

ed more ambitiously "Predestination Unto Poesy."

I know not but in every leaf
That sprang to life along with me,
Were written all the joy and grief
Thenceforth my fate to be.

The wind that whispered to the earth,
The bird that sang its earliest lay,
The flower that blossomed at my birth—
My kinsmen all were they.

Ay, but for fellowship with these
I had not been—nay, might not be;
Nor they but vagrant melodies
Till harmonized by me.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.

NEWS FOR BIBLIOPHILES.

Among collectors the books of Poe are still in the ascendant. On the evening of November 22, the large sum of \$3,800 was paid for Mr. Maier's copy of that thin pamphlet, "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" (1843), which has been already referred to in this column. This is the highest price ever paid at public auction for any American printed book. There are a few other American books which, if they were to come upon the market would undoubtedly surpass this record, such, for example, as the Bay Psalm Book (1640), the first book printed within the limits of the present United States; the first Massachusetts Laws (1648), and the first New York Laws (1694). These are all much older books. One other modern book is as valuable—Poe's first book, "Tamerlane and Minor Poems" (Boston, 1827). Of this, which may be considered the most valuable nineteenth-century printed book in existence, three copies only are known, two, both perfect and with the covers, being in the library of F. R. Halsey of this city, and one, lacking the covers, in the British Museum.

Two thousand nine hundred dollars was paid at the same sale for the interesting association copy of Poe's second book, "Al Aaraaf, Tamerlane, and Minor Poems" (Baltimore, 1829). This, as we noted last week, was the copy used by Poe when preparing for the press the collection of his poems published in 1845 as "The Raven and Other Poems." In that book the following note, signed "E. A. P.," was prefixed to the section "Poems of Youth":

Private reasons—some of which have reference to the sin of plagiarism, and others to the date of Tennyson's first poems—have induced me, after some hesitation, to republish these, the crude compositions of my earliest boyhood. They are printed verbatim—without alteration from the original edition—the date of which is too remote to be judiciously acknowledged.

Notwithstanding this statement these poems are not "printed verbatim." The variations are numerous as shown by the alterations in Poe's autograph in the Maier copy. Another peculiarity of this copy is that the date of imprint instead of 1829 is (or seems to be) 1820. The late J. C. Chamberlain, who examined the book when it came up in the Harold Peirce sale in Philadelphia in 1903, was of the opinion that the date had been altered in ink from 1829 to 1820 and by Poe himself. His purpose was, Mr. Chamberlain surmised, to show a book which antedated Tennyson's first volume of verse, the "Poems of Two

Brothers" (1827), which is referred to in the note quoted above. If this could be proven it would make the volume still more interesting. It is certainly, as we said before, the most interesting "association" Poe book in existence.

The most important items in the second Haber sale, which will be held by the Anderson Auction Company on December 7 and 8, afternoons and evenings, are the early editions of the works of Edmund Spenser. They include the first edition of "The Faerie Queene," both parts (1590-1596), also a second set with the first part, second edition (1596), and the first and second folio editions (1609 and 1611), the "Complaints" (1591), "The Shepheard's Calendar" (1591), and "Colin Clouts Come Home Again" (1595).

Among other early English books are Langland's "Vision of Piers Plowman," the second edition (1550); More's "Utopia," first edition in English (1551); Puttenham's "Arte of English Poesie" (1589); the "Mirrour for Magistrates" (1610); Phaer and Twyne's translation of Virgil (1596); Milton's "Poems," first edition (1645), and the second edition (1673); "Paradise Lost" (1667), with the second title-page, and with the seven preliminary leaves added from a later issue; Shirley's "Poems" (1646), and Killigrew's "Comedies and Tragedies" (1664).

Among books by American authors, the Whittier items are perhaps the most interesting. Mr. Haber's "Mogg Megone" (1836) is the copy given to Miss Lucy Hooper, and the letter of presentation accompanies the book; his "Narrative of James Williams" (1838) is accompanied by Whittier's letter acknowledging the authorship of the book; and his "Moll Pitcher" (1832), is the Foote copy with two letters from the author relating to it, in which he says, under date of April 22, 1834: "I doubt whether any copy of 'Moll Pitcher' is extant. It was a mere pamphlet and only a few copies printed."

The oldest book in the collection is a fine copy of that famous picture book of the Middle Ages, the "Nuremberg Chronicle" (1493), which contains upwards of 2,000 wood-cuts. This copy contains the numbered leaves at the end which were left blank, in order that the owner might write in a continuation of the history.

On December 6, Stan. V. Henkels will sell in Philadelphia a collection of autograph letters and historical documents, mainly from the correspondence of Elbridge Gerry, including fine specimens of many Revolutionary names.

In presenting One Hundred Famous First Editions in English and French Literature, Ernest Dressel North, No. 4 East Fifty-ninth Street, has been guided quite as much by literary interest as by bibliographical rarity. The earliest volume is Sidney's "Arcadia," 1590, with six facsimile leaves. Only ten copies of this book are known in any state. The latest item is the modest volume, Whittier's "Snow Bound," 1866.

Between these terms there is much of interest that can only be glanced at. Milton's "Paradise Lost," with the second title page—or is it the first? the doctors disagree; Goldsmith's "The Vicar of Wakefield"; Butler's "Hudibras" with the sequels; De Foe's "Robinson Crusoe," all three parts; the thin pamphlet in which FitzGerald pub-

lished the first English Rubáiyát—here are some of the most striking exhibits. The original issue of the "Tattler" and "Rambler" are to the layman among the more inviting volumes.

In sheer rarity, all yield to Robert Burns's "Poems," the third edition, 1787. This copy is in its original binding, and throughout the skeletonized proper names have been filled in in the poet's handwriting.

There is an excellent catalogue, with full literary and bibliographical indications. The exhibition extends from December 1 to 14, and will appeal equally to bibliophiles and unpretentious gentle readers.

Correspondence.

ENGLISH FOOTBALL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your article on "The Football Deaths" (the *Nation*, November 4), you mention the reluctance of the football rules committee to change the game

in such a way that it will resemble the English, or soccer, game, in which players are not allowed to run carrying the ball. The chief argument we have heard against this change is that the English game is not an exciting enough contest for the young American.

Permit me to point out that "soccer" is not "the" English game, and that it is not an exciting enough contest for most young Englishmen. In the English universities two games of football are played—Association, or "soccer," and Rugby. Rugby, in which the player is allowed to run carrying the ball, is somewhat the more popular. But neither game has the universal vogue among schools and colleges which the American game enjoys. At Eton, for instance, neither game is regularly played; there are instead two local varieties of football, the "wall game" and the "field game," both differing widely from the games played at the universities. Winchester and Harrow also have games of their own. In the colonies Rugby is played in a way which seems to tend toward something like the American game.

There is, therefore, no game which occupies in England the position held by football in America, and the English universities have no predominant autumn sport. There are rowing events of some importance, track meets, hare and hound runs, and golf tournaments. Lacrosse has been introduced, and has met with some favor. Hockey—which we call "shinny" and relegate to vacant city lots—is nearly as popular as "soccer" football. But no one of these games is absorbing enough to arouse universal interest and displace its rivals. A few hundred undergraduates watch the more important "rugger" games, but no match except the Oxford-Cambridge is played on a field provided with seating arrangements for a large audience.

Those who have followed football on both sides of the Atlantic believe it would be a useless retrogression to attempt a modification of American football in the direction of either Rugby or "soccer." It is not the rules that make the English game safe. The excessive softness of the ground, which is covered with very thick turf and rarely freezes or even dries out in the football

season, is one explanation of the comparative freedom of English players from injuries more serious than sprains and bruises. But the great reason is the different spirit in which the games are played. The Englishman looks on a game as a means of finding amusement and exercise. He therefore refuses to take sport seriously, to "go in to the game hard" regardless of injury to himself or his opponents. Except in rowing, he pays little attention to training, coaching, and practice. And if he can afford to keep horses and hunt, or if he has facilities for shooting, or plays a good game of court tennis, he will not go in for organized athletics at all. A man in an English university does not play football unless he thinks football the most agreeable form of outdoor exercise, and as long as he finds in the game what he is looking for, he does not care a great deal whether his side wins or not. This increase of efficiency at the cost of time and comfort would not appeal to him at all, for the English athlete has other interests outside his game, and would not think of sacrificing his studies, his social pleasures, or his leisure to a sport.

It is this calm, casual, excessively amateur spirit, incomprehensible to many American athletes, which makes English games comparatively safe. Rugby, "soccer," and hockey might be dangerous indeed if played "for God, for country, and for Yale." If we wish to obviate the perils of American football it is not the rules we must Anglicize, but the temperament of the players.

F. SCHENCK.

Oxford University, November 15.

OPEN FOOTBALL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In dealing with recent football casualties in an editorial paragraph, November 25, your statement, in reference to the Yale-Harvard game, that "the expectation that the Yale team would open up the game for the game's sake proved fruitless," seemed to one reader at least to do some injustice to an eleven which surely during the past season has practised the new football, with its theories of open play, more consistently and brilliantly than any other eleven in the East. Any unprejudiced observer of the game you criticize will bear witness to the fact that that contest illustrated with peculiar force the advantages from a strategic, as well as a humanitarian, standpoint, of the open game, as actually played by Yale, over the football of ten years ago, as employed by Harvard throughout the afternoon. Lilley's injury was not due, as you intimate, to Harvard's line-plunging tactics, but occurred in a broken field, and was caused by what seemed to many spectators an unnecessarily rough tackle, which the tension of the opening play of the game may explain, if it does not excuse.

New rules for enforcing less rough and more open play should, undoubtedly be advocated, but it seems that the efforts of the football authorities in New Haven during the season which has just closed, as well as in previous years, to develop the game along open lines, should receive appreciation and approval, certainly from the Nation.

FRANCIS PARSONS.

Hartford, Conn., November 26.

[We certainly had no intention of do-

ing injustice to the Yale team. Our criticism of the game agreed with the comments made generally in the press.—ED. NATION.]

THE "FOOTBALL" IMPOSTURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It seems curious that the opponents of the fight to kill or cripple, misnamed a game, and misnamed football, have never noted the fraudulent shelter under which its advocates take refuge, and the false pretence by which they secure a good will meant for a wholly different and real game. It is not football; it is handball. It is not the continuance of the old football of our boyhood; it is a "protective mimicry" of the name, used for something wholly different, and used "with intent to deceive." The reason why almost none were injured in the old and none are reasonably secure from death or maiming in the new is that in the former the ball was kept on the ground; in the latter it is kept in the arms; hence, in the former the violence was expended on the ball, in the latter it is expended on the holder, or his companions. The "old boys" who rave over the game for old associations' sake, and revile its opponents, are unconsciously befooling themselves or consciously befooling others.

ANTAPATE.

Hartford, Conn., November 26.

THE READING OF VERSE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Whether or not it was by a coincidence that in your issue of November 11 there appeared an interesting paper by Professor Gummere of Haverford College, protesting against the modern method of reading verse from the platform and stage, and a criticism of the opening of the New Theatre, and of the inability of most of the players, including those taking the parts of Antony and Cleopatra, to render Shakespearean verse as verse, I do not know. In any case, I am sure that a great number of your readers hope that there may be an awakening of the players, the dramatic schools, and those who profess English literature and elocution, to the fact that prose is prose and verse is verse. Why should the interpreters of Stephen Phillips (his "Herod" is now to be seen in New York city), why should those who attempt to revive Shakespeare, fear to read their lines, not, to be sure, in the ranting or sing-song style of old-time barn-stormers, but in such manner as to treat their audiences to something of the beauty of the line, and to the richness of the poetical rhythm?

I wonder if the readers of the *Nation* happen to have seen the interview with Mr. Forbes-Robertson, that master of dramatic diction, which was published in one of the newspapers only yesterday? What the English actor says is so truly to the point, and bears so directly upon the discussion which the *Nation* has itself started up, that I presume to quote freely from his remarks. The trouble with contemporary stage elocution springs, says Mr. Forbes-Robertson, "from the actor's very desire to act well." Perhaps the word "realistically," expresses more precisely what must have been in the speaker's mind. Continuing:

In his effort to appear natural, he [the

actor] mumbles his words as too many people do in everyday life. Much of this can be corrected by constantly bearing in mind the true value of vowels, the percussive value of consonants, and the importance of keeping up the voice until the last word is spoken. There must be plenty of wind in the bellows, so to speak. The great thing is to have the sound come from the front of the mouth. . . . The actor must learn to breathe deeply from the diaphragm and to take his breath at the proper time. Too often the last word is not held up, and that is very often the important word. . . . Schools for acting are valuable, . . . but, after all, the actors, like other folk, must be taught how to speak as children in the home, at school, and in society.

The people of the Latin races are, as a rule, better speakers than we Anglo-Saxons. They speak more distinctly and with a better sense of the value of sounds and words. They elide their words, to be sure, but they do it beautifully. We are slovenly of speech, we drop our "r's" and ignore our "ings," not only among the untutored, but more and more among the cultured, especially in England. . . . In Paris the best French is spoken. There the French actor should get his standards. In London the best English is spoken—the English actor should speak as the most cultured do there. In America it is different; there is not much to choose between the English spoken at Boston, New York, Washington and other cities. The American actor should follow the best practice among the cultured of all cities.

I need not apologize for citing so fully the words of one who is not only sane in his views upon right-speaking, on and off stage, but who is also a successful exponent of his own philosophy. It is only fair also to add to Professor Gummere's apt discussion of the subject Mr. Forbes-Robertson's comment upon the elocution of the French stage. The art of reading verse may have become well-nigh lost, so far as we Anglo-Saxons are concerned, but even the casual visitor to Paris ought to know that it is not lost to the leading members of the Théâtre Français. Perhaps it is unnecessary to add that the proper manner of reading English verse and French is so distinct that the practices of a Mounet-Sully and of a Forbes-Robertson have, in fact, almost nothing in common save a regard for that part of tradition which is sound, and a respect for the poetry of the drama represented.

W.

New York, November 22.

GENERAL MEADE AT GETTYSBURG.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of November 18, 1909, you publish a most interesting letter from Mr. Jesse Bowman Young about the movements of Meade's army from and after Gettysburg. Permit me to add some remembrances of my own confirming his conclusions.

At the time of the battle of Gettysburg I was in Washington with a new regiment of infantry. The military authorities there were naturally much disturbed over the situation, and we were dispatched in great haste to join the army under Meade. Arriving soon after the battle of Gettysburg, I found our army encamped at or near a small town called Funkstown. I had previously served upon the staff of Gen. Sedgwick, who commanded the Sixth Corps, and I now called upon him. He received me kindly, and informed me that he had just returned from a conference of all the general officers, at which they had decided that it was then inexpedient to attack Lee, since