

work has given him a prominent place in recent German fiction. "Die da kommen und gehen" (imported by G. E. Stechert & Co.) is a volume of short stories full of interest. They are records of lives that come and go, of whose existence the earth bears but a faint impress, lives without complications, yet not without psychological interest. In "Requiem" the eyes of a robust fisherman are suddenly opened to the delicate beauty of his invalid wife, and when death takes her from him, he continues to live ever after as under the spell of a dream. There is an admirable tenderness about "Eine Begegnung," and even "Ein kleiner Frühling," stories of passing fancies, of loves barely reaching the threshold of consciousness and passing away without a crisis, leaving nothing but a faint memory. The author is a keen observer of life and reflects his impression with the tact and the discretion of an artist. A. VON ENDE.

NEWS FOR BIBLIOPHILES.

The following are the prices paid for a few of the more important items at the Hermann sale, on March 18 and 19, at the rooms of the Anderson Auction Company in this city: Shelley's "Queen Mab" (1813), a presentation copy, original boards, uncut, \$875; "Epipsychidion" (1821), with the autograph signature of Shelley on the title-page, sewed as issued, uncut, \$500; Thackeray's "Paris Sketch Book" (1840), with an original drawing by Thackeray inserted, \$215; "Notes of a Journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo" (1846), with three original drawings by Thackeray inserted, \$180; "Pendennis" (1850), with an original drawing in colors by Thackeray inserted, \$250; Scott's "Waverley" (1814), 3 vols., original boards, uncut, \$400; Matthew Arnold's first publication, "Alaric at Rome" (1840), original paper cover, \$345; Charles Lamb's "The King and Queen of Hearts" (1808), \$430; FitzGerald's "Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyam" (1859), uncut, \$246; Milton's "Paradise Regained" (1671), \$260; Butler's "Hudibras" (1663-1678), first edition, 3 vols., \$240; Burton's "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621), \$180; Poe's "Al-Aaraaf, Tamerlane and Minor Poems," original boards with trimmed edges, \$1,460; Grimm's "German Popular Stories" (1823-26), with illustrations by George Cruikshank, original boards, uncut, \$540; the *Scourge* (1811-16), a complete set, 12 vols., with colored plates by Cruikshank, \$300; the *Annals of Sporting* (1822-28), a complete set, 13 vols., with colored plates by Henry Alken, \$420; "Tales of the Islanders," an original unpublished manuscript by Charlotte Brontë, \$470 (this manuscript sold in November, 1905, for \$120); unpublished manuscript of Bret Harte, fifteen pages, \$120; a collection of fifty-five letters of Robert Southey to Mrs. Hodson, \$360; a collection of letters by and to Abraham Lincoln, more than 250 items in two folio volumes, \$835.

On March 29, the Anderson Auction Co. will sell the second part of the library of the late William Harvey. Among books with colored plates by Rowlandson are Burton's "Adventures of Johnny Newcome in the Navy" (1818); the three "Tours of Dr.

Syntax" (1812-20-21), first editions; "The English Dance of Death" and "The Dance of Life" (1815-17); the "Journal of Sentimental Travels in the Southern Provinces of France" (1821); and "Naples and the Campagna Felice" (1815). Brough's "Life of Sir John Falstaff" (1858) and "The Table Book" (1845), in the original parts, are important Cruikshank items. A copy of Stith's "History of Virginia" (London, 1753), reprints of Indian captivities, publications of the Caxton and Rowfant Clubs, and an original drawing by John Ruskin, are other notable lots. On March 30 and 31, the same firm will sell the library of L. D. Griggs of Waterbury, Conn., including books on art and a collection of editions of the Book of Common Prayer.

On April 1 and 2, the Merwin Clayton Sales Co. of this city will offer the libraries of the Rev. William Laurie and the Rev. Joseph M. Clarke. Early American periodicals, pamphlets relating to Yale College, and books on Ireland are important classes represented.

On March 30 and 31 and April 1, C. F. Libbie & Co. of Boston will sell the library of George Alfred Townsend, better known as "Gath." Books on the civil war and American local history, especially Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York, make up a large part of the collection. Among the rarities is a copy of the famous Martyr-Book, "Der Blutige Schau-platz oder Martyrer Spiegel," printed at Ephrata in 1748 and 1749, the largest book printed in America before the Revolution. This copy has the frontispiece (slightly damaged) not in all copies.

Frederik Muller & Co. of Amsterdam send us the advance sheets of a sale of autographs to be held by them on April 19. Included are documents signed by Charles V, Maria Theresa, Louis XV, etc.

Correspondence.

THE "LOST LEAF" OF "PIERS THE PLOWMAN."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Prof. J. M. Manly's notable article, "The Lost Leaf of Piers the Plowman," which appeared something more than three years ago (*Modern Philology*, III, 359), has reawakened the lively interest of scholars in the critical problems presented by Langland's poem. Professor Manly pointed out for the first time the manifest lack of connection in Passus V of the A-text between vv. 222-35, which describe the confession of Sloth, and the passage which immediately follows (vv. 236-59). In this fact he found evidence of the disappearance from the author's manuscript of a leaf, containing between sixty and eighty lines, in which, he believed, the confession of Sloth was concluded and the figure of Robert the Robber introduced. Moreover, he reminds us that from the company of deadly sins who make their confessions Wrath is omitted, and brings this omission into connection with the break at v. 235, by advancing the theory that the confession of Wrath covered the two pages of another lost leaf in the original manuscript, and that the two lost leaves were the halves of a folded sheet, "the next to the innermost of a

section or gathering," in the bound volume in which, as he supposes, the author committed his poem to paper.

Dr. Henry Bradley, reviewing Professor Manly's article a few months later (*Athenæum*, April 21, 1906), accepted his view that vv. 236-59 do not properly follow the confession of Sloth, but proposed a different explanation:

Professor Manly has failed to perceive that the proper place of lines 236-59 is after line 145, at the end of the confession of Covetousness. In this position they not only fit perfectly, but actually improve the sense.

Dr. Bradley's explanation of the mistake which has occurred is, that the author wrote his text on loose sheets instead of in a bound volume, and "that one (or more) of these leaves (containing the confession of Wrath and the end of the confession of Envy) got lost, and that another (containing lines 236-59) was misplaced." This theory of the "misplaced sheet," which has the advantage of being simpler than Professor Manly's "lost leaf," has recently been endorsed by Dr. Furnivall (Forewords to the Offprint of Manly's "Piers the Plowman," Early English Text Society, Original Series, 135 B (1908), p. iii) and M. Jusserand (*Modern Philology*, VI, 287). Nevertheless, a still simpler explanation of the difficulty, it seems to me, may be offered.

All are agreed, it will be remarked at the outset, that some displacement of the text has occurred immediately following v. 235. The break in the sense at this point was instantly evident as soon as Professor Manly pointed it out. The lines which follow are in no wise appropriate to Sloth. But shall we transfer them, as Dr. Bradley would do, to Covetousness? To me, as to Professor Manly, they seem rather to belong to Robert the Robber. It is nowhere hinted that Covetousness would have found difficulty in making restitution, as is implied in vv. 236-8 (I transliterate to modern English characters):

And yit I-chulle yelden ageyn, yif I so muche
have,
Al that I wikkedliche won sethe I wit hade.
And thaugh my lyfode lakke letten I nulle—etc.

On the other hand, these phrases fit well with the situation of Robert the Robber, who looked on *Reddite*, "And for ther nas not. Wher-with he wepte ful sore." Again, the penitent's determination to seek St. Truth "er I seo Rome" (v. 241), may be compared with earlier lines in the poem (A. iv, 111) where "Rome Renners" and "Robbeours" are mentioned together.

But perhaps the most serious difficulty in Dr. Bradley's rearrangement of the passage lies in the fact that if vv. 236-59 be transferred to Covetousness the latter would then give utterance to two vows hardly consistent with each other:

(1.) I and my wife will wend to Walsingham,
And bidde the Rode of Bromholm bringe me out
of dette (v. 145);
(2.) I schal seche seynt Treuthe er I seo Rome
(v. 241)

Each of the deadly sins (except Envy), it will be noted, closes his confession with a vow. And it might be supposed that Robert the Robber would follow their example in this. But if in vv. 236-41 Covetousness is the speaker, Robert is left without a vow, though there can be no question as to his contrition.

This omission, now, will be supplied—

and most appropriately—if we recognize the troublesome lines 236-41 as forming the conclusion of Robert's prayer, and restore them accordingly to their proper place following v. 253. Let us see how the lines read thus placed (the shifted lines being marked by asterisks):

Robert ye Robbour on Reddite he lokede,
And for ther nas not Wber-with he wepte ful sore.
But yit the sunfol schrewe seide to him-seluen;
"Crist, that vpon Caluarie on the Cros dyedest,
Tho Dismas my brother bi-souyete the of grace,
And heddest Merc of that mon for Memento sake,
Thi wille worth vpon me as Ich haue wel deseruet

To haue helle for euere yif that hope neore.
So rewe on me, Robert, that no Red haue,
Ne neuere weene to wyne for Craft that I knowe.
Bote for thi muchel Merc mitigacion I be-seche;
Dampne me not on domes day for I dude so ille,
*And yit I-chulle yelden ageyn gif I so muche haue,
*Al that I wikkedliche won sethe I wit hade.

*And thaun my lyfode lakke letten I nulle
*That vche mon schal habben his er ich henne wende:

*And with the Residue and the remenaunt (bi the Rode of Chester!)

*I schal seche seynt Treuthe er I seo Rome!"
Ak what fel of this Feloun I con not felre schewe,

But wel Ich wot he wepte faste watur with his eyen,

And knouhliche his gult to Crist yit eft-sones,
That Penitencia is [pike he] schulde polissche newe,

And lepe with him ouerlond al his lyf tyme,
For he hath leiyen bi latro lucifers brother.

A thousen of Men tho throgen to-geders,
Weopyng and weylyng for heore wikkede dedes,
Cryinge vpward to Crist and to his clene moder
To haue grace to seche seint treuthe: god lene thei so motel

Thus arranged, the whole passage seems to me to fit together perfectly. With the words, "I beo-hote to the Rode" (v. 235), the vow of Sloth comes naturally to its conclusion (for I cannot feel with Prof. Manly that this is an abrupt ending). In the next line Robert is introduced—abruptly, if you will, but in the same fashion that Sloth is introduced at v. 222. His prayer for mercy concludes with a vow which could not be better suited to the situation. The next six lines (254-9) serve to dismiss Robert and thus to clear the stage for the throng of nameless penitents, who, like Robert, will seek St. Truth. Consider, on the other hand, how abruptly vv. 260-2 would come in if placed, as Dr. Bradley suggests, directly after v. 235. It is unnecessary, then, in the case of this much discussed passage, to assume either a "lost leaf" or a "misplaced sheet." The text as we have it appears to be intact. The whole confusion has arisen through the carelessness of the scribe, who introduced vv. 236-41 at a point 12 lines earlier than they belonged.

Nor is this the only blunder of the kind committed by the scribe of the A-text. Professor Manly ("Cambridge History of English Literature," II, 33) has recently pointed out a precisely similar case in Passus VII. Here we find four lines (71-4), which the author plainly intended to follow v. 90, inserted 16 lines ahead of their proper place. Dr. Furnivall, commenting on the misplacement of these lines in Passus VII, explains graphically how the mistake occurred. The four lines were added by the author, "no doubt at the top or bottom of the page, with a tick to show where the lines ought to come in." But the scribe "shovd them into a place 16 lines earlier, where they've nothing to do with what came before or after them." This explanation

is eminently satisfactory, and will apply equally well to the misplaced lines in Passus V. Here also the lines were written in by the author, at the top rather than the bottom of the page, since in both instances the scribe has brought them in earlier than they belong. These two passages taken together are instructive, not only as to the careless habits of the A-scribe, but also as to the method of the author in revising his lines. It would not be surprising if further scrutiny of the A-text should result in the discovery of still other misplacements of this sort. For example, in Passus II, vv. 37-9, would certainly fit better if placed after v. 51; and in Passus III, as Skeat has already remarked, vv. 266-9 "ought to be put lower, having ll. 270-271 above them." One also suspects some misplacement at IV, 64, and at VIII, 77.

The absence of Wrath from the congenial company of the deadly sins, which Professor Manly used to confirm his theory of the "lost leaf," is a matter which requires to be considered separately. If we assume that the poem as Langland wrote it included a confession by Wrath, it is easy to explain its disappearance on the hypothesis of Dr. Bradley, that the poem as it passed from the hands of the author to the scribe was written on loose sheets, and that one (or more) of them has been lost. I do not feel certain, however, that the author's text included the confession of Wrath. Langland shows a free hand in his treatment of the deadly sins, by varying at pleasure from the stereotyped order in which they stand in the works of edification. May he not have felt himself at liberty to omit one of the seven if he felt that it did not suit his purpose? Let it be noted in this connection that in Passus II (vv. 60-74), where the other six sins are marshalled, Wrath is likewise absent. Professor Manly is mindful of this omission, but assumes that a line in which Wrath was mentioned has dropped out. This would be, to say the least, a singular coincidence.

In conclusion, I wish to make it clear that the restoration of the passage in Passus V here proposed in no way militates against Professor Manly's view that the revisions of the poem which we know as the B- and C-texts were not the work of Langland. Though it was the theory of the "lost leaf" which led him to re-examine the relation of the revised texts to the original form of the poem, Professor Manly's subsequent investigations enable him to base his conclusion on more general grounds. In regard to this larger question of the authorship of the B- and C-texts, however, it will perhaps be well to reserve final decision until Professor Manly presents his evidence in full, as he promises to do shortly.

CARLETON F. BROWN.

Bryn Mawr, Pa., March 8.

P. S.—I discover, after writing the above communication, that Mr. Theophilus Hall in the *Modern Language Review* for October, 1908, remarks briefly with reference to the break at V, 236, that "the lines in question are surely part of the confession of 'Robert the Robber,' to which they form a fitting close" (p. 1). To him, therefore, belongs the credit of first pointing out this solution of the passage. That two persons

should have arrived at this solution independently makes it the more conclusive.

C. F. B.

March 13.

A MEMORIAL TO JOHN NEWBERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The month of July in the year of 1913 will see the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Newbery, the philanthropic publisher of St. Paul's Churchyard, whose life I published about thirty years ago under the title of "A Bookseller of the Last Century." Newbery was immortalized by Goldsmith in his "Vicar of Wakefield," by Dr. Johnson in the *Idler*, by Washington Irving in "Bracebridge Hall," and by many other writers who have recognized the influence of the first man who published, wrote, edited, and compiled books for: "all those little Masters and Misses who are good, or intend to be good."

We have travelled a long way since Newbery and Goldsmith cooperated on that famous list of books of which "Goody Two Shoes" and "Tommy Trip" may be taken as among the best examples, but if it were only for the fact that Newbery was the first to give the "Rhymes and Jingles of Mother Goose" to the world in collected form his memory should be kept green by English-speaking children wherever they may be found. Newbery's original collection of Mother Goose's melodies has, moreover, an added interest, for there is no doubt that Goldsmith had a hand in the editing, annotating, and arranging of the first edition, while he was living with and working for John Newbery. Neither in London, at the scene of his labors, over against the north door of St. Paul's Churchyard, nor at Canonbury House, Islington, where he and Goldsmith lived and worked together, nor at his birthplace, Waltham St. Lawrence, is there anything of prominence to keep John Newbery's name in remembrance. "Mother Goose" has enriched countless publishers, who have banished both the name of Goldsmith and of Newbery from their editions, and has delighted children innumerable on both sides of the Atlantic, and the year of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth would be an appropriate one in which to commemorate in some enduring way the life-work of a man who was, as Goldsmith said, "not only the friend of the children, but the friend of all mankind."

This would seem to be the more necessary, for a claim to have been the originator of this collection was made about forty years ago on behalf of a Mrs. Goose, or Vergoose, the mother-in-law of one Thomas Fleet, a printer who flourished in Boston, Mass., during the eighteenth century. The absurdity of this contention was amply demonstrated by H. W. Whitmore, a former city registrar of Boston, in his preface to a facsimile of Newbery's edition, which he published in 1893; but ancient superstitions and modern myths alike die hard, and there are thousands in America to-day who cling to the idea that Mother Goose was an American lady, instead of a *nom de plume* borrowed by Newbery from Charles Perrault's "Contes de ma Mère l'Oye," which was published in the seventeenth century, and which had

an origin even still more remote, as any one may learn who will read Longfellow's "Ancient French Romances."

The Marquis of Northampton, the owner of Canonbury House, where, as a contemporary poetaster has it,

Learned Chambers treasured lore for men,
And Newbery there his A B C's for babes,

has recently restored it and made of it a museum of North London Antiquities; and a movement is on foot to secure subscriptions to raise some enduring monument, either in Canonbury House or elsewhere, to the memory of the father of children's books, a most laudable enterprise. And in doing this let us not forget our great American publisher, whose name forever deserves to be linked with that of John Newbery. For he reprinted all of the Newbery-Goldsmith books in America as fast as they came out in England, among them the famous "Mother Goose's Melody." Therefore the memorial to John Newbery by grateful English and American children should in some way enshrine also the name of Isaiah Thomas.

CHARLES WELSH.

Winthrop, Mass., March 13.

MAINTAINING IDEALS OF STUDY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial of February 25 on "Making Scholarship Attractive" you present certain aspects of the subject so convincingly that it seems worth while to call attention to certain other considerations which you have overlooked or undervalued. As regards two of the remedies suggested, you have, I think, quite effectively disposed of the arguments used in their support. "Honor days," or by whatever other name occasions of doing public honor to "high scholars" may be called, will never be effective agencies in stimulating a spirit of scholarship that is worthy of the name. There will never be any lack of public honor for anything the community regards as honorable. To put the honors first and expect the scholarship to follow is putting the cart before the horse indeed. Affairs of this kind are purely a worked up demonstration on the part of the government and find no spontaneous support in the feeling of the student body. I recall an occasion of the sort when, as each good boy's name was called by the presiding official, the small company of students present responded with perfunctory hand-clapping, until at the sound of one name they burst out into a round of perfectly genuine applause. It was the name of the champion strong man of the college!

Equally futile, as you well indicate, would be any organized attempt to make scholarship the basis of social distinction. Societies of the type you refer to are not charitable institutions, but natural groupings of men of similar social tastes and habits. A common interest in the higher things of life will draw those who feel this interest together as surely as any other form of attraction, and it may safely be left to take care of itself. In any of the larger colleges the intellectually superior youth do now, in spite of the apparent contempt of seriousness, come together in societies of their own, and these are regarded by their mates with the kind of respect

that serious interest in any worthy thing always commands. Only, young men are still happily far from accepting the official standards of scholarly accomplishment. They have an instinctive sense of the fictitiousness of distinctions won in official ways. They admire and respect a clever man, but they distrust the stamp by which the institution marks its "distinguished" scholars. The real problem of college administration is to bring about some kind of harmony between this instinctive appreciation of good work that exists even in the penal colonies of our parasites and their imitators, and the methods of teaching employed to stimulate such work.

It is at this point that I find myself differing from the conclusions of your article. You lay the blame of present ills chiefly upon the existence in our larger colleges of courses of instruction in which it is easy for the student to win the certificate of accomplishment with a minimum of intelligence and a shameful absence of work. You connect with these courses the charge of incompetency on the part of the teachers. Now, as a matter of fact, the most notorious of such courses have been at Harvard, and I think the same would be true elsewhere, in charge of men of the highest scholarly repute and of altogether exceptionally stimulating quality as teachers. Such courses were deliberately planned to furnish to large numbers of students not aiming at special results in the given field of study, glimpses at the larger aspects of the several subjects treated. In the scheme of a great university they have had and always ought to have their honorable place. They were intended to correspond to the so-called "public courses" of the German universities, where hundreds of students not enrolled in the department concerned come together to hear what men of the highest standing in their several professions have to say about the relations of their subject to learning as a whole or about some aspect of it specially interesting to thinking people at the time. Such courses were never intended to be used as tests of scholarship, and it is in their use for this purpose, not in their essential quality, that the real evil consists.

Now the remedy you suggest is that the teachers proceed "to keep the undergraduates up to the mark." That is easily said, and there is no doubt that it can be done. It would be possible for our colleges to revert frankly to the conditions of a half century ago, to divide their students up into small groups, set them lessons to learn, and maintain an army of useful young men to see to it that they learned them. But we may be perfectly sure that no sooner would this machinery have got into working order than we should begin to hear the same old criticisms over again. The lame and the lazy would simply have a new set of devices to escape the consequences of their own action or inaction, and the authorities would have to begin devising new means to meet them. We gave up this way of approach to the problem more than a generation ago, and we are not going back to it. Whatever is done to meet the very real evils you have pointed out must be done on the basis of the ideas which underlie our present educational conditions.

In other words, the principle of liberty with which the present movement in education began must still be maintained. It has been grotesquely misunderstood and misapplied, and we are suffering from these misunderstandings and misapplications. But in spite of all this, the principle that in higher education the student must be made responsible for his own actions remains unshaken. The only question is how this responsibility can be brought home to him wisely, and, in the best sense of the word, safely. I venture to believe that the chief obstacle to a right attitude on the part of students toward their work comes from the wrong aim set before them by the college itself. Formerly the aim of the indifferent student was to do a moderate amount of prescribed work in a way to escape disgrace, and then, after the lapse of a fixed period of residence, to take the degree which was the certificate of such performance. In the desire to escape from that system we have run, or slid, into another equally dangerous, if more seductive. We now set before our youth the ideal of accomplishing so many "courses" in as little time as faculties can be persuaded into permitting. In place of units of time we now talk and think in units of acquirement vaguely supposed to correspond to units of instruction. The "course" has come to have an almost mystical meaning as a kind of mysterious entity independent alike of the quality of the man who "gives" it and of the kind of youth who "takes" it. We hear of "good" courses and "bad" courses, "hard" and "soft" courses, "big" courses and "small," until the college community comes almost to believe that these qualities attach in some occult fashion to a given presentation of a subject without special reference to the personality of the teacher.

"Counting courses" has come to be almost synonymous with getting an education. In many places the unit is deliberately made as small as possible. We began with courses representing several hours of classroom work per week through a year. Now a "course" may mean instruction covering a half or a quarter, or even an eighth of a year. Then we patch these odds and ends together and give a certificate that the youth has "done enough work" to entitle him to membership in the goodly company of educated men. All this degree giving rests upon a system of credits differing little from the method of reckoning piece-work in a factory. It has not greatly changed since the days of required studies. It does not vary essentially from the method used in grammar schools. It is a device unknown to the higher education of any other civilized country, and would be repudiated anywhere else as unthinkable, in connection with any intellectual ideal. Good teachers have fought against it. Faculties in their higher moments have tried to infuse into it some degree of reasonableness, to make it bear some relation to the intellectual life. But the business side of college administration has regularly defeated such effort, and we stand to-day in the grotesque position of trying to maintain ideals of study for study's sake and then dealing with our students on a commercial basis which makes it possible for them to win all the certificates of accomplishment without ever feeling for a moment the breath of the ideal

we would fain have them live and work by.

The remedy I propose is at one stroke to knock the bottom out of all attempts to get or to give something for nothing by giving up all credits on courses as such. It should not be possible for a student to ask "Is this course hard or easy?" Work is hard and loafing is easy, and such inquiries relate, not to the intrinsic difficulties of a subject, but solely to the point whether the given teacher will make it easy for the student to gain credit toward his degree. It is obvious that if no credits were given on courses such questions would disappear at once. In their place would come questions like this: "Is this course one that will best lead me toward the goal of learning I have set before myself?" "Is this course one that an educated man, such as I hope to become, ought to pursue?" "Will this course and that and the other, put together, make such a combination as a reasonable man would approve?"

Then, as the condition for a degree, we should provide in every department a series of graded tests, consisting of oral and written examinations at considerable intervals, and these should be the *only tests upon which credit should be given*. Under the term "examinations" should be included any form of test, such as extended theses, laboratory reports, drawings, charts, or whatever proof of the candidate's real accomplishment at the time may best serve as a basis for academic recognition. All these tests should be set by departments, not by individuals alone. The subjects of examination should not regularly correspond to any specified courses of instruction. The degree should be given in a subject or definite group of related subjects. For example, to win the degree, the candidate must have passed primary examinations in several subjects, thus securing a broad basis of general knowledge and an adequate preparation for further study. Then he must have passed a smaller number of secondary examinations in subjects, some of which will be in continuation of those pursued for the primaries. Finally, he must have passed one or two final examinations in subjects which he shall have carried from the beginning.

It will be seen that this scheme combines some of the advantages and avoids some of the dangers of the German, the English, and the American ideals. It retains the free choice of studies up to a certain point, where a moderate degree of specialization must come in. It frees the teacher from any direct personal responsibility for the standing of the student, but it does not, as in England, put him at the mercy of an examining board in which he has no part. As a member of the department he has a voice in determining the tests, while at the same time, he is subject to the wholesome correction of his immediate colleagues. The plan retains the American idea of reasonably frequent examinations and stages of advancement without the present evil of examination by courses. It opens up to faculties the opportunity of illustrating a broad, generous idea of a liberal education without the fatal scrap-piness from which we at present suffer. The plan would not prevent any teacher from using any amount of tests which might seem to him useful for purposes of in-

struction or discipline; only, such examination would never be thought of as bearing directly upon the student's academic standing. No course would be "hard" because there would be no such thing as "passing in a course." No course would be "easy," because slackness in instruction would be followed by failure in the credit tests. The student would get out of a course much or little to help him in gaining the training which alone would enable him to pass successfully the stages leading toward his degree.

It is, of course, idle to imagine that under this or any other system, the deliberately useless student will be greatly improved. He will always spend what energy he has in devices to defeat the purposes of his own academic existence. Academic systems must be planned with no further reference to him than is necessary to keep him from blocking the ways and to save the college from stultifying itself by certifying to his accomplishment of work it knows he has not done. The worst evil of the present conditions is that they are teaching, not only the loafer, but the better man as well, to look to fictitious and immediate rewards, instead of working for more real and more remote attainment.

X.

Cambridge, March 18.

INTELLECTUAL DEMOCRACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial of February 25 on "Making Scholarship Attractive" strikes undoubtedly at the root of the whole matter. There are, to be sure, in college too many "spoiled, lazy boys"; nor can any one rightfully look for a remedy until, as you suggest, "our colleges themselves firmly assert the authority of intellectual interests." And yet true as both these statements are, they are likely to remain unheeded, because they fail to meet specifically the world of complexity that lies below the surface of any large university. Rigorous reform will probably result not from broad generalizations, but rather from a careful analysis of the various attitudes toward the student held by instructors the land over—obviously a colossal task. The slightest step in this direction, however, would reveal an alarming array of men who in one way or another are essentially opposed to making on the student more than shockingly lax demands; nominally they may stand for high standards of scholarship, but they lapse variously into indulgence.

With one class of such men, as I have observed them in two or three universities, I wish here to deal, for though they are relatively few in number their influence is, I am sure, disproportionately harmful. These are they, strangely enough, who desire to make knowledge human and attractive for the student; to be not only teachers but friends too. These are they, also, who all too plainly wag the tail when some "rich parasite" in passing gives them a smile—usually an ulterior smile, looking for future favors. These are they who find it far easier to be friends with the rich than with the poor. With them the student of only ordinary circumstances, or less, gets a square deal; and the student of wealth and social position does not—he gets more.

These are they who are indeed enthusiastic about this friendship game.

Truly, the little brothers of the rich on any faculty are a mighty foe to the traditional ideals of education. Instead of holding all students up to reputable work, they easily find reasons for making exceptions, being always scrupulously careful, however, to convince themselves by specious logic—even sophistry—that their reasons are cogent. It is largely due to the easing off processes of such men that an instructor is often confronted by a boy who refuses to buckle down to any prescribed task whatsoever—he has been led to believe that really to use his best intelligence on such a matter is bourgeois—or who essays without a blush to defend from a low mark a slovenly piece of his own handiwork, brain-work it is not. These men, too, are the kindergartners of the college, who maintain that a student, like a child, should be taught amusingly rather than by requiring him to give any severe attention. Whence, otherwise, those sullen, pampered faces which seem to say, on entering the classroom, "Well, now that you've got us here what are you going to do to make us happy?" All students deserve on occasions, of course, to be treated with the gentlest good humor; just as all students most of the time need fierce directness, if they are to grow. Teachers might well take the hint in this respect from the treatment accorded by coaches of athletic teams; the result would be more winning wits. The test should always be that a student is really applying his mind to the matter in hand. In this connection I recall the case of a boy who, when asked to write a composition embodying something learned in a college course, replied in a panic, "Oh, I couldn't." He was true to his word.

On the other side, let a good round note be blown for these very fellows whom men are trying to spoil. For experience convinces me that the majority of them, whenever they can break loose from the pampers, really delight in mental competition—just as they do in competition at games—and in a rough encounter of intellects. They often have virile, revolutionary ideas which they wish to test on an older, maturer judgment; they ask for no quarter, they demand only fair play. How stupid, then, how criminal of an instructor, when approached in this way, to waste time by feeling flattered, or by surreptitiously shifting the conversation to the boy's prominent people! I remember once hearing a captain of a crew rebuke an instructor by saying meekly, "I can talk about something else than rowing." Boys of any brains, no matter what their social position, are, as a rule, I believe, bored by this sort of attention and at heart give more respect to the teacher who maintains in his relations with them a strict intellectual democracy, showing partiality neither to the grind nor to the more leisurely disposed, and who, above all else, recognizes and tries to stimulate any eager, active mind.

Intellectual democracy, that, it seems to me, should be the rigid ideal of every teacher. In the undergraduate body, of course, there will always be exclusive clubs and the condescension of the great man to the little man, as in society at large. But

in the attitude of the instructor what student really desires to see any respecting of persons! Surely, not until it is weeded out will our colleges discharge the magnificent duty with which they are entrusted—to guide youths during their most formative years; to give flexibility and reach to their imaginations; to grant them an opulent chance, which your young men should always have, to see visions; to encourage in them mental correctives for the rougher and readier standards of the world outside. Just so long as intellectual democracy continues to be vitiated in the manner I have cited, just so long will this duty remain unfulfilled, and just so long shall we observe rich men's sons learning, even at college, the shifty ways of unfair influence.

HAROLD DE WOLF FULLER.

Cambridge, Mass., March 12.

THE UNDERGRADUATE POINT OF VIEW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In an editorial of February 25 on low standards of scholarship in the universities, the *Nation* laid a large part of the blame on the "benevolent gentlemen" whose easy courses are the sheltering fold of idlers.

While the existence of such professors and their damaging effect upon the students who elect their courses are not to be denied, yet it seems more likely that they are merely by-products of general conditions, rather than prime causes. Of course, they make it far easier for a determined loafer to keep his head above water for the specified four years, but it is too much to say that they produce loafers from new material, or that they exert any influence over those not idly inclined. If there were a general desire among the students to do effective and creditable work in college, and thereby prove their ability to do likewise in life, these kindly incompetents would lecture to empty seats, and their courses would die of malnutrition. They were called into being, and their continued existence is made possible by the presence of a large percentage of students who wish to coat themselves with the fashionable veneer of a college "education" with the least possible annoyance from such obsolete old fogies as Homer, Molière, or Newton.

The difficulty lies much deeper than the shortcomings of a few professors more charitable than wise, for it springs from the characteristic undergraduate point of view and standard of values. The ludicrous inaccuracy and distortion of student ideas of life and student judgment of men and things are perfectly well known, except in the one place, where such knowledge would be of use—among the students.

The undergraduate regards himself as a mature and important personage, who, for reasons of his own, has elected to live for a few years with some hundreds or thousands of personages almost as mature and important as himself, in a community where the conditions of life are as favorable as, and in some cases much more favorable than, those he has been accustomed to. The only drawback to this delightful scheme, with its great freedom from disciplinary restraint, lies in the fact that each of these communities is encumbered by a number of men, called the faculty, who are so far

advanced in age, or so biased in opinion, as to be utterly incapable of comprehending the ambitions of the full-blooded college man. As far as possible, the undergraduate ignores this superannuated body and applies himself with vigor and enthusiasm to the real affairs of life—the making of a team, the election to a club or fraternity, the acquisition of a reputation as a good fellow or a hard drinker, according to his tastes and talents—in short, to becoming a "big man" in some branch or other of the college activities. That expression "big man" nearly every one can remember having used at the boastful age when one dons his first trousers and scalps his sister's doll as a proof of manliness. "I'm not a baby, I'm a big man." Likewise, the undergraduate, "I'm not a callow boy with an unformed mind and a half-formed character, but I'm a big man with important matters on my mind."

Until the Almighty or President Wilson or somebody can make it plain to the student that what appears to be a big man from the campus point of view is really nothing but a small boy with an inflated ego, the "soft course" professor will still lecture to large and somnolent classes, and the undergraduate will continue to circulate noisily and violently in a sphere which approximates the mathematical definition of a point, "that which has position, but no magnitude." HERBERT JONES.

Princeton, N. J., March 10.

WORK FOR TARIFF REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: After an interval of twelve years, Congress has met to revise the tariff. This rare occasion makes the opportunity for the most effective work of a decade by the Tariff Reform Committee of the Reform Club. The essential conditions surrounding the present revision are novel. For the first time we have a vigorous tariff reduction movement originated by Republicans and manufacturers, and spreading in the party of "protection." This movement, quite naturally, is not in accordance with our views in important particulars, and is apparently not yet strong enough to control the revision; but it makes a serious division among the protectionists. In this clash a great deal of damaging truth about "protection" can be brought out and used to widen the breach. This situation permits of forcing the discussion of the whole tariff question, in Congress and before the people, practically free from considerations of party. This, in itself, is a long step toward the just settlement of the question.

Moreover, the imperative need of a great and prompt increase in the revenue now compels the party of "protection" to recognize the insufficiency of any tariff, and to consider various plans for more direct taxation, as well as for increasing revenue by reduction in certain rates of duty. This makes the opportunity to show, in Congress and out, and likewise without partisanship, the advantages of more direct taxation over tariff taxation.

Under these exceptional circumstances this committee can accomplish, by reason of its experience and connections, and at comparatively small expense, a great deal toward the final breaking down of the protective system, by supplying the most effective facts, figures, arguments, and sug-

gestions to members of Congress and newspapers. Persistent and intelligent work on our part now can accomplish in a few months results that ordinarily would be the work of years. We need at once several thousand dollars for carrying on the work which has been already begun. We can supply a large number of country newspapers with convincing information in the interest of the consumer, in plates which they are ready and willing to use, if we can meet the necessary expense, and we ought to carry on this service largely just now. We ask all interested, therefore, to send a liberal contribution, to the fund of the Tariff Reform Committee. Checks should be made payable to the order of Louis Windmuller, treasurer, Reform Club, No. 42 Broadway, New York.

BYRON W. HOLT, Chairman.

New York, March 18.

POSTPONING INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: So far as I have observed, no mention has been made in your columns or elsewhere of a simple solution of the inauguration question. A Constitutional amendment for so small a matter as a date would be almost "much ado about nothing." And yet the people want their pageant: certainly the tradesmen and hotels in Washington would miss it sorely. Why not adopt your plan for your proposed change of date to January 1, without any change of date at all? The President-elect shall take the oath in the Senate chamber without ceremony on March 4; but inauguration day shall be fixed for the last Wednesday of April or the first Wednesday of May.

This plan would make our inauguration correspond to the coronation of all monarchical nations. The new President's address on taking the oath, if any be needed, would be to Congress only, and his fuller declaration to the people would come all the better after two months in office.

WOLCOTT CALKINS.

Newton, Mass., March 12.

Notes.

The University of Chicago announces the following books as in press: "The Camerallists," by Albion W. Small; "English Poems: The Elizabethan and Caroline Periods," edited by Walter C. Bronson; "The Wars of Religion in France: The Huguenots, Catherine de' Medici, and Philip the Second, 1559-76," by James Westfall Thompson; "Christ and the Eastern Soul," by Charles Cuthbert Hall; "The Teachings of Jesus about the Future," by Henry Burton Sharman; "The Development of the Idea of Atonement," by Ernest D. Burton, John M. P. Smith, and Gerald B. Smith; and "Studies in Galilee," by Ernest W. G. Masterman.

Sir Leslie Stephen was almost as well known for his walking feats as for his literature, and it is an odd fact that his mountaineering book on "The Playground of Europe" has never been published in this country. Putnams, the regular publishers of Stephen's other work, are now making good this deficiency.