,500,000 worth. We should like to see a larger proportion of these goods made at home, as manifestly they might be if the American manufacturer were not handicapped by duties averaging 36.08 per cent. on his raw material.—ED. NATION.]

WHO PAYS THE DUTIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me to call your attention to a paragraph on page 270 of Taswell-Langmead's 'English Constitutional History' (2d ed.), which may be recommended to those interested in the Mills bill. The passage is as follows:

"Four years later, in 1343 (17 Edward III.), the King, being much pressed for money, assembled, with the concurrence of the Lords, a council of merchants, and procured from them, without the assent of the Commons, a grant of forty shillings on every sack of wool that should be exported. It seems to have been contended that this duty did not fall upon the people, but upon the foreign purchaser; but the Commons, in their remonstrance, showed that they possessed some rudimentary knowledge of the principles of political economy, alleging that the tax actually fell on the seller, the foreign merchants refusing to give the accustomed price on account of the additional duty.

In 1363, however, upon the petition of the Commons, all grants of subsidies upon wool made by merchants without the consent of Parliament were declared void by statute."

Though this is about an export duty, it shows how many centuries ago it is that the refutation, in the minds of practical men, was made clear of that false argument that foreign merchants pay the taxes we may levy on foreign commerce. But in spite of this lesson to be learned from the Commoners of England in their fight against the unconstitutional action of their King, the same old fallacy is even now at times advanced in favor of those who wish to extend monopolies at the expense of our public.

Very respectfully,

OSGOOD SMITH.

AUGUST 15, 1888.

H. H. RICHARDSON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have read your article on the late H. H. Richardson with much pleasure, and can, perhaps, add a little to it. In regard to the rebellion which was raised in the École des Beaux-Arts on the appointment of Viollet-le-Duc as lecturer, Mr. Richardson has often told me the circumstance which you mention, that the protest of the students was written in his room; with the additional one, that, although he took no part in the composition of the protest, he

went with the other students who carried it to the Tuileries to lay it before the Emperor; and, while looking on at the demonstration, was arrested, with others, and taken to the police-station, where he remained till late at night, when Count Nieuwerkerke, then Minister of Fine Arts, made his appearance and ordered the release of the captives. Although he was for some time the only American in the School of Fine Arts, at least in the section of architecture, and was so completely a Frenchman in all his professional relations that, on leaving the School, he was offered a "marrying position" as one of the most promising of the young French architects, he never forgot his own country, and, during his seven years of student life, always declined to enter the *concours* for the medals and prizes which were open to him, preferring, as he said, to get as great a variety of work in design as possible, as a preparation for American practice, rather than spend six months on a single problem as a competitor for a prize.

As to his work in the School, it seems to be taken for granted by every one who has written about him that, after the first year or two in this country, he abandoned entirely what he had been taught, except, of course, the mental discipline that he had gained, and turned to a new style of design, which he had to evolve mainly out of his inner consciousness. There is a good deal of truth in this view, but it appears to me to be not entirely correct, and to do injustice to the influence of his patron, André, whose peculiarities of style, and even certain pet *motifs*, are frequently suggested in Richardson's work of all periods, although the rendering is very different from that which André would have employed, and the part which his old master had in his inspiration was probably unsuspected by Richardson himself. In fact, André's ideas were so congenial to Richardson's tastes that hardly any one else in Paris could have done so much to favor him. If there was any other man suited to be his teacher, it would have been Henri Labrousse, whose simplicity and originality were as dear to Richardson as the "bigness," the "stuff," the broad contrasts of light and shadow, and the largeness of detail which André impresses on all his best pupils. The cavernous triple portals, the all-embracing arches, the deep and richly decorated voussoirs, in everything, except the details, are André's as well as Richardson's, and belonged to certain Romanesque architects six or seven hundred years before their two modern disciples took pleasure in them.

It is, by the way, a little curious to recall the steps by which Richardson was attracted to the adoption of the Romanesque as a complete style. His first work in this country was classic, the Boston and Albany Railroad office at Springfield being as purely Italian Renaissance as possible. A little later came his commissions for the Medford church, and the two churches at Springfield, which were almost necessarily Gothic. About the same time he had some secular buildings to do, among them a market-house in New York. For this he made a design composed of huge round arches, which might have come direct from André, and the same fondness for the sweep and simplicity of the semicircular arch showed itself wherever he thought it admissible, even as a relieving arch. One day he said to me that he never could quite like pointed arches, even in a church. "They always had a pinched look," he thought, and his Brattle Square Church in Boston, for which he at first sometimes felt himself called upon to

apologize, showed the sincerity of his aversion to them, which ripened into a profound and loving study of the Romanesque, and the adoption of it, not only for churches, but secular buildings. The delicacy of his feeling for breadth and silhouette, as well as proportion and color, was surprising in a man so impetuous and enthusiastic. "Don't stick shelves around it," was the common observation by which he quelled our inclination to exuberance in string-courses, and a "tormented" look was that which he disliked most about a building.

I have heard it said that he was very catholic in his tastes, and interested himself in a great variety of subjects. If so, it must have been in his later years. When I knew him, he thought and talked and dreamed nothing but architecture—and his family. Nearly everything was converted in his mind into a possible architectural suggestion. He was once asked to make a design for the organ-case for the Brattle Square Church, and deputed me to study the construction of organs as a source of ideas. The most conspicuous peculiarity about the instrument appeared to me to be the swell-box, which I duly described to Mr. Richardson. "Something that opens and shuts to vary the quantity of sound," he mused. "Why would it not be a good idea," he continued, "to put a gigantic head on the front of the organ-case, with its mouth to open and shut to form the swell?" He was more than half in earnest, and I think was only dissuaded from incorporating some such idea with his design by the consideration of the effect it would produce upon the children in the congregation.

T. M. CLARK.

178 DEVONSHIRE STREET, BOSTON, August 18.

"SUPPOSITIOUS."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Old as is this word, and often as it has been used, it has not yet, I believe, found a place in any dictionary. Some notion of the frequency with which it occurs in literature may be formed from the ensuing quotations:

"The testimony produced is none of his: It is *suppositious* and a counterfeit." Bp. Richard Mountagu, *Invocation of Saints* (1624), p. 212.

"A *suppositious* fragment, taken out of the Constitutions of Clemens." Abp. John Williams (1636), *Holy Table* (1637), p. 168.

"Dionysius Areopagita, an Author, however, said to be *suppositious*," etc. William Sclater (1652), *Civil Magistracy by Divine Authority* (1653), p. 10.

"Their useless, *suppositious*, loose, and illegitimate Directory." Bp. John Gauden, *Considerations*, etc. (1661), p. 6.

"There is no great difficulty in discovering that these Letters were *suppositious*, and not written by Ung-can." Dr. Johnson, *Lobo's Voyage to Abyssinia*, etc. (1735), p. 243.

"If he had intention of adopting a *suppositious* child, he would have fixed upon a boy, rather than a girl." Goldsmith (1769), *History of Rome* (1786), Vol. I., p. 148.

"The vanity of the ancients . . . first led them to the invention of *suppositious* cases." John Lawrence (1797), in the *Monthly Magazine*, Vol. XLVI., p. 112 (1818).

"To come, however, to these *suppositious* epistles (which remind us of 'the genuine correspondence of the celebrated Dr. Solomon')," etc. *Quarterly Review*, Vol. XII., p. 74 (1818).

"A *suppositious* dialogue;" "*suppositious* proofs." Professor H. H. Wilson, *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus*, Vol. I., pp. 14, 65 (1827).

"They . . . almost always added to their improved editions some *suppositious* pieces which claimed to be written by the original author." "This *suppositious* chronicle forms a kind of philosophy of history," etc. William Taylor, of Norwich, *Historic Survey of German Poetry* (1830), Vol. II., pp. 119, 295. At p. 314 of the same volume, Taylor has *suppositious*.

The word in question is often also found in

the pages of less known authors whom it seems unnecessary to mention.

Supposititious we took from the Latin *supposititius* or *suppositicius*, comparable with which are *adscripticius*, *adventicius*, *collati-cius*, *collecticius*, *commenticius*, *conducticius*, etc., etc. Such an adjective is based on a supine; and its termination expresses manner of origin. It is singular, therefore, that scholars like Bp. Mountagu and Abp. Williams, for instance, should have elected, instead of *supposititious*, *suppositious*, which, answering to the factitious *suppositiosus*, from the stem *suppositio[n] + -osus*, should denote fullness or abundance of what is signified by *suppositio*. Actual adjectives similar to *suppositiosus* are seen in *ambitiosus*, *contentiosus*, *seditionus*, and *superstitiosus*. This pedagoguery must be pardoned. It is risked in preference to possible obscurity.

Except to import "fraudulently substituted," as, for example, when qualifying *child*, *supposititious* is hardly authorized by good usage. Mr. Dickens, in his 'Little Dorrit,' 'Great Expectations,' 'Our Mutual Friend,' and elsewhere, makes it equivalent to "supposed," but with dubious warrant, old or recent.

What may be called, for distinction, the Latinistic to *suppose*, akin, in sense, to *supposititious* and the ineligible *suppositious*, is defined by Dr. Johnson, "to put one thing, by fraud, in the place of another," but is left unexemplified; and his editors, Archdeacon Todd and Dr. Latham, go no further. It is not very unusual, however; nor are the related *supposite* and *supposition* unknown. Proofs here follow:

"Finding his wife Hyperia, that, in like manner, was delivered, but of a dead child, he *supposed* this in the stead." "Your nephew dyed at Sea, and . . . I *supposed* my sonne in his place, who was receiv'd for him; and ever since he has beene bred as if he had beene the true Tygranes." Anon., *Ariana* (1636), pp. 77, 203.

"No *supposed*, false, subintruded God or Gods." Bp. Richard Mountagu, (died. 1641), *Acts and Monuments*, etc. (1642), p. 11.

"The Philistines would not suffer the feet of men to tread upon that threshold upon which their but fictitious and *supposed* Deitie had fallen." Rev. William Jenkyn, *The Stil-De-stryer* (1645), p. 23.

"He was then in a place where they understood nothing better than *supposing* of false titles, and never remember any reasons but such as they know will please their Clients." Anon., *The Comical History of Francion* (1655), Books I.-III., p. 62.

"What he brings of the *supposite* and imaginary causes of Paul, Barnabas, and Peter, proves," etc. Rev. Dr. Robert Bailie (1653), *The Dissuasive . . . vindicated* (1655), p. 21.

"I beleieve I am not blameable for making this *supposition*" (of my sonne). Anon., *Ariana* (1636), p. 203. See the second quotation from this work, *supra*.

Quotations are added for several more words, equally new to lexicography, derived from *supponere*:

"Hence there can be no difficulty in the meaning of the word *Supposititious*, which is the Abstract of the *Suppositum*." Rev. John Serjeant, *Solid Philosophy* (1697), p. 99. Dr. South, too, has *supposititious*. *Suppositat*, which it presumes, I have not met with.

"Whether (in any art or science whatsoever) a bare Hypothesis, or sole *suppositiary* argument, may not be gratis, and, with the same facility and authority, be denied, as it is affirmed." Rev. John Gaule, *The Mag-astro-mancer, or the Magical Astrological Diviner posed and puzzled* (1652), p. 107.

"Witness, for instance sake, those queries, whither God be materia prima, and whither Christs divinitie might not *suppositate* a fly." Rev. John Doughty (1627), *A Discourse*, etc. (1628), p. 12.

"Passions, as Actions, are of Persons or *Suppositos*." Dr. Richard Burthogge (1674), *Causa Dei* (1675), p. 55.

Copious beyond the conception of all but

very diligent readers was the experimental vocabulary of bygone times. Superficial observers are wont to credit our own age with extraordinary addiction to the misusage of new terms. Yet, as can have escaped no one accustomed to incursions into the dark corners of old libraries, scientific technicalities apart, the seventeenth century was no whit behind the nineteenth in opulence of verbal innovation.—Your obedient servant,

F. H.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, July 28, 1888.

Notes.

A NEW edition, the fourth, of that excellent English handbook, 'Descriptive Astronomy,' will be published next year; and its author, Mr. George F. Chambers of Eastbourne, Sussex, recognizing that a book of such character must necessarily have many general defects, as well as contain a certain number of errors, notifies the astronomical world that he is prepared to welcome suggestions and corrigenda from any and every quarter.

G. P. Putnam's Sons will publish immediately the President's Message in large type, small quarto, with sixteen full-page moral and graphic illustrations from original designs by Thomas Nast. The "Questions of the Day" edition of the President's Message, with annotations by R. R. Bowker, which has been delayed for some important additional material, will be ready about the same time.

G. S. Fellows & Co., New York, announce 'Protection Echoes from the Capitol,' "containing 1,200 aphorisms and leading principles of the protective policy," by Thos. H. McKee; and 'Memory Systems, New and Old,' by A. E. Middleton.

J. B. Lippincott Co. have in press 'An Elementary Treatise on Human Anatomy,' by Prof. Joseph Leidy; 'Inebriety: its Causes, its Results, its Remedy,' by Franklin D. Clum, M.D.; 'Tenure and Toil; or, Rights and Wrongs of Property and Labor,' by John Gibbons; 'Embroidery and Lace,' from the French of Ernest Lefebvre; 'Jesus in Modern Life,' by Algernon S. Logan; 'The Writer's Handbook'; 'A Marriage of Shadows, and Other Poems,' by Margaret Veley; 'Sinfire and Douglas Duane,' by Julian Hawthorne; 'The Owl's Nest,' from the German of E. Marlitt; 'Memoirs of a Royalist,' by M. de Falloux; 'Life of Henry M. Stanley,' by the Rev. H. W. Little; and 'With the Camel Corps up the Nile,' by Count Gleichen.

'The Pillars of Society, and Other Plays,' by Henrik Ibsen, edited by Havelock Ellis, will be the September volume in the "Camelot Series"; 'Poems by Southey,' edited by Sidney R. Thompson, in the "Canterbury Poets"; a 'Life of Bunyan,' by Canon Venables, in the "Great Writers." Thomas Whittaker is the American publisher of these series.

In the making of pretty books England has been rapidly advancing of late, without, however, in any way threatening the preëminence of France. It is as a pretty book that we are inclined to receive Mr. Alfred Pollard's new edition of Sir Philip Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella' (London: David Stott). The type is well chosen and the page well shaped, albeit a thought too scant for the text; the paper is suitable; there is a frontispiece, and altogether the book reveals that its maker took thought and knew bookmaking to be an art. It is well made, also, in another sense, for the editor has done his work in scholarly fashion, supplying

an adequate introduction, many various readings, and ample notes.

Quite in place in the Messrs. Putnam's "Nugget Series" is La Motte Fouqué's 'Undine,' with 'Sintram' contained between the same covers—the first prettily illustrated. The little volume is convenient for the pocket, yet ornamental for the library shelf or table.

The end of Pepys's Diary; Essays and Tales by Addison; Johnson's Lives of Addison, Savage, and Swift; and Plutarch's Lives of Pyrrhus, Camillus, etc., form the most recent additions to "Casell's National Library."

Several years ago we reviewed Myers's 'Outlines of Ancient History,' commending the author especially for his success in making a readable book by "willingness to omit names and dates which are not essential." He has since published a 'Mediaeval and Modern History' marked by the same qualities; and the earlier work is now transferred to the publishers of the later (Boston: Ginn & Co.), and republished in a revised form. In this revision President Myers has associated himself with Prof. W. F. Allen of the University of Wisconsin, who has undertaken the Roman portion, to be issued next year. In the present edition, therefore, the history of Rome appears in its original shape, as a temporary arrangement; this portion being without the maps and illustrations, which are abundantly provided for the revised work. As compared with the original, this revised edition of the Oriental and Greek histories is somewhat enlarged, and, on the whole, improved. The maps, as in the modern history, are mostly taken (by permission) from Freeman's Atlas. The illustrations are well selected, and are genuinely illustrative—a rare thing in American school histories. On the whole, we know no brief account of ancient history so well suited as this to be read by intelligent persons (not young children) who wish to acquire an accurate outline of events and to seize the spirit of the past.

Mr. John S. White's 'Recent Examination Papers for Admission to Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Sheffield Scientific School,' etc. (Boston: Ginn & Co.), speaks for itself as a work of practical utility for teachers of preparatory schools. It ought, however, either to be provided with a table of contents, or to have the several institutions designated by the headlines of the pages.

Prof. D'Ooge's 'Colloquia Latina' (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.) is the result of his own experience in stimulating the interest of beginners in Latin by oral dialogue. The dialogues here devised (or partly borrowed from classic authors) have attractive subjects and a considerable variety, and are capable of being much extended by a skilful teacher. They are quite above the ordinary attempts in this direction, which are apt to be dreary enough.

Mr. W. J. Rolfe and his son, Mr. J. C. Rolfe, have edited with notes Macaulay's 'Lays of Ancient Rome' for parallel reading during the study of Latin (Harpers). A portrait of Macaulay is prefixed, and there are other illustrations, some of which, we venture to think, ought to be retired from general circulation in favor of more recent and authentic representations. The editors dispute Matthew Arnold's judgment of the Lays as poetry, and fortify themselves by reproducing two English and one American counter-judgments. However this may be decided, there can be no doubt that the Lays are good enough poetry for youth, and are capable of being made into an acceptable text-book. Their declamatory quality and easy memorizing insure them a long vogue among schoolboys.

The 'Lessons in English, adapted to the study