

employers, and the strike, for the time, came to an end. When M. Simon finished this part of his book, he had not heard of its renewal; but, as we know, the soothing effect of his Majesty's words was but temporary.

While, however, the Emperor has shown himself intolerant of anything like Socialism when carried on among the people themselves, he has been the zealous promoter of the Socialistic system having its origin in the iron power of the State. The passage of the law assuring to invalid and aged workmen an income proportional to the salary they received in the practice of their trade, is an event of importance enough to mark the first year of any reign. Opposed to the end by the representatives of the class for whose benefit it is intended, it was finally adopted, as M. Simon says, "after long hesitations, and on the pressing desire of the Emperor."

To go backwards from the events last mentioned, we must not forget to chronicle the Emperor's conflict with the Liberal press of Berlin. The best known incident of this conflict was the publication of a portion of the Emperor Frederick's diary. All the circumstances concerning this episode are so familiar that it is unnecessary to repeat them here, and it need only be recalled that all the efforts of the Government to have some one punished for the publication came to naught, the courts steadily deciding in favor of the defendants. But the somewhat hostile criticism of the Liberal journals during the first part of his reign, and especially their free speculation upon his former relations to his father and his present ones to his mother, irritated the young sovereign in the extreme, and led to a protest on his part to the Berlin officials when they came to present him with a fountain on his return from his southern visits. He spoke out his indignation very clearly, but, the Liberal journals pretending to misunderstand him, he named them explicitly as the offending members of the press. When this did not silence them completely, a bill was prepared for presentation in the Reichstag the effect of which, if enacted, would be to restore the censorship in its worst form. This bill has not yet been urged upon the Legislature, and whether it has been abandoned, or is being held in reserve for another session, I do not know. M. Simon has made no mention of it whatever.

Two other policies—the building up of a navy and the fostering of a new colonial system—mark the first year of the new Emperor's reign. The first of these has long been a favorite project of his, and he has lost no opportunity of expressing his desire that Germany may become a first-class marine Power. The colonial policy is perhaps a natural outcome of the other; but M. Simon is undoubtedly correct in saying that it originates not so much with the Government as in the sentiment of the people, which is just now under the fascination of the colonial idea. In this matter the Emperor would prefer, as M. Simon puts it, to keep behind rather than to anticipate public opinion.

Apart from Russia and the two members of the Triple Alliance, the two countries whose relations with the German Empire offer the most interest are England and France. More than once since the advent of William II., the grounds for a possible disagreement between the Governments of London and Berlin have been made visible. The disputes in the two closely connected royal families, and the treatment of Sir Robert Morier by Bismarck, have furnished such grounds. Yet the relations of the two Powers have remained friendly, and a compact has been made binding them to joint

action in the war against the slave trade on the African coast. M. Simon with justice attributes the avoidance of any break in the relations to the habit of the British Foreign Office of keeping itself free of personal entanglements. In regard to the attitude assumed by the new Emperor to France, M. Simon believes it not to differ from that of his two predecessors. To quote from his book:

"For a long time," he says, "people have been saying that he [the Emperor] is badly disposed towards the French nation. It would, perhaps, be more exact to say that he feels mistrust—a feeling which he shares with his predecessors, and which finds its explanation in the relations created between France and Germany by the war of 1870 and the treaty of Frankfurt in 1871."

M. Simon goes on to say that the question of Alsace-Lorraine keeps open a big ditch between the two countries, but that, that question aside, "their diplomatic relations, since the advent of William II., have not lost the correct and courteous character which they had under the two preceding reigns." M. Simon is careful to remind his countrymen, as has been mentioned above, that the intentions attributed to the Emperor Frederick of returning the conquered provinces never had any existence in the mind of that ruler, and that therefore he is not to be preferred on that ground to his son and successor. Whether he is to be preferred on the ground of a greater liberality of mind and general policy, M. Simon has been careful throughout the present volume to express his doubts. M. Simon does not make the pretension, as he informs us, of writing history, in the strict acceptation of the word, of events so close at hand; moreover, he could not write historically of mere matters of speculation. If, then, he seems to strive, in a work not strictly historical, to lay stress upon the doubts he has conceived upon the degree of liberalism that would have marked the reign of a monarch who achieved something like popularity in the land of his enemies, for his supposed liberal tendencies, is there anything unfair in supposing that M. Simon has been actuated in this by a natural and patriotic desire to bring about a less hostile feeling on the part of his countrymen towards an emperor who is not, after all, so different from the one they admired?

In writing of contemporaneous events, there are advantages in living at a distance from the scene of your story, but there are also disadvantages. If M. Simon lived in Berlin, he would notice, unless I am much mistaken, from the mere tone of ordinary conversation, the public consciousness of the changed spirit in the national administration. From Frederick to William was a change from progressive ideas to mere reverence of tradition. So far as a stranger can observe, the Germans do not regret the change, but they recognize it. German society of all classes adapts itself with peculiar readiness to the opinions in vogue at court, and it is from this easy to determine when these opinions have undergone a change. A friend related to me the other day an instance which illustrates the point, and at the same time shows the direction of the last change, in a field apart from politics. A certain gentleman here made his preparations, during the lifetime of the Emperor Frederick, to start a review of literature and belles-lettres (a department in which German periodical journalism is singularly weak). On the Emperor's death, he gave up his intention, giving as his reason that, without the interest he had counted upon in the court, he did not believe that he could make the venture a success.

A little incident, now going the round of the newspapers, shows as well as anything how the

Government of William is careful, even in small things, to distinguish itself from that of Frederick. The last-mentioned Emperor changed the name of the palace at Potsdam where he was born from "Neues Palais" to "Friedrichskron," directing that it should always be known by the latter name. As soon as he was in his grave, the old name began to be revived, and it is now given out that the building is to be known again as the "Neues Palais," the order, of course, coming from the Emperor, as without his permission the change of name would be illegal.

M. Simon's summing up is highly favorable to the young Emperor, whose first year of sovereignty he has been reviewing. One year, as he admits, is a short period to judge by, and no final judgment can be passed until he has been seen in the face of trial, which he has not yet had to encounter. But what one can say at present is, that in this first year of office he has avoided the mistakes which many expected to see him commit, and justified the hopes that others felt of his capacity for government.

"This year of début," so M. Simon begins his concluding remarks, "truth compels us to recognize, has not corresponded to the fears to which at first it gave rise; it has rather confirmed the prophecies of those placed within the environment of the future heir to an imperial crown, who augured well of his qualities as a ruler. . . . These fears [that he might disturb the peace of Europe] have happily shown themselves up to the present time to have been without foundation, and nothing gives cause for apprehension that they may be near a realization."

This is true, and the influence the young Emperor has exerted for peace indicates a conquest of himself which is thus far his best title to renown. His reign, which in so many other respects seems likely to be a repetition of that of his grandfather, bids fair to resemble it too in the conscientious regard for duty; he will set, we may hope, and, I think, believe, his duty to Germany above any ambition he may feel to win his laurels on a field of battle.

J. K. P.

FROM NIFFER TO TELLO.—II.

DRESDEN, July 2, 1889.

BOTH Layard and Loftus, in their travels and explorations in Assyria and Babylonia, were possessed with the laudable desire of finding whatever could confirm the historical accuracy of Bible statements, and the latter, I think, was curiously biased by this desire in his observations about the Bene Rechab, or Sons of Rechab, to whom he devotes the better part of a chapter in his valuable and fascinating work on Chaldaea and Susiana. It will be remembered that there was among the Jews at the time of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar a nomadic tribe, the Rechabites, dwelling in tents and abstaining from the use of wine, by the command of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, their father, and that, in consequence of their adherence to this ancestral commandment, Jeremiah used them as the text of a sermon to the Jews, ending with the words (Jer. xxxv. 19): "Therefore thus saith Jehovah Sabaoth, the God of Israel: Jonadab ben-Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me for ever." Loftus at once reached the conclusion that the Bene Rechab whom he found along the Shatt-el-Hai were the Rechabites of the Bible. He speaks of them as a very numerous and independent tribe, allied with the great Montefik nation, but governed by an Amir holding a peculiar, almost sacred position. He also lays great stress on the markedly Jewish type of face which distinguishes them even among Semites, and which was the great argument for his identification. In answer to all

my questions I was assured that they were only one of the largest sub-tribes of the Montefik nation, and no one knew anything of the existence past or present of an Amir as their head.

It is so difficult to obtain information among the Arabs of conditions, events, or men of a past generation, that I should, nevertheless, be inclined to accept Loftus's statements regarding the status of the tribe in his day, and suppose a change of conditions since that time; but in regard to the matter of Jewish type I am afraid that he was the victim of mental bias. The Jews have always played an important part in Irak or Babylonia, and they even formed, shortly before the Mohammedan conquest, an independent kingdom in the marshes of that region. There would, therefore, be nothing surprising in the existence of a tribe or tribes with Jewish blood in their veins. But to me (and I found my opinion confirmed by at least one other unprejudiced observer) the Bene Rechab, together with all the Montefik whom I observed, are not only not Jewish in type, but, in marked contrast with the pure Semitic type of the Affek, they present a non-Semitic, or at the least mixed, type. Their faces were generally broader and rounder, the eyes neither so dark nor so liquid, and their noses of no particular shape, and as much or more inclined to turn up than down. In many cases one might suppose that Mongol blood ran in their veins. I may add that similar divergences of type seemed to me to prevail in the towns along the Euphrates. So the Arabs of 'Anah and Hillah present a pure Semitic type, those of the intervening towns, and especially of Hit (ancient Issos), a non-Semitic or mixed type. Similarly, the Armenians present at least two, and I think three, types, one of which is very pronounced in its Semitic character, so that it is frequently impossible to distinguish Armenians from Jews, although the former claim Aryan descent; while another broad, flat-nosed type might even be Tatar.

To return from this ethnological digression, leaving our horses at the camp of the Bene Rechab, and taking the chief with us as guard and guide, we descended the Shatt-el-Hai by boat the very night of our arrival, reaching M. de Sarzec's camp among the 'Atab Montefik at midnight. After our own rough settlement on the barren summit of the Niffer mounds, M. de Sarzec's little village on the shore of the Shatt seemed like a quiet summer retreat, the more especially as his wife, a ten-year-old son, and a French maid accompany him. Tello itself is three or four miles from the camp. Excavations were not in progress on the day of our visit, on account of M. de Sarzec's indisposition, and for the same reason he did not accompany us to the diggings. Outwardly considered, the mounds are very uninteresting, low, and so gradual in outline that it is difficult to determine their real extent. The excavations are neither large nor deep, and from all that I could learn I do not think that any part of the mounds has been thoroughly explored, so that much may still be expected from this site. The antiquities excavated here, as is well known, are the most valuable yet found in Babylonia, and M. de Sarzec has justly acquired his renown as a successful excavator. The determination of this site for excavations was the result not of its identification with a well-known ancient city, for even yet we scarcely know what city stood there, but of the finding by Arabs at this point of fragments of an inscribed statue, and up to the present moment excavations in Babylonia have resembled a game of chance, the ruins of the most famous cities yielding comparatively

little to the spade, while this unknown site has yielded treasures of the first importance for the history of civilization.

Our visit to M. de Sarzec was almost enlivened by an Arab war, resulting from the cutting of an irrigation canal, and the village nearest to M. de Sarzec's camp was actually marching to the fray when the gendarmes interfered and sent the combatants home. The peaceful and subdued condition of the tribes along the Shatt-el-Hai, due to a severe chastisement inflicted upon them by the soldiers a few years since, was well illustrated by this incident. Having witnessed a war in the morning, we had a specimen of Arab love-making in the afternoon, on our return voyage up the Shatt-el-Hai. Two Arabs towed our boat by means of a rope attached to the top of the mast. It proved to be an exciting if not perilous mode of locomotion. Sometimes they would stop to clap their hands and dance and sing, and then, when the boat had come to rest and the rope was slack, whether from a sense of neglected duty or of mischief, they would start off again at full speed, almost oversetting us. One of them was in love with a maiden named Chorla, a native of one of the villages which we passed. The sight of this village inspired him to dance and sing, clap his hands and stamp his feet with double diligence, chanting Chorla's praises and proclaiming his own devotion. Arab music is tolerant of almost any words, however unrhythmical, and the laws of composition appear to admit of indefinite repetition, so that while he sang a long time, the words were little more than variations of the one theme: "Chorla, how I love thee! I cannot live without thee!" and an emphatic statement of her worth. Shortly we met Chorla herself walking on the bank, but the coy maiden disappeared within her garments, demurely ignoring both us and her lover. The final act of such a courtship would be the agreement with the parents on the price to be paid for the bride's purchase, although a maiden occasionally elopes without waiting to be bought. Indeed, during our absence from Niffer the daughter of our guide, a maiden of fifteen, who had been offered me for a wife, created much scandal by a runaway match. A self-respecting maiden should prefer to be purchased, and for a high price, as the amount paid is some criterion of her value.

On our way the Bene Rechab chief told of a mound named Jokhah or Yokhah, which he declared to abound in antiquities. According to his account, walls are visible there, and fragments of stone statues and other objects of worked stone abound. As no stone exists in the country, remains of this sort are a favorable indication of the importance of a site. I expressed my desire to visit the site in question, to investigate the truth of this story, but the Bene Rechab refused me an escort, declaring that it was unsafe, being in the territory of the Ez-Zefib, the same tribe which had robbed the Bene Temim a few days before. The offer of double and even treble payment had no effect. I then proposed to go without escort, and offered to give a large backsheesh to any one who would accompany me alone on a swift horse to guide me; but this also was in vain, and I went to bed with an uncomfortable sense of failure. The next day, however, we found our opportunity. On our return journey, near the Mejdieh marshes, we came to a very large camp of Sa'adun Montefik, whose chief, Hamud-el-Bender, pressed us to spend the night with him. I accepted the invitation, on condition that he would give me a guide and an escort to visit Yokhah that afternoon. He did so, and we visited it without accident, al-

though on the return there was an alarm of Ez-Zefib, and most of our escort left us, brandishing their spears and riding in war curves, to chase the supposed enemy, whom I did not see, if they existed. Among these Beduin Montefik, by the way, I saw no firearms, while the Affek, on the contrary, all go armed with the very long-barrelled, old-fashioned Turkish guns of the last century, or somewhat more modern double-barrelled muzzle-loading fowling-pieces.

Yokhah proved to be an extensive mound, but low and partly covered with sand. It lies among the sand-hills, or at least did so at the time of my visit, and a high wind whirled the sand over us in such quantities that we could see but a short distance, and I was unable to make out the general shape of the mounds. There were no fragments of glass or glazed pottery on the surface. We found a couple of brick walls cropping out, the bricks of which looked ancient, but were uninscribed. There were also great quantities of stone fragments, some of them showing worked surfaces; and one larger piece we found, the worked faces of which had been intentionally destroyed, as though to efface something. I found also a number of small fragments of copper. My guides could give me no information about the place, nor of antiquities which had been found there. The surface indications seemed to me rather favorable, but it would be difficult to excavate here at present on account of the distance from water, and also on account of the unsettled state of the country. The same is true of the large mound of Umm-el-Akarib (pronounced Ajarib), a few miles to the south-east, so favorably mentioned by Dr. Ward in the report of the Wolfe expedition; and of El-Hammam, which is about the same distance to the southwest. The latter place is comparatively well known on account of its conspicuous tower of unburned brick, the remains of a *ziggurat*, or stage pyramid, connected with some great temple.

Several important cities of the very earliest period must be sought, it is supposed, in this region, and among others Nisin, a sort of sister city of Nipur, where we have been excavating. Hommel has suggested the identification of Nisin with El-Hammam, but such suggestions in the present condition of our knowledge are almost without value. Tentative excavations at several of these sites would probably settle the question of identity, by bringing to light some inscribed fragments containing the name of the city. Until such excavations can be made, there seems to be little chance of determining what cities lie under the *tels* of Yokhah, Umm-el-Akarib, and El-Hammam. I have already noticed the important fact that, after passing Bismya, the Shatt-en-Nil is said to lose itself in the sand hills by these three mounds.

We spent that night as the guests of Hamud-el-Bender, as we had promised, and were entertained with princely hospitality. He and his tribe belonged to the Sunnite or orthodox Mussulmans, while all the other Arabs whom I had met in Irak were Shiites, or adherents of the Persian schism. The latter are more fanatical, and cannot eat with Christian infidels, or even drink from the same jug from which they have drunk. The Sunnites have no such prejudices, and are perfectly willing to dip their hands in the same dish with Christians. Our host appeared to be a very rich and powerful chief. His camp had more tents than any I have ever seen, and his camels and sheep were beyond number. At the time of our visit wool-peddlers were there buying for Baghdad and Bassorah merchants. The price paid for each

sheep was said to be four piastres, or sixteen cents, ten sheep out of every hundred being given for nothing. I was also informed that the annual Government tax on each sheep was four piastres, on each camel ten piastres, or forty cents, and on the land, which is claimed as public domain, 50 per cent.

Our return route after leaving Hamud-el-Bender's hospitable tents was for the most part over ground already traversed. The only other mound of very large size which we saw was Tuweyhis, almost due east from Niffer, about in the place assigned on Kiepert's map to Serasoubli. This mound was said by our guide to be larger than Bismya; it should, therefore, be a mound of the first importance. I was unable, however, to check his statements by personal observation, as large canals full of water intervened, and I could not spare the extra day needed to visit it. We reached Niffer Friday, April 5, after an absence of six days.

JOHN P. PETERS.

Correspondence.

THE MARBLE FAUN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The mistake of your correspondent who writes in the *Nation* of July 11 and 18 concerning 'The Marble Faun,' to my thinking, lies in a misapprehension of the book as a whole, and is indicated whenever it is called a "novel." That is exactly what it is not: Hawthorne himself, on the title-page, calls it a Romance, and the distinction must be borne in mind; it was never intended as a delineation of actual life in any country, or at any time, and must not be judged from that point of view. The Italy of tradition and poetry, the Italy of those who have never visited it, is a land of dreams and memories, whose long past is ever present, and whose brief present is insignificant. There is abundant evidence that Hawthorne carried with him during his Italian travels this atmosphere of unreality. In the preface to the very book in question he says, "Italy was chiefly valuable to him [the author] as affording a sort of poetic or fairy precinct, where actualities would not be so terribly insisted upon as they are, and needs must be, in America"; and elsewhere in the same preface he says, "The author proposed to himself merely to write a fanciful story, evolving a thoughtful moral, and did not purpose attempting a portraiture of Italian manners and character." Again, he expresses surprise that so much of description should have crept into his story, and explains it by the strong hold of one's mind that artistic and imaginative Italy always takes.

But Hawthorne is too subjective to be held rigidly to local color: in his own way, and of objects that appealed to his peculiar sensibility, he was a keen observer; but of the actual, every-day life of the people around him, he knew less than most men. He does not belong to the modern school of story-writers, and must not be judged by their canons. Had Donatello been an Italian, the criticism that his characteristics are incompatible might be correct—to the Italian of Donatello's nature before his sin, a "New England conscience" is an impossibility; but the answer to all such criticism is, that he was not an Italian, and the mistake lies in seeking an actual prototype for a fanciful character. In the story he is spoken of as belonging to Italy in much the same way that the merchants in the 'Arabian Nights' are assigned to Bagdad: some local habitation is a

necessary part of the stage setting, and Italy does better than any other country.

Donatello is not a portrait of any one man, or any dozen men; he is an ideal creation, the embodiment of Hawthorne's speculations as to the purpose of evil. The philosophical motive of the book, in my estimation, is the development of the human mind through the arousing of conscience; it is the use of sin as an educational force. In Donatello the whole drama is portrayed; the other characters of the romance furnish the side-lights. Since the literary form chosen is that of a story, the philosophical ideas must be clothed in human attributes; but that the development of the philosophy may not be hindered by the demands of probability, Donatello is portrayed as just that slightly unreal, faun-like creature, who is human enough to be the hero of a story, and fanciful enough to be untrammelled by the laws of logical development. That he has also the possibility of the Puritanic horror of sin is simply a part of the premise of the argument, and not itself open to discussion. The question of probability Hawthorne has waived by slightly removing his hero from the race of men, by leaving his pointed ears a matter of doubt, by dwelling upon his communion with the birds and the innocent animal life around him; and by so doing he has purposely placed him beyond the reach of our tape-line, and the book of 'The Marble Faun' must be judged as a whole, not as a congregation of characters.

That fanciful blending of the actual and visible world with the unreal, personified images of the imagination is precisely Hawthorne's distinctive gift. To attempt to explain it to one who does not appreciate its charm without an explanation, is as futile as to undertake to elucidate a witticism. There is nothing that I know of in literature, outside the realm of fairy tales, with which to compare 'The Marble Faun'; and perhaps, after all, it is an exquisite kind of fairy-tale adapted to grown-up children, and clothing in fanciful forms the deepest philosophical speculations. Some one has said that Hawthorne never escaped from his inherited Puritanic consciousness of sin; he only succeeded in giving it literary expression; but in no other one of his books is it so vital a part of the work—nowhere else has he treated it so completely or so profoundly.

G. P. D.

CHICAGO, July 21, 1889.

THE DESCENT OF ANNE HATHAWAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: If the late Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps had regained comparative health, he had promised me to devote more time to the question of the descent of Anne Hathaway. When I began to correspond with him, he was positive that she did not belong to Shotton, and I agreed with him. Since that time I have wholly changed my opinion, and he modified his before he published the seventh edition of the 'Outlines.'

We have two clues to Anne's history, and, so far as I know, only two. The first is, the will of Richard Hathaway of Shotton, dated 1581, which mentions no daughter Anne, only a daughter Agnes. Mr. Phillipps tells us that the names Agnes and Anne were interchangeable. Why? Because, under the Norman pronunciation, the *g* was a silent letter, and we find the same person mentioned as Agnes, Annes, or Annis, and often in one instrument. The change from Annes to Anne was very easy, and very likely to be made if there were two of the same name in contiguity. In Richard's will mention is made of a daughter Agnes and a son Thomas, and he then leaves to Agnes

and Elizabeth Hathaway "a sheepe apeace of thema." "Daughters of Thomas Hathaway" he calls these, and this could not have been his son Thomas, not yet twenty years of age. Of his own children, only two were grown, namely, Agnes and Bartholomew. This Anne and Elizabeth, daughters of Thomas, seem to have been older, since no condition is attached to his bequest of a "sheepe apeace." May they not have been wards or children of a brother for whom the son was named?

Of this will Fulke Sandells was one of the executors and John Richardson one of the witnesses. The names of these two persons, resident at Shotton, soon appear as Shakespeare's bondsmen in the marriage bond executed November 28, 1582. What more natural, if Anne were really under the care of Richard Hathaway? Two seals were used upon this bond, but only one was lettered. Under the circumstances, may not the R. H. upon this seal be supposed to stand for the Richard Hathaway whose executor Fulke Sandells was at the moment? But why, when Fulke Sandells is named as Fulke Sandells of Shotton, is "Anne" called Anne Hathaway of Stratford? Is it not possible that, although in some way under the care of Richard Hathaway, she was and had been for some time in the employ of John Shakspeare at Henly Street?

There is still another clue to Anne Shakespeare in this will. Richard Hathaway desires that a debt of four pounds, six shillings and eight-pence be paid to his shepherd, Thomas Whittington. Ten years after, in April, 1601, this same shepherd of the Shotton farm died and left in his will to the poor people of Stratford forty shillings "that were in the hande of Anne Shaxspere, wife to Mr. William Shaxspere." So Anne at least had not then lost sight of Shotton.

Now for Lady Barnard's will. In January, 1570, she leaves handsome legacies to the daughters of her "kinsman Thomas Hathaway," a joiner, then living at Stratford. Of the five Hathaways mentioned, two are named Elisabeth and Joan. Joan was the name of Richard's wife at Shotton, and he had a daughter Elisabeth. A third is named Rose, and the Register of Burials at Stratford enters "Rose, daughter to Thomas Hathaway, buried November 1, 1582." Not too creditable a person, this Rose, to judge by other entries. Lady Barnard applies the word "kinsman" to the Hartts as well as to this Thomas Hathaway. The Hartts were the grandchildren of her grandfather's sister. Why may not Hathaway have been the grandson of her grandmother's brother, all of them being cousins to herself "twice removed"?

Mr. Phillipps thinks there was no connection between the Thomas mentioned in Richard's will and Richard's own family. He gives no reason, and it seems to me an arbitrary decision. No one of the above suggestions would have any value of itself, but, taken together, they seem to me to have weight.

CAROLINE HEALEY DALL.

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS., July 20, 1889.

THE EXCAVATIONS AT DELPHI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just seen the letter of Dr. Waldstein in reply to mine on the excavations at Delphi. I have no intention to enter into a controversy on the subject, but will simply say that I showed my letter in the *Nation* to M. Foucart and to the French Minister at Athens, M. Monthonlon, and they both declared it to be absolutely exact. It was, indeed, written on the information of the former gentleman, and