

fect of their labors upon recent political history. Take New York. We need only remember how large a share in the overthrow of Tammany has been played by the entire complex of problems that is called up when we speak of the East Side. We have there the issue of poverty upon which corrupt politics battens, of vice which politics traffics in and protects, of overcrowding, of underschooling, of police neglect and police tyranny among the immigrant populations. This East Side which has displayed the moral forces that have swung elections, was largely discovered and made part of the common body politic through the efforts of the college settlements, the college investigators, the college cranks of every kind, who stir our disillusioned organs of public opinion to such high merriment.

Take Mayor Gaynor's Administration, with its record of fine achievement and still finer promise, and see how it is thoroughly permeated with, and based upon, the ideals that abide in the amateur college type of mind. It is not only that men have been appointed to high administrative office who have been closely identified with the movement towards a progressive and socially humane democracy, such men as Stover in the Park Department, or Murphy in the Tenement House Department, or Lederle at the head of the Board of Health; but even in so dry-as-dust a department as Finance, the good old methods of the practical politician are being thrown over in favor of the sane principles of bookkeeping and housekeeping worked out and popularized by a handful of college men engaged in the study of decent municipal government. Subway construction, school building, playground development are now gone at in the belief that the city is made for the well-being and happiness of its people, and not of the politicians. And that sentiment of the "people" in the city is largely the product of a campaign of education carried on by college men. Here, then, is a class of unofficial statesmanship which is coming to count more and more in our political life, and which the college is entitled to cite on its side of the question.

We have spoken of college men. We need only recall how large a place the college woman occupies in the field of social service to recognize how many

women have surmounted their suffrage disqualifications and had their share in shaping political life in a great city.

PHILANTHROPY AND POWER.

It appears from recent developments that the great philanthropic foundation designed by Mr. Rockefeller will be made the subject of serious deliberation before it receives its charter from Congress. To say that this is as it should be does not by any means imply an attitude of unfriendliness toward the spirit or purpose of the gift. Mr. Rockefeller, whatever may be true of his methods of getting, has shown in his giving a sense of responsibility for the proper use of his magnificent opportunities that is worthy of all praise. In planning a permanent organization that would continue after his death to exercise the same kind of judgment in the expenditure of millions for educational and philanthropic purposes which he or his agents have been exercising now for many years, we have no doubt that he is animated by the sole desire to make his vast fortune productive of the greatest possible amount of good. But to apportion praise or blame is not the only function of public opinion in such matters, and it is no part of the business of Congress in the premises. The nation is called upon not merely, or mainly, to appraise motives, but to estimate consequences.

The Rockefeller Foundation stands out from among all the great benevolent foundations of the past by the combination of an almost boundless scope with enormous resources. The amount of the latter is not known, but it is safe to say that they will far surpass those of any other philanthropic foundation thus far launched in the world, with the possible exception of the Baron de Hirsch fund. But the comprehensiveness of scope, the indefiniteness of purpose, is far more distinctive of the proposed Foundation than is its probably colossal magnitude. The funds to which it invites comparison present in this respect a striking contrast to it. The Rhodes scholarship fund, for instance, is devoted to the prosecution of a single well-defined educational purpose. The Carnegie Institution has for its object the promotion of research. The Carnegie Foundation was, on its face, designed for an even more strictly limited purpose, its object being to im-

prove the conditions under which the profession of college and university teaching is carried on. The Russell Sage Foundation is laid out on very broad lines, and the idea underlying it was a real innovation in the field of philanthropic effort; yet the purpose of it is quite specific. It is an agency designed to investigate the conditions that produce and surround poverty, and to promote the improvement of those conditions, directly or indirectly. The Baron de Hirsch fund involves a vast field of choice as to means, but its aim is specific enough. The General Education Board, magnificently endowed by Mr. Rockefeller, was a step in the direction of this new foundation, but it was confined to the field of education, and has been doing its work by systematic aid to existing institutions. The new Foundation goes far beyond any of its predecessors in point of indefiniteness and elasticity.

Of course, it is precisely this elasticity that constitutes the distinctive merit of the proposed foundation; looking to the long future, it allows for the unlimited possibilities of change in human conditions and human needs. But admirable as is the purpose thus held in view—the purpose of doing in each generation what in that generation most needs doing—the fact cannot be blinked that the lodging of such great discretionary power in a self-perpetuating body controlling a vast fund raises serious questions. It is true that Congress is to have power to amend or annul the charter; but there may be broad questions of policy which it is easier to decide aright before the charter is granted than to insist upon in future years in the face of established influences. And the main questions suggested, as it seems to us, are, first, whether there are any limitations of power that ought to be made from the start, and that may not be made in the charter as proposed; and, secondly, whether some other form of organization than that of a self-perpetuating body should not be demanded. The first question bristles with difficulties, to be sure; for experience shows how wide may be the actual scope of an institution's influence, even when its ostensible activity is limited to a narrow range. The Carnegie Foundation is exercising—in the main with great wisdom, thus far, we feel sure—a power over our educational institutions

that probably nobody suspected it would even attempt to wield, and that nobody can deny is capable of producing injurious consequences; and if a fund whose only weapon is the power to exclude a college from the benefits of its pension system can essay such a part, what limits can we hope to set upon the possible exercise of influence by such an institution as the Rockefeller Foundation, upon a thousand phases of the national life?

But the more difficult the problem of any effective limitation of power, the more serious becomes the question of the personal control of the Foundation. Can there not be found a more wholesome, a safer, method of organizing this great social force than that which would place it in the hands of a self-perpetuating body, the original members of which are the personal representatives of the donor? The answer will naturally occur that just this has been done, over and over again, in the case of our colleges and universities, without objection and, indeed, with explicit approval. But it must be remembered that, however complete in form may be the power of the trustees of a university, they are in fact constrained to act within fairly well-defined lines. They are subject, in the first place to the influence of the standard and traditions of the whole body of like institutions in the country and in the world at large; and, secondly, there arises inevitably, in the course of time, a body of alumni, whose power to make their views felt is always demonstrated sooner or later. No such agencies exist to limit the powers or to direct the energies of the men in control of such an institution as the proposed Rockefeller Foundation. With its undefined possibilities of influence upon the general welfare, would it not be wiser to have its management chosen—if not at the beginning, then as vacancies arise in the future—by men representing in some definite way the great permanent interests of the whole nation? Out of such institutions as the Presidency of the United States, the Supreme Court, the presidencies of our leading universities, and others that might be mentioned, would it not be possible to fix upon a little group of electors for the filling of vacancies as they arise? And would not the placing of the Foundation upon a basis of this kind be the best proof the founder could give of large-mindedness and of singleness of purpose?

NEWS FOR BIBLIOPHILES.

No collectors are more eager nowadays than the buyers of views of Old New York, and on the evenings of March 22 and 23 the Anderson Auction Co. of this city will hold a very timely sale of the Neill collection. The series known as Bourne's Views, mostly from drawings by C. Burton, published in 1831; Davis and Imber's Views (1827); Milbert's lithographs (1825); early copperplates from the *Columbian Magazine*; early aquatints; interesting folding panoramas, and many views of business buildings on Broadway, and other sheets are included. In all the catalogue contains 433 lots.

A selection of duplicates from the library of Hon. Daniel B. Fearing of Newport, R. I. will be sold by the Merwin-Clayton Sales Co. on March 22 and 23. Mr. Fearing has been bringing together books on angling and kindred subjects for many years, and his collection is now, without doubt, the finest in the country. He was the largest buyer at the John G. Hecksher sale a year ago. Among the books in the sale are Brown's "American Angler's Guide" (1845); Pierce Egan's "Sporting Anecdotes" (1845); Houghton's "British Fresh-Water Fishes" (1879), and several editions of Walton's "Complete Angler," including Pickering's famous first edition (1836) and the very rare German edition printed in Hamburg in 1859, the greater part of which was destroyed by fire.

On March 24 and 25 the same firm will sell portions of the library of George Luff of New York, including a complete set of H. H. Bancroft's historical writings, 39 vols.; Daniel Webster's set of Sander-son's "Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence," 9 vols.; the first edition of La Peyrouse's "Voyage autour du Monde," 4 vols. (1797); New York Colonial Laws (1752), printed by James Parker, and (1789) printed by Hugh Gaine; Stedman's "Narrative of a Five Years' Expedition against the Revolted Negroes of Surinam" (1806), with colored plates, several of which were engraved by William Blake and others by Bartolozzi; Haywood's "Civil and Political History of Tennessee" (1823); books on the Revolution, Indians, and New York, travels in the West, etc.

On March 22 and 23 C. F. Libbie & Co., in Boston, will sell the library of the late Joseph Stickney of Concord, N. H. Several very rare New England imprints are offered: Thomas Shepard's "Eye Salve" (1673); Hubbard's "Happiness of a People in the Wisdom of Their Rulers" (1676); Samuel Wakeman's "Young Man's Legacy to the Rising Generation" (1673), and his "Sound Repentance the Right Way to Escape Deserved Ruine" (1685). A long set of New Hampshire Registers (1772-1888), New Hampshire Laws and Reports; Genealogies, Confederate publications, and American newspapers are included.

On March 22 Stan. V. Henkels, in Philadelphia, holds a sale of autograph letters and historical documents. A letter written by John Hancock to Elbridge Gerry dated "Lexington 18 April, 1775 9 o'clock evening," beginning "I am much oblig'd for your Notice, it is said the officers are gone Concord Road, & I will send word thither," seems to show that the route of the British troops was known, and that there was no

necessity for hanging signal lanterns in the tower of the Old North Church, or for Paul Revere's "Midnight Ride." There are important letters by Signers of the Declaration, Gens. Washington, Charles Lee, Greene, Steuben, Lafayette, Robert Howe, Wayne, and others, a curious manuscript by Thomas Paine, complaining of Washington's treatment of him, etc.

On March 28 and 29 the same auctioneer will sell the third part of the library of the late Clarence H. Clark, including the collections on art, archaeology, engraving, and bibliography. Audsley's "Ornamental Arts of Japan," Audsley and Bowes's "Keramic Art of Japan," Gonse's "L'Art japonais," Owen Jones's "Alhambra," Lord Kingsborough's "Antiquities of Mexico," Nash's "Mansions of England," and Silvertre's "Paléographie universelle," are important works with colored plates. Mr. Clark's copy of the "Description de l'Egypte," 20 vols. folio, the great work prepared by the French savants who accompanied Napoleon to Egypt, was a presentation set from Louis Philippe, and each volume bears a presentation inscription stamped upon the binding. Several of William Loring Andrews's books are included, among them his rarest publication, the catalogue of his collection of Aldines, published in 1885, and limited to fifty copies.

Correspondence.

SHAKESPEARE'S SIGNATURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Supplementing the article in the March number of *Harper's Magazine*, "Shakespeare as a Man among Men," I may add a word with reference to the spelling and pronunciation of his name. For a century the orthography has been a perennial subject of debate. The whole question should be referred for settlement to the contemporary pronunciation and the calligraphic means of phonetic representation, a central point which has not generally been taken into account in discussions of Shakespeare's handwriting. The new signature may contribute its quota of aid in the solution. To those not familiar with manuscripts of Shakespeare's time, it is difficult to understand a system of spelling which, at first sight, seems systemless. We have so standardized and stereotyped our modern spelling and are so accustomed to regarding as ignorant any one who varies from accepted standards, that we are inclined at once to call the irregular orthography of three centuries ago likewise ignorant. But a scientific analysis on the basis of phonetic representation would show that their modes of spelling were not more ignorant or less ignorant than our own or those of the Anglo-Saxons, their ancestors. The art of printing and the training of eye and ear had not yet brought the world under the rule of uniformity of sound representations. Scribes attempted mainly to represent the oral utterances by characters that, when pronounced, seemed true records of the sound of the voice. That is they, as all Teutonic races for centuries had done, spelled phonetically.

Since one sound or a combination of sounds was represented sometimes by two