

peraments. Affections of the larynx meet with rapid relief under the influence of these soothing waters. The learned Dr. Rotureau has called attention to the similarity of the Royat waters to those of Ems, both in their marked curative action in this class of diseases and in their chemical composition. Royat is, in fact, the French Ems, with the advantage of a better climate and pleasanter surroundings, and of a spring—the Saint-Victor—which is a powerful tonic.

2. Arthritic affections, as gout, rheumatism, and the eczema that goes with the rheumatic diathesis. For these, at the outset, the stronger waters of Vichy or of Carlsbad are preferable, when the disease occurs in well-nourished and plethoric subjects: such should not go to Royat. But in asthenic subjects, or in the more advanced chronic stages of these complaints in any case, the waters of Royat are invaluable. The great point in prescribing treatment for this class of disease, a class in itself so varied and complicated, is to recognize the pathologic complications, and not to be led away by a name. One case of gout may require the utmost energies of a Carlsbad treatment, with all its austerities of regimen; another, occurring in a different constitution or at a different phase of its development, may much better be sent to Royat.

But of all the arthritic manifestations which are best adapted to treatment in this Vale of Tempe, those ailments which Bazin has named the *arthritides* must take the foremost place. They represent, so to speak, the youth, the maturity, and the ripened age of the gouty diathesis. To the first class belong the light attacks of urticaria and of herpes, which seldom require treatment, being briefly self-limited in their course. The second class comprises dry eczema; of the third the catalogue is long, ill-omened, and ill-sounding—nummular eczema, acne, syccosis, squamous pityriasis, and psoriasis—from each and all of which Mercury forefend rather than relieve us! But for those who are taken in their clutches the springs of Royat, patiently exhibited both within and without, are the nearest thing to an appointed cure.

3. The whole class of chloro-anæmic affections is satisfactorily treated by the iron springs of Royat, in conjunction with bathing, riding, rambles, and all the other gently reconstituent influences of this charming place. Royat is an almost certain cure for ailments which come from impoverished blood. The César and the Saint-Victor Springs, according to the special need, the baths in the "living waters" of the Eugénie—these never fail to bring relief to the sufferer from anæmia, from chlorosis, and from the attendant nervous depressions or exhaustions. Royat, like Bussang in the Vosges, is especially adapted to the reconstruction of the blood globules, and consequently to the cure of the delicate women who have succumbed to the wear and tear of life, or whose health has been run down by the fatigues of pleasure, social or other; whose bank account of red globules, in short, has been hazardously reduced by drafts and insufficiently repaired by deposits. The alkaline and saline principles in these waters stimulate the appetite and favor digestion; the assimilable ferruginous salts give their plastic qualities to the impoverished blood; and the abundant carbonic acid of the baths acts as a useful stimulant upon the capillary network of the skin. Uterine troubles caused by the anæmic condition, and all forms of dyspepsia which depend upon nervous derangements—and they are not a few—find also in Royat their place of healing. Gastralgia, acid dyspepsia in nervous subjects, and atonic dyspepsia dependent upon anæmia, are relieved at least by these waters, and not infrequently cured.

It must be borne in mind that a patient may leave Royat cured, but, by returning to a faulty

habit of living, may relapse into his old ailment. For such sufferers there are two courses: either to change the habit of living or to come annually—as some do—to the springs. I need not say that the prevention of such relapses is preferable to their cure, even at such an attractive station as this.

It remains to add a word about the way of living at Royat. First may be mentioned the hotels: they are numerous, handsome, and well managed, as far as my experience of them goes. At the "Grand Hôtel" I found perfect comfort and courtesy, and a magnificent view of the Limagne plain. The "Continental," the "Splendide," and the "Hôtel des Sources" are also good.

Next come the "villas" and boarding-houses, where families who wish comparative privacy without any cares of housekeeping may find stylish rooms and a good table. The visitor who goes to the villas Beausite, Dourif, De la Grotte, Tiretaine, or Allaire, or to the Châlet des Roses, will not go wrong. And, finally, there are a number of *maisons meublées* and *garnies*, where families can hire furnished rooms and choose their own table, or have their marketing and cooking done for them. This independent form of *ménage* is, for many, the pleasantest way for a long sojourn. There are some twenty of these houses, one of which is kept by the sisters of the *religieuses dominicaines*.

I must not close without mentioning the learned inspector of the waters of Royat, Dr. Boucomont, and his younger colleague in medicine, Dr. A. Petit, to both of whom I am greatly indebted for lavish courtesies. It cannot be out of place to say that they occupy the first rank as consulting physicians. TITUS MUNSON COAN.

## Correspondence.

### DR. WALDSTEIN AND THE METOPE OF THE PARTHENON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: M. Reinach's letter, which appeared in *The Nation* of April 29, concerning your review of my book on Pheidias, calls for some explanation. For the first time my attention is drawn to the discussions which took place at the Société des Antiquaires of Paris in the autumn of 1882, from which it becomes evident that the authorities of the Louvre Museum realized the importance of the marble head, and recognized that it held some relation to the Parthenon, before I discovered the metope to which it belongs and published my discovery. I owe to M. Reinach this (to me new) information on a subject in which I am much interested. These discussions were first published in the *Bulletin* of that society in 1883, after I had published my discovery in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* in 1882, and, as will be seen, they arose in consequence of my publication. Why I could take no notice of the facts mentioned in these reports will become evident from what follows.

In the Christmas of 1881-2 I visited the Louvre Museum. I then noticed the head in question in its temporary position, and identified it as described in my publications. I expressed my conviction that, if the provenance was known, it would be found to be Attica. I consulted M. de Villefosse in his office at the Museum and asked him for information. He referred to the books of the Museum and gave me the information I have published, namely, that the head came from the Peiræus and nothing more. At my request he opened the case containing the head, so that I might examine it more closely. Neither then nor at any other time was I told that any person suspected or knew that the head belonged to the

metopes of the Parthenon. I asked the authorities of the Museum for a cast of the head, which was promised, but it was not until several months later that, through the kind exertions of M. de Villefosse, the cast was procured and sent to England, and I was thus enabled to find the actual metope in the British Museum of which this head forms a part. My discovery was announced by Mr. C. T. Newton in the *Academy* of August 26, 1882, and shortly after this my paper describing the whole discovery (by the way, an abstract of the essay as it stands in the book, handed in to the press and printed in the summer of 1882) was published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* in the autumn of 1882.

From the *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires* published early in 1883 I learn the following facts:

(1.) In the meeting of October 18, 1882, M. Read brings before the Society several papers of mine, among them the article describing the identification of the Louvre head, and makes complimentary remarks on my discoveries.

(2.) In the next meeting of November 8, 1882, M. de Villefosse refers to the report of the previous meeting, at which he had not been present, and, without denying my discovery, he begs to state that the authorities of the Museum had not underestimated the importance of the work, and in proof of his statement he quotes the minutes of a meeting of the Comité Consultatif des Musées (held in 1880), in which there is a list of works, and, under the heading *Marbres grecs et principalement attiques*, there occurs *une tête d'homme: style des métopes du Parthénon*.

(3.) In the following meeting (Nov. 22) Prof. Rayet observes that the minutes of the Conservatoire du Louvre do not authorize the administration of the Louvre to claim priority of the discovery made by me; and M. de Villefosse answers that he did in no way deny my discovery (*qu'il n'a en aucune façon contesté la découverte de M. Waldstein*); but that he wished personally to remark that the authorities of the Museum had bought the head because they considered it as having come from the Parthenon.

I am pleased to know and to state the fact that the authorities of the Louvre Museum bought the head as being related to the Parthenon marbles. But from 1879 to the publication of my discovery this opinion was followed up neither by further research and publication, nor by manifest action. For the head was not placed in the Greek room of the Louvre, where there is an original metope of the Parthenon, but remained in a case in a different part of the building, unlabelled. Furthermore, upon inquiry, I was not informed of its relation to the Parthenon. Your reviewer, as far as he was considering my discovery, was thus correct in crediting me with the identification of a head which lay undistinguished in the Louvre. Had I known of these discussions at Paris, which were subsequent to my publication in the *Hellenic Journal*, I might have referred to them in my book, though the essay in question was in print before the publication of the *Bulletin* in 1883. As all readers will know, it is beyond the power of any investigator to read all the abstract reports of the meetings of foreign societies embracing the most varied subjects of study. Though at the very time of the discussions in 1882 I was, as I have been for several years past and still am, in friendly correspondence with M. de Villefosse, who has referred to my discoveries and has sent me *tirages à part* of his papers, he never sent me an account of the meetings referred to, nor alluded to the facts discussed. I can only believe that he wished not to trouble me with this kind of question, now forced upon us by the zeal of M. Reinach. In my book I have on several occasions merged my own claims to independent discovery

where any doubt might have arisen, in order to avoid the possibility of a discussion of priority; for I feel strongly that discussions of this class are most detrimental to the spirit of scientific investigation, and to the maintenance of dignity on the part of those concerned in it. I regret it the more in this case as I am apparently put into opposition with men (M. de Villefosse and M. Heuzey) to whom I stand in personal relations of the most friendly nature; who, moreover, in their official capacity, have ever shown me the greatest liberality.

There is one point against which I wish to protest. M. Reinach's view, that such discoveries as I have had the good fortune to make imply a corresponding ignorance on the part of the directors of a museum, endangers the progress of research. As a director of a museum myself, I should deem it a great misfortune if, in my dealings with investigators working in the Museum of which I have charge, I should be forced to believe that every discovery they make would in so far prove my own deficiency in acuteness. Libraries and museums and their treasures might then become less accessible to researchers, if they were presided over by custodians who were inclined to be less liberal-minded than the authorities of the Louvre have proved themselves to be in their dealings with myself. Surely, men like M. de Villefosse and M. Heuzey have given sufficient proof of their sound scholarship without being endangered in their reputation by not anticipating all that may be discovered concerning the many thousands of objects in their care.

I must finally draw attention to the last paragraph in M. Reinach's letter. The essay on the Louvre terracotta was written and printed long before the facts were discovered which necessarily modified the whole question. Two courses were then open to me: I might rewrite the essay embodying the new information, or leave it as it stood and append the new material. I chose the latter course; because, first, it was more honest, and, second, it promised to be more conducive to the solution of the questions discussed. I thus clearly give the history of my own discoveries, enabling other researchers to follow me step by step, and putting them in as favorable a position for the future task as my own, arrived at through considerable labor and study. This is done in note F, which is not a mere footnote, as, from M. Reinach's letter, the reader might possibly suppose, but consists of eleven pages of print with a plate. What is now wanted is not a summary statement of personal opinion, but a careful examination of the varied material which I have adduced, and if possible the discovery of new facts and data upon which, perhaps, a final conclusion may be based. This final consummation no one can more warmly desire than I do; and no one will be more grateful to him who really brings it to pass.

CHAS. WALDSTEIN.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, May 18, 1886.

#### GOVERNMENT AND THE RAILROADS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The annual report of the Union Pacific Railroad Company would hardly be classed as a political document, yet none more eloquent in matter has been issued this year. It could hardly be expected that the directors should state the conclusion to which their argument leads, but what that conclusion is, we will let the argument state for itself:

"Nothing connected with the present condition of the affairs of this company has, during the past year, excited so much anxiety among its stockholders as the relations between it and the United States Government."

It seems that no question between the parties can ever be regarded as settled. Committees of investigation or officials appointed for the pur-

pose are constantly taking up anew every claim against the company, no matter how solemnly it has been decided. As the report says, "There is no corporation in the world the affairs of which, during the last sixteen years, have been subject to such incessant searching and wearisome investigation as the affairs of the Union Pacific Railroad Company." The effect is, that many operations which promised great profit have been passed by on account of this fear of Government interference.

"Neither, the directors regret to say, do they, in these respects, see any immediate prospect of a better condition of affairs. Those familiar with the subject are well aware that such resolutions as the one above-quoted almost always originate in stock-jobbing circles. The Government is used as a lever to put prices up or down on the Stock Exchange. During the intervals between the sessions of Congress the situation is comparatively free from difficulty. Events are then allowed to take their ordinary course, and your property is managed, like other properties, on well-understood business principles. Meanwhile, in anticipation of each meeting of Congress, schemes of a stock-jobbing nature are quietly, though with infinite skill, matured. The departments and Congress are then worked upon to accomplish the object."

"The directors by no means imply that officers of departments or members of Congress knowingly permit themselves to be used to affect values, but [for reasons given] they fail to realize what serious consequences may follow measures instigated by adroit men, whose schemes they do not suspect and cannot be expected therefore to fathom."

In other words, in this as in all other respects, the Government is really controlled by the lobby.

For this state of things, according to the report, "there is but one remedy"—that, instead of a percentage of its earnings the Company should liquidate its indebtedness to the Government in fixed payments extending over a term of years. To this proposition I should take two exceptions: (1) it is not a sufficient remedy; and (2) there is another remedy which might be made much more effectual. In the first place, the remedy is defective because it cannot be carried out. If the lobby finds its profit in stock fluctuations caused by its schemes, it will strenuously oppose any measure calculated to put a stop to those schemes. I suppose nobody imagines that the settlement proposed by the Union Pacific Railroad Company has any chance of passing Congress at this session, and there is not much risk in predicting that year after year will continue to pass with the same result. Moreover, if it were passed, it would not be a final settlement any more than those which have preceded it. It would still be open to the lobby to charge that the policy pursued by the Company was endangering the security of its payments to the Government; and every new branch opened, every new change in the system of rates, and a hundred other items might furnish the pretext for just such attacks as are complained of in the report. The question is, however, far wider than the single case of the Union Pacific. That is only one of many of these gigantic corporations which are getting far beyond State control, but lie at the mercy of Congress under its power to regulate inter-State commerce. Suppose that Congress, under the stimulus of the lobby, should enter upon a course of experiments like those of the "Grangers" some years ago, should try to fix a maximum and a minimum of rates to prevent discrimination, and to regulate mutual encroachment on territory, with the accompanying apparatus of investigating committees: what a paradise of stock-jobbers presents itself to the imagination!

The only real remedy is that which corresponds to the real difficulty, government by the lobby. Mr. Gladstone, in one of his recent speeches, thanked God that the House of Commons was the place of the greatest publicity in the world. It is not very extravagant to say that, barring

governments like Turkey and Russia, Washington is one of the most secret places in the world. It is the secrecy and irresponsibility of the committee-rooms which give to the lobby its power. That business should be dragged out of the committee-rooms into the publicity of the two houses; that there should be responsible heads of administration open to public cross-examination by individual members; that all the springs of administration, and every interference, whether by members of Congress or any outside interest, with the course of administration, should be laid bare to public criticism and condemnation—this is the only effective remedy for the evils set forth in the Union Pacific report and many others of the same class. Of course the lobby will fight this; like every measure contrary to their interests; but it has the advantage of presenting the simple issue whether this Government is to be carried on in the interest of the lobby or in that of the country. As your correspondent "F. G. S." well observes, it is not a question of establishing a responsible ministry after the English fashion, with resignation upon defeat, and dissolution of Congress at irregular intervals, but merely of the passage of the Pendleton Senate report of 1881, giving to the Cabinet officers seats in both houses, with the right of sharing in debate and the duty of answering questions; or of Mr. Long's bill of this year, making the same provision with regard to the House of Representatives alone. There is no common interest so complete and so urgent for all the great railroads of the country, if they wish to save themselves from stock-jobbing and blackmailing schemes by or through the Government, as to unite their efforts for the passage of these bills.

G. B.

BOSTON, May 20, 1886.

#### TWO SOLVENTS OF THE LABOR TROUBLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: If the laborers and the capitalists of this country (and the two classes together comprise the entire public, since almost everybody is either employer or employed, or both) could be practically recalled to a fundamental truth of political economy, one of the two indispensable solvents of our recurring labor troubles would be put into operation at once. I say two solvents, because there are no others of any relevancy or efficiency whatever. The first is that employers and employed recognize the simple fact that the transaction between them is pure buying and selling. There are no moral elements involved, no obligations on either side, except those underlying ones implied in all buying and selling, namely, that each party is bound to render in good faith just what has been previously bargained for in the trade.

The employer buys a service of a certain grade and quality, and sells a return service reckoned in money as wages, and the employed buys this return service and sells his own personal service against it; and each party is bound in common sense and common justice to do what he has agreed to do. That is all there is of it. All the preachers and all the philanthropists and all the master-workmen in the world cannot add to or detract from the essentials of this transaction one iota. It is just exactly in every particular of it as it is with the buyer and seller of commodities on the street and of credits in the Stock Exchange.

There is no compulsion and no obligation in buying and selling, and there is only one kind of it, and the motive on the part of both parties to it is forever the same, namely, to get something of more consequence to him than that which is given. Each buyer is at the same instant a seller, and each seller the same instant a buyer. Both

are on a level of perfect equality as persons, as individuals; and that man, whoever he is, is blind to his own interest as well as to the inmost nature of trade, who binds himself down to act only in conjunction with others in buying and selling. So doing, he scales down his own individuality. He loses his chief motive to make his own service the best possible, and so the chance to get the most for it. He sinks down to an average. He degrades himself to a herd, whether it be of employers or employed. And as the personality goes down, the illusion that *things* are the main element rises before the mind and confuses everything. The word "wealth," with its concrete and material associations, which has wrought a thousand mischiefs in political economy, is working untold mischief to-day in the minds of labor-givers and labor-takers. As they look at it, "wealth" is something that exists whether or no, something that can be divided up; something to be snatched after; something that all have a claim to; and hence legislation is appealed to to control the distribution, arbitrators must be created to look after the shares falling to each party, and Most and his crew, finding themselves out of supplies, makê a dash at society itself for not furnishing them a living.

Political economy is a science of persons, not of things. It deals only with the desires and the efforts of men, and the satisfactions and returns for these. It insists that all trade, whether in tangible commodities, in personal services, or in commercial credits, is of one and the same nature; that trade is buying and selling, which is naturally profitable and ought to be free; that laborers are buyers and sellers in precisely the same sense as merchants are, and are as capable of attending to their own interests, man by man; that every seller has the right to get the most he can for his service under all circumstances—that is to say, to render the least of his own service needful at the time to get the service of the other man; that God ordained to be proper and profitable this mutual exchange of services among men; that no persons in the world except the parties themselves, man to man, have the wisdom to dictate its terms; and that, consequently, legislation, arbitration, combination, compulsion, ordering-out, strikes, and boycotts are each and all a fundamental impertinence.

Only when a traffic is clearly contrary to the public health, morals, or revenue, has legislation one word to say about it.

It is plain, then, that if employers and employed realized as they should that they are buyers and sellers only, man against man, nothing less and nothing more, our labor troubles would be at least one-half solved.

The second solvent, and the only other possible one, is to allow their natural markets, wherever found, to all the producers in this land. Laborers and capitalists are alike producers, joint producers, partners in production, and joint owners of the products. But products must have their markets, or the processes are a failure. A market for products is products in market. Therefore, if we would sell at a profit all that we can make or grow with all our laborers employed and all our capital invested in productive enterprises, we must necessarily admit freely all foreign products that want to come in, in order that these may take off at a profit—that is, pay for—all our domestic products that want to go out. To open our ports is nothing in the world but to find our natural and profitable markets. There is no other way to find them. There is no other way to get them. And the blessed thing about it is that there is no ghost of a rational objection to this way. I have been looking diligently for thirty years to see if I could discover any valid objection of any kind to our selling our surplus products to other people at a profit—that is, to

our buying their products with our own products at a profit—and I have not gained, as yet, a glimpse of any such objection.

It must not be allowed to slip out of mind, that free trade would not compel anybody to trade, would not even recommend anybody to trade with foreigners, but would only permit all persons to trade with them in case they found it to be profitable. A trade not profitable to both parties to it ceases of itself, as a fire goes out for lack of fuel. What harm, then, could ensue to anybody from merely taking away the barriers to trade?

Just see how the taking away the barriers would give instant employment to idle laborers and to idle capital, and so tend powerfully by raising the rate of wages and profits to quell the contest between them. I suppose we might sell under freedom at least \$2,000,000,000 a year to foreigners more than we do now, as that is only one-third the value of our *manufactured* goods alone for the census year 1880. Well, what a quick and strong demand for capital (now idle) and for laborers (now idle) with which to create these two thousand million dollars worth of goods! There are said to be one million idle laborers to-day in the United States able and willing to work, and that after twenty-five years of close protectionism. A new demand for laborers and a new demand for capital such as is implied in the production of \$2,000,000,000 worth of new products to be sold abroad for ships and raw materials and finished goods for which we have not equal facilities (otherwise we should not buy them), would set all these hands to work in six months, and take up all these idle millions of capital which our banks are now striving in vain to loan.

A world market for products when the world is open to them is very wide: a one-country market under restrictions and protectionism is very narrow. A world market under freedom increases with every passing year, and a universal glut of products is at once a contradiction in terms and an impossibility in fact.

Were it not for the shortsighted policy, impoverishing at once to capitalists as a whole and to laborers as a class, of a few greedy and unscrupulous men caring nothing for liberty and less for justice, laborers and capitalists in this good land of ours, instead of eying each other with ill-concealed defiance across a widening chasm, would be to-day vying with each other in their well-rewarded zeal to increase the quantity and improve the quality of an ever enlarging volume of products, with which to supply directly, at the smallest possible cost, the wants of themselves and their countrymen, and indirectly these wants of another kind, and some of the wants of the wide, wide world besides. A. L. PERRY.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE, JUNE 1, 1886.

#### LANGUAGE AS AN INDEX TO NATIONAL CHARACTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent last week on National Differences of Language speaks of them as indicating differences of national character (or conditions); and says that it is evident French owners of property do not allow "trespassing" since they have no word for it. But in the midst of these remarks a Frenchman is quoted as acknowledging that while they cannot translate the English word "job," "God knows we have the *thing*." Does this hang together quite solidly? And is it not open to question how *far* and how *accurately* differences of language "evidence" differences of character? I am in much sympathy with your correspondent, but I am nothing if not

CRITICAL.

## Notes.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT Co. have in press: 'Travels in Brazil,' illustrated; 'La Plata Countries of South America,' by E. J. M. Clemens; 'A Soldier's Reminiscences in Peace and War,' by Gen. R. W. Johnson; 'Harcourt,' a novel by Mrs. Annie Somers Gilchrist; 'Lyrical Poems,' by Emily Thornton Charles; 'Poems,' by H. S. Hagert; F. Anstey's 'A Fallen Idol,' and two translations of foreign medical works: 'The Accommodation and Refraction of the Eye,' by E. Landolt, M.D.; and 'The Parasites of Man,' by Prof. Rudolf Leuckart.

G. P. Putnam's Sons announce 'Reminiscences of the Filibuster War in Nicaragua,' by Gen. C. W. Doubleday, in his youth a participant in Walker's campaigns; 'American Railroads, considered from the Point of View of Investors,' by John Swann; and 'A Life in Song,' poems by Prof. Geo. L. Raymond.

The present set towards Russian literature is evidenced by the translation of N. G. Tchernytchevsky's 'What's to Be Done?' about to be brought out by Benj. R. Tucker, Boston. Apparently the French version has been followed.

An 'Elementary Course in Practical Zoology,' by B. P. Colton, A.M., is in the press of D. C. Heath & Co.

A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, will soon issue 'Mr. Desmond, U. S. A.,' an army story, the scenes and incidents being laid at Fort Leavenworth, and the characters taken from military life.

The publishers of the 'Century Dictionary' look forward to an interval of still two or three years before this work can see the light. The De Vinne Press will manufacture it.

The first volume of Critical Miscellanies in Macmillan's admirable uniform edition of John Morley's works contains essays on Robespierre, Carlyle, Byron, Macaulay, and Emerson. Any one of these may be said to be worth the price of the volume. That on Macaulay interrupts a certain homogeneity that would otherwise have characterized this collection; for the essays on Carlyle, Byron, and Emerson are closely related, and the connection between Robespierre and the English Rousseau, as Mr. Morley styles the author of 'Sartor Resartus,' may be traced through Jean Jacques.

Under the title 'Representative Poems of Living Poets' (Cassell & Co.) Miss Jeannette L. Gilder issues a large and welcome volume of collected verse, whose novel feature is that the poets themselves selected the pieces to represent their genius. There are, of course, a few exceptions: the poems which represent Tennyson, for example, were chosen from a list of his known favorites, and received from his son the non-committal assurance that they "would answer the purpose." But in general one has here the poet's word for the choice, and if one considers what poor judges poets are thought to be of their own work, it may be a surprise to see how well they know their own points. Browning gives us "Abt Vogler," "Caliban upon Setebos," "A Forgiveness," "Saul," "Clive"; Holmes, "The Chambered Nautilus," "The Last Leaf," "Old Ironsides," "The Voiceless"; Tennyson, "The Revenge," "Boadicea," "Come Down, O Maid," and "The Daisy"; and so with the others—it is not the worst verses they like best. Some seventy poets are thus "represented," and the representation is as full for the minor poets as for the great ones. The absence of Swinburne and the two Morris'es is noticeable and unexplained. Mr. Lathrop contributes a preface in which he protests against the humble worship of Shakspeare *et al.*, and casts a reproving eye on those critics who "persuade the poet to enfeeble his gift of levita-