

sioned by the setting up a Printing-Press in Williamsburg." William Parks had carried on a printing office in Annapolis. On February 1, 1728, he made proposals to print a collection of the Laws of Virginia, but the volume did not appear until 1732. It is a copy of this which is to be sold at auction next week. Clayton-Torrence notes nine other copies. Gilbert's copy sold in 1873 for \$32.50 and Brinley's in March, 1880, for \$20.50.

Books and pamphlets on the Stamp Act and the Revolution; books on Masonry and Anti-Masonry; a collection of manuscripts relating to the Republic of Texas; Burk's "History of Virginia" (1804-16), with the scarce fourth volume; and an autograph letter signed of Daniel Boone are other lots included in this sale.

Correspondence.

THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION DEFENDED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have watched with great interest the discussions in your columns and elsewhere of the recent changes in regard to the award of pensions by the Carnegie Foundation, but I have looked in vain for any defence whatsoever of those changes. That there should have been some adverse criticism was inevitable, but that all enlightened criticism should have been hostile is astounding when one dispassionately considers the situation.

Certainly no one can doubt that it was the sincere wish of Mr. Carnegie to further the cause of higher education in this country. Some tentative plan for the distribution of the funds had to be mapped out, but to expect any plan to have anticipated from the start all unseen difficulties and dangers is certainly requiring too much of limited human powers. This the framers of the plan in their wisdom understood, and the right was reserved to make any changes that experience might prove necessary or desirable. This reservation was clearly stated at the outset, and any ignoring of it by teachers is inexcusable.

Now, after four years' trial, it appears that the plan as originally undertaken cannot be carried out. The pension list has suddenly grown enormously, owing to causes that one would least expect. If institutions are inclined to take advantage of the situation and to try to divert the gift from its original purpose to the solving of local difficulties of administration, if teachers individually are inclined to follow the letter of the rules without any regard to the spirit and to claim a share of the spoils, the Foundation is in honor bound to stop such procedure straightway in order to safeguard its high purpose. This it has now attempted to do by removing the cause inherent in Rule II. If the pension list must be kept within fixed bounds, if curtailment must come, the directors have undoubtedly thrown the burden where it can best be borne; that is, upon the younger and more able-bodied members of the teaching profession.

One hears much of the ethical question involved in the sudden change. Some even go so far as to declare that there has been a breach of faith on the part of the direc-

tors of the Foundation. It is quite possible that some teachers have made plans on the basis of the old rule, but since the Foundation has again reserved the right to deal with individual cases, we may rest assured that all worthy claimants will meet with justice. It was stated by the directors in the beginning that pensions were to be awarded only to professors in colleges on the accepted list, again with the reservation of the right to deal with worthy cases elsewhere. According to the last report of the President, more than one-third of the professors now drawing pensions are from colleges *not* on the accepted list. No one, however, seems to have raised the ethical question here. To be sure, I do not recall having seen anywhere a word of praise for this admirable generosity, but I assume that silence has not been due to disapproval. In case the directors had seen fit to change Rule II merely by substituting fifteen years for twenty-five years' service, would the ethical aspect have been emphasized by the critics?

Another criticism often seen is that the Foundation shows a tendency to meddle with college affairs and that it is not safe for such large powers of coercion to be vested in an outside body. To me this power of control seems destined to bring great pressure for good upon our present loose educational system. The Foundation evidently from the first recognized that the best and most lasting results could be obtained by starting with institutions themselves. The lack of any general supervision over our higher education has led to shameful abuse, and to our national disgrace "colleges" and "universities" have been allowed to spring up everywhere with full authority for conferring academic and professional degrees. If the Carnegie Foundation will continue boldly to point out what a true college standard of scholarship shall be, if by its efforts some institutions shall be induced to raise their present low standards and others be forced to unmask their blatant hypocrisy, if this much alone shall be accomplished by the Foundation, its efforts in the cause of education will not be in vain. We have long needed some fearless, disinterested body to point out abuses in our present system, and this has been done in an effective manner for four years by the Foundation. The President has not hesitated to comment on any unseemly practice, whether it be political corruption at the University of Oklahoma or vulgar advertising at Harvard. The annual reports summarize in masterly fashion the actual condition of things, and sound advice is there given by a skilled educator for the remedying of flagrant abuses. It is hard to see wherein the danger to true education lies, so long as the Foundation is supervised by such a body as the present directors.

G. C. SCOGGIN.

University of Missouri, March 21.

A TEST OF ORTHODOXY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Let me contribute to the discussion of sectarianism in colleges the enclosed list of theological test-questions recently submitted to a professor of ancient languages in one of the oldest denominational colleges in Pennsylvania. The orthodoxy alone of this particular teacher (who is not a

clergyman) had been called into question, and upon affirmative answers to these questions his further connection with the college was made to depend.

MORGAN BARNES.

Ojai Valley, Cal., March 12.

Dear Professor X—:

You are asked to give categorical answers to the following questions:

(1.) Do you accept as scriptural the doctrine concerning God as taught in the answers to the fifth and sixth questions of the Shorter Catechism?

(a) "There is but one only, the living and true God."

(b) "There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory."

(2.) Do you accept the testimony as to Christ's preexistence and oneness with God, as set forth in the Gospel according to John, and in Paul's letter to the Philippians? John 1:1-8; Phil. 2:5-10.

(3.) Do you accept as historical the record concerning Christ's human birth, as given in Matthew 1:18-25; Luke, 1:26-35; Luke 2:1-20?

(4.) Do you see in Jesus Christ not only the supreme revelation of God as through the highest and holiest of men, but view Him as God, "manifest in the flesh," as "the image of the invisible God," and "the effulgence of His Glory, and the very image of his substance," as set forth in the following Scripture: Timothy 3:16; Colossians 1:15-17; Hebrews 1:1-3?

(5.) Do you see in the life and death and resurrection and heavenly ministry of Christ God's method of redeeming humanity, and behold in the death of Christ the supreme sacrifice of love needed to bear away sin, and reconcile an estranged race unto God? 2 Cor. 5:18-21; Romans, 5:8-10.

(6.) Do you believe in the return to this earth of the exalted and glorified Saviour, who, according to His promise, will judge the living and the dead? Matthew 24:30-31; Matthew 25: 31-33.

ETYMOLOGY OF SLANG.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The volumes which have recently been added to the Century Dictionary contain (if the specimen sheets may be trusted) the following definition of the slang term *fan*:

[Said by some to be short for *fanatic*, but this implies a popular pronunciation fan-a-tic. Others associate the word with *fan!*, which has various slang uses.] One who is very enthusiastic on the subject of athletic sports, especially baseball; one who haunts baseball grounds and baseball games; a baseball "fiend." [Slang.]

In what is here said about the implied popular pronunciation of *fanatic*, the etymologist seems to assume the following general principle: In the formation of a slang term by abbreviation, the first syllable of the original word will be selected only in case such syllable is accented. I venture to question the validity of this principle, and offer as evidence the following list, mainly drawn from the student vocabulary:

Original.	Slang.
gymnasium	gym
fraternity	frat
preparatory	prep
psychology	psych
semester	sem
condition	con
professor	prof
barbarian	barb
οἱ πολλοί	poll
political economy	poly ec
plebeian	plebe
professional	pro
lieutenant	lieut
republicans	reps

I may add as collateral evidence, "Die"

for Diana, as in *Die Vernon*. "Con" and "Prof" may have arisen from the written forms, but this cannot be true of all of the terms cited.

FRED NEWTON SCOTT.

Ann Arbor, Mich., March 21.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To describe Jane Austen in her own style, may it not be said that her pre-eminent qualities are reality and rectitude? Not long since I was impressed by the fact that the author's name seemed to express these or related qualities with surprising definiteness. It is well known that in daily life generalization commonly proceeds upon an unconscious basis. So I endeavored to find the source of the suggestion. It occurred to me that it lies in the similarity of the name to the word "austere," of which Austen might be regarded as a sort of softened, feminine form.

The question naturally followed, how far are we thus influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the names of authors? That the name, at any rate, often contains the right suggestion is evidenced by the quizzical style of "Q.," the studiousness of Browning, the sombreness of Gray, the mildness of Lamb, the youthfulness of Suckling, the modesty of Lyly, the solidity of Dryden, the curiosity of Pepys, the subtle wit of Swift, the irony of Sterne, the madness of Chatterton, the commonsense of Johnson, the dictatorial mien of Pope, the rusticity of Cowper, the engaging style of Reade, the cumbrous weight of Drayton, the belligerency of Warburton, and the dreadful works of Strype.

ALBERT SCHUMAKER.

Leipzig, Germany, March 3.

GIBBON'S LIBRARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Edward Gibbon, according to his literary executor, Lord Sheffield, had the "damned, parson-minded idea of leaving his books to be sold." Beckford, the author of "Vathek," purchased them for £950—"to have something to read when I passed through Lausanne," he says. "I shut myself up for six weeks from early in the morning, until night, only now and then taking a ride. The people thought me mad. I read myself nearly blind. I made a present of the library to my physician" (Dr. Schöll). According to a note in the appendix to George Birkbeck Hill's edition of Gibbon's "Memoirs," p. 339, Dr. Schöll sold half of it to an Englishman named Halliday, living in Switzerland, who, in 1876, gave it to a gentleman in Geneva. "The other half," according to Mr. Hill, "was dispersed by sale, 500 volumes going to an American University."

Can any reader inform me what American university is referred to? If Gibbon made marginal comments like Macaulay, it would be interesting to ascertain his observations.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

University of Chicago, March 23.

Literature.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late Lord Acton, LL.D. Edited by A. W. Ward, Litt.D.; G. W. Prothero, Litt.D.; Stanley Leathes, M.A. Volume VI. The Eighteenth Century. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$4 net.

The volume of this great work which now lies before us appears as the last but one of the whole series, and covers, broadly speaking, the period from the Peace of Utrecht to the outbreak of the French Revolution. It overlaps Vol. V a little in respect of India, the story of which it takes up from the days of Bābar, as well as in respect of some of the minor European countries. There are in it twenty-four chapters, the composition of twenty-four writers, some of whom, however, contribute more than one chapter, while some contribute only a part of a chapter, so that it is not a case of a different writer for each chapter. Six writers belong to the European Continent—Professors Daniels, Michael, and Höttsch, who are Germans; Professors Schollenberger and Hubert, who are Swiss, and M. Lemoine, who is French. Several appear in the series for the first time. The best known to the historical world of the United States are Sir Alfred Lyall, Dr. Adolphus W. Ward, Messrs. Armstrong and A. L. Smith of Oxford University, the late Mr. R. Nisbet Bain of the British Museum Library, and Mr. Dunlop, whose long-continued labors in the melancholy field of Irish history have had less general recognition than they deserve. All the chapters are done in the same thorough and business-like way to which we have become accustomed in previous volumes of the series; and in all there is the usual, or perhaps an even greater, abstention from any decorative embellishment of the plain unvarnished facts. Some of these chapters, however, along with the merit of a lucid and carefully exact narrative, present a philosophic appreciation of the forces at work and a discriminating judgment of the characters of the principal historical figures which make them interesting reading. We have nowhere met with a better account, in a concise form, of the policy and personal traits of the Empress Catherine the Second of Russia, than that given here by Professor Höttsch.

No part of the volume is better done than the few pages in which Sir Alfred Lyall sketches the history of the Moghul Empire in India, singling out its conspicuous features and touching on the characters of the Emperors Bābar and Akbar, with a graphic terseness which makes us wish that he had written a history of this remarkable Asiatic dominion, instead of only one section in a chapter. The experiment

made in allotting the career of the elder William Pitt (Lord Chatham), to a German professor, is justified by the intelligent grasp which Dr. Wolfgang Michaels shows both of Pitt's character and of the political situation in England as well as of the state of Europe generally, in the middle of the eighteenth century. The remainder of the chapter, which carries English political history down to 1793, although done with care, seems to want breadth in its presentation of the main currents; for the general features are lost in detailing ministerial changes and party intrigues.

But the most interesting parts of the volume are those which bring on the scene the three leading figures—so far as general European politics are concerned—of the eighteenth century, viz., Frederick II of Prussia, the Emperor Joseph II, and the Empress Catherine II of Russia. Each has a type of character so far from usual in monarchs that it may be described as being among the most striking features of the eighteenth century. These sovereigns were all reformers, in some directions even zealous reformers, ahead of their time; and for that reason just the persons whom the time needed. Each of them had able ministers, but each was abler than any of those ministers, and far more enlightened than the nobility which surrounded their thrones. How much reform there was in the atmosphere of that time appears in the fact that one discovers the propensity even in second or third-rate monarchs, such as Leopold of Tuscany, afterwards the Emperor Leopold the Second, in Stanislas Poniatowski of Poland, and in Christian VI of Denmark, not to mention the far more remarkable Gustavus the Third of Sweden. All these rulers, and notably the last, as well as the first three, were heartily autocratic. With reforms looking towards a more popular government, they had no sort of sympathy. If they had needed any justification for their despotic attitude, they could have found it in the fact that political liberty would, in the first instance at least, have retarded reforms of the administrative and economic order. The nobility was everywhere hostile to any curtailment of its privileges; the masses of the people were unprepared for power, though already becoming restless, and showing by insurrections here and there throughout Europe their growing discontent.

To one who reviews the century as a whole, down to 1789, three things stand out, as giving it a character of its own. The first is the decay of that ancient organization of society, both legal and economic, which had come down comparatively little changed from the Middle Ages. The old privileges of the nobles, the old serfdom among the masses, the old systems of local government in cities and rural areas, were antiquat-