

where Ampère made the first studies which he afterwards completed in a charming book, 'Promenades dans Rome.'

M. Turquan's volume ends with a detailed account of the last years of Madame Récamier. She became a widow some time before the Revolution of 1830. This revolution caused great commotion among her friends. Chateaubriand, though he had many reasons for discontent with the Government of the Bourbons, remained the chivalrous advocate of their cause. He resigned his seat in the House of Peers; the Abbaye-aux-Bois became his refuge. It was there that he read to a select circle the eloquent pages of his 'Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe.' Madame Récamier became to him a sort of Antigone. By degrees she grew almost blind. The celebrated beauty who had carried everything before her in her early days, led at the close the most melancholy life. She died on May 11, 1849, after a new Revolution. She was a victim of the cholera, which was then raging in Paris. It is said that on her deathbed her features, softened and glorified, recovered all the beauty of former days.

## Correspondence.

### NON TROVATO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the literary notes of your number of March 20, I have been surprised to see the following sentence: "The Oxford Dictionary has been followed in the remarkable omission of 'anti-slavery,' certainly one of the best-worked of the *anti* epithets of the nineteenth century."

If such an omission had been made from the Dictionary it would certainly have been remarkable; so remarkable that one wonders the writer could let the statement go without looking to see if it could possibly be true. The word would have been duly found on page 364, column 1, with the other well-worked *anti* epithets of the nineteenth century, *Anti-combination* (laws), *Anti-corn-law* (League) *Anti-rent* (agitators), *Anti-state-church* (Association), and *Anti-vaccination*, duly distinguished by black type from the general crowd of *anti* combinations. On account of the interest of *Anti-slavery*, special trouble was taken by me to trace the epithet to its source, and I succeeded in getting a quotation from the manuscript minute-book of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society of the 9th of April, 1823, which is probably the earliest written use of the word on this side the Atlantic. In addition to this, the Dictionary quotes of the same year the New York *Observer* of 17th of May, the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* of 1825, and a speech of Wendell Phillips of 1863; which, I think, sufficiently epitomize the history of the epithet.

In Great Britain, now, critics do not venture to write of the Dictionary's "remarkable omissions" when they overlook a word in it (which, on account of the vastness of the field, and the necessity for economizing space, is always possible); they modestly say they "have not found" it.

JAMES A. H. MURRAY.

OXFORD, April 11, 1902.

[Our dereliction arose from too good a memory and too imperfect examina-

tion, original and recent. On the first appearance (in the eighties!) of the portion of the Dictionary containing the word *anti-slavery*, we made at least a mental note of the absence of this word from its place in the main alphabetical sequence. At that time undoubtedly we lacked the caution the exercise of which is emphasized anew by Dr. Murray. In apologizing for this lese-Dictionary, we may properly allege the mitigating circumstance that it is not obvious at first glance on what principle like compounds are allotted now to the main alphabet, now to a subordinate place. The need of definition is not the controlling factor, as is plain, say, from *antisocial* being at the front while *anti-slavery* is perdu.—ED. NATION.]

### WHO WAS ISAAC WEAVER?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The pamphlet 'Experience the Test of Government . . . Philadelphia, printed by William Duane, 1807,' and included in Duane's "Select Pamphlets," 1814, has by some cataloguers been regarded as anonymous. A copy which has just come into my hands has, written on the back of the title-page, evidently in a contemporary hand, "Written by Isaac Weaver."

At my request the Library of Congress has made research into the matter, but finds no mention of Isaac Weaver, much less any support of this ascription. It is very desirable that, if possible, the authorship of this important tract be determined, and I hope some Pennsylvania antiquarian or bibliographer may be able to throw light on the question—at least, to discover who Isaac Weaver was. W. I. FLETCHER.

AMHERST COLLEGE LIBRARY, April 19, 1902.

### THE STUDENT GOWN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Can some bright student of sociology explain the sudden fondness of American students for what is euphemistically termed "academic costume"? One can understand the argument that some sort of uniform is desirable in order to add to the solemnity and dignity of Commencement day. But how any young fellow with a trace of humor in his composition can, of his own choice, appear at other times in a flowing black gown and a mortar-board, is not so evident. Many college students are of very humble social position, and are compelled to do the lowest sort of manual labor in order to meet their expenses. Yet in a number of Eastern colleges the seniors array themselves for the spring term in all the majesty that this garb can give. In the course of a few weeks these seniors will go, one to his farm, one to his merchandise, and sink into the mediocrity that is the lot of the majority; but, for one glorious spring term, they have been marked off from the vulgar herd. Wherever they have gone they have been gazed upon with awe as living college seniors. Does this represent the real state of mind of the gownsmen, or must we look farther?

At Oxford and Cambridge the students have, of course, retained the distinctive dress worn in the Middle Ages, when every

one was attired according to his station. American colleges were at first modelled somewhat on the English pattern, but in the course of the last two decades they have gone as far from their English models as possible. Is the gown intended to remind us of historic relations that would otherwise rapidly be forgotten? Our German cousins are rather absurdly fond of uniforms; but German students, though many of them wear modest flat colored caps, seldom venture to don a peculiar university garb except for processions.

What, then, is the genesis of this fashion? Has it come to stay, or is it a passing fad? Some one who knows will, perhaps, be good enough to tell. OXFORD.

April 14, 1902.

### "ACADEMIC STUDIES AND DEGREES."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the thoughtful and temperate article on "Academic Studies and Degrees," which appeared in the *Nation* of April 10, there are certain assumptions which may well be questioned. One of these assumptions is, that the student of science is a specialist, while the student of the classics is not. Another is, that scientific studies are directly utilitarian to the student, while classical studies are not. A third assumption, which (to be sure) may be regarded as a direct consequence of those just given rather than a new proposition, is that classical studies give "the flexibility of mind which we call culture," while scientific studies do not. The writer appears, moreover, to exclude modern languages from the category of culture-giving studies.

"The studies that lead to knowledge of man, with the flexibility of mind which we call culture," is a passage to be pondered over when it is applied to the old-fashioned classical college curriculum. Is it true that Latin, and Greek, and mathematics, the main constituents of the traditional A.B. course, gave a peculiarly wide or true knowledge of man? Is it true that from their very nature or from the way in which they were taught, they gave especial flexibility of mind, a quality of culture, not to be attained by means of other studies? Occupied with such reflections, I yesterday chanced to enter the study of an acquaintance whose name would be recognized by many readers of the *Nation* as that of a man of culture. Finding myself alone there I did, what I usually do under such circumstances—that is, I looked somewhat curiously at the pictures on the walls. I found there, among others of less notable persons, portraits of Darwin, Carlyle, Emerson, Lincoln, Newman, and, I think, Chaucer. Now, it seemed to me that there was an indication, almost a proof, of liberal culture, of varied interests and sympathies, of the power to meet a great variety of educated men on common grounds, in the selection of such a list of portraits. Yet how very modern the list was, as a whole. The owner was, no doubt, more or less proficient in Greek and Latin twenty or more years ago; but I feel sure that most of the ideas, not purely literary, with which he occupies himself are ideas for which he need not go to the classics—ideas with which he would not find the classics especially helpful. And is this not true of most liberally educated men at the present time? Has not

this age, like every other age of real intellectual activity, brought forth its own intellectual products, and is not cultivation nowadays mainly concerned with these products?

And even if, in the group of portraits which I have described, one were to replace Carlyle by Pasteur, and Chaucer by Helmholtz or Clerk Maxwell, could these changes fairly be taken as indicating commonplace and utilitarian interests? Is not the true criterion of culture the ability to hold mutually agreeable and profitable mental intercourse with many sorts and conditions of men? Is it not to be sought in familiar acquaintance with many subjects of general interest, rather than in the profound knowledge of any one thing, even if that one thing be Greek? Is it not true that a student who should, at the present time, confine himself in college to such studies as his grandfather took while there, would appear uncultivated in general intellectual intercourse with most educated men of to-day? The writer of the article under discussion admits that such a student would find himself one of a very small company.

Is the writer sure that the feeling of having preserved the old tradition of "aristocratic" or "clerkly" learning, at the sacrifice of intellectual companionship with the great mass of college-trained men, would make this student anything better than a prig? Will not this writer admit that a great deal of the old spirit of "disinterested and 'clerkly' study" has gone over from the classics to physics and chemistry and biology? He has spoken of the Johns Hopkins. Did he know Rowland? Was any classicist ever more magnificently disregardful of mere utilities than he? Let us remember that the discovery of the Roentgen rays was led up to and made possible by decades of patient study in a field of physics that seemed absolutely barren of all promise of utility.

I agree, however, with what I understand to be the opinion of the writer, that some studies of a too technical character are sometimes thrown open to candidates for the A.B. degree. The danger that this will happen is perhaps especially great where a college and a technical school exist side by side. The curriculum of a scientific school which undertakes to give a professional education is almost always sadly overcrowded; things for which some use cannot be plainly foreseen must be left out of it. The result is an atmosphere of hurry and strain, a spirit of desperate economy like that which forces an Arctic explorer to leave his watch behind in making his race for life. This spirit is the very opposite of "liberal," and no amount of work done "under such conditions can give a liberal education.

Very truly yours, EDWIN H. HALL.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 14, 1902.

[We had no intention of excluding the modern languages, or indeed any of the historical sciences, from the category of "humanistic" studies; still less of asserting the inferiority *per se* of scientific studies. What we wished to emphasize is the cleft between these two kinds of training. Let Mr. Hall take extreme instances—a young man trained in clas-

sical and modern literatures, history, and philosophy; and another student trained exclusively in mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, and other natural sciences—and he cannot doubt that these two different curricula would bring about two radically diverse mental attitudes. Without predicating superiority of one or the other education, it is clear that they are different. That this difference should be recognized in our academic degrees—a contention which we cannot see that Mr. Hall's interesting *questionnaire* really touches—was the plea of the article in question.—ED. NATION.]

## Notes.

Our readers have had a foretaste of Prof. G. Frederick Wright's forthcoming book on 'Asiatic Russia,' illustrated with photographs and maps, which McClure, Phillips & Co. are to publish in two volumes.

William S. Lord, Evanston, Ill., has in press 'Love-Story Masterpieces,' compiled by Ralph A. Lyon; 'John McGovern's Poems,' and 'Line o' Type Lyrics,' by Bert Leston Taylor.

'Next to the Ground,' by Martha McCulloch-Williams (McClure, Phillips & Co.), is an out-of-door book of an unusual kind, in that it is a study not only of wild animals and plants, but of the biology of farm processes, crops, and domestic animals. The author shows minuteness and fidelity of observation, and considerable scientific knowledge in accounting for the facts that she notes; she has, moreover, freshness and aptness of diction, and a freedom from sentimentality that makes her book seem genuine and wholesome as befits its subject. The scene of her observations is a Tennessee plantation. To anybody familiar with Southern farms her description of August, "the ragged month," and her chapters on breaking up old grass-land and burning for tobacco seed-beds, will bring up lively remembrance of characteristic landscapes and scenes of labor. The chapters on quail-shooting, fox-hunting, and 'possum-hunting are less convincing; one cannot follow with the thrill of the chase. The study of the hog free to range in ample feeding-grounds will surprise readers who know the animal only in the confinement of the sty. The book gets some human interest from the incidental introduction of the planter and his family, but this part of the work is not uniformly skilful. Wherever the author appears to have seen for herself, her record is to be relied on. She evidently uses, however, considerable material not obtained from her own experience, and here, unfortunately, she has made mistakes that mar a highly commendable book.

Mr. Ernest Christopher Meyer, of Madison, Wis., has prepared and publishes an essay entitled 'Nominating Systems; Direct Primaries versus Conventions in the United States.' He regards the "primary" as the "citizen's citadel of right," and when pure, as "the fount from which the great blessings of democratic government flow." Of course this view implies the permanency of the party system. Independent movements will be hindered by making party machinery a part of the governmental

organization, which properly knows only citizens, and favors no one because he calls himself a Republican or a Democrat. Whatever reform is to come must be reform "within the party." Nor is it to be assumed that the caucus will, on the whole, be more difficult to manage than the convention. As Mr. Bryce observes, no meeting can be held without a prearranged plan; and while the regulation of caucuses by law may make party organization more perfect, it does not follow that government will be thereby improved. Mr. Meyer, however, is firmly convinced that there is a fund of political virtue among the people which can be utilized by legalizing the caucus, and he deserves credit for the pains he has taken to collect whatever information on the subject is to be found. His book is certainly of value, but it will not supersede Mr. F. W. Dallinger's excellent work, 'Nomination to Elective Office.'

The sixth—a skip from the fourth—volume of the 'System of Physiologic Therapeutics' (Blakiston), under Dr. Cohen's editorship, is by Dr. N. S. Davis, jr., upon 'Dietotherapy.' The alternative title of 'Food in Health and Disease' is more acceptable. The work is a convenient arrangement of principles and details in the matter of food and feeding, and very acceptable features are the reproduction of numerous dietaries in actual use about the world taken from Bulletins of the Department of Agriculture, and a table of the composition and fuel value of flesh foods by Mitchell. Dr. Davis accepts his father's well-known views, that alcohol is as unnecessary as a medicine as it is undesirable as a beverage, although he admits that in small doses it may be beneficial. These, however, are to be strictly guarded by prescription. As a whole, the book is a good working exposition of what may be accomplished by foods. When the author says (p. 27), "the Pasteur or Chamberlain filter is the best," and "it is made of porous earthenware," it is apparent that he has the Pasteur-Chamberlain in mind, and uses "earthenware" in a very broad sense to include biscuit porcelain. More definiteness would be better. As in the other volumes of this series, the index is copious.

An edition of Gauss's classical work on 'Curved Surfaces' has, during the last generation, appeared about once every three or four years, so that it would seem to vie in popularity with 'Gulliver's Travels' and far outdo Munchausen. The last and best edition, at any rate the easiest for Americans to read, is a splendid publication by the Princeton University Library. It is in English. A mathematician who does not possess enough Latin to read a book on mathematics is cut off entirely from all the more important parts of the older literature, except what is written in French. Not only the language, but Gauss's algebraical notations, are modernized in the new publication, even in points where his preferences were emphatic. We should prefer to read the paper in his collected works. However, no doubt it is more easily read here, and all the slips are corrected. Besides the work itself, there is a translation of an earlier work by Gauss on the same subject, which never was printed until seventy-five years after it was written, in 1900. There are also an abstract by Gauss of his own memoir, and serviceable notes. A valuable bibliography is added, in looking over