

than its due share; urged that more attention be given the other Romance languages, and recommended the preparation of a volume of selections from the less familiar of these idioms. Dialect study proper he would, however, leave to natives, because of the great advantage they possess. He referred to the want of grammars at all up to the standard of the philology of to-day, and suggested the desirability of an investigation that would show what classes of Latin words passed into the various Romance languages, and thus throw light upon the history of civilization. Dr. Mahrenholtz of Dresden read an essay on Friedrich Melchior Grimm and the part he played in making the Frenchmen of his day acquainted with German literature and ideas. Prof. Stengel of Marburg presented briefly a plan to gather material for the preparation of a history of French grammar in Germany, and appealed to the members of the Association to help him by collecting the titles, etc., of such grammars as might be in their local libraries.

The only pedagogical paper was presented by Principal Dörr of Solingen; it was on "Reform in Modern Language Instruction," and called forth much earnest discussion. The subject of a reform in the method of teaching modern languages had been brought up at the previous meetings of the Association, and resolutions passed to the effect that the Association was in favor of a change in the method of instruction, subordinating grammar and translation into the foreign language, making reading the basis of instruction, and emphasizing oral reproduction. A number of instructors have undertaken to teach on this plan, but Dörr had begun a similar method several years ago, and the object of his paper was to describe his mode of instruction and state his experiences. Neglecting theoretic phonology, he begins by teaching orally the numerals and the few verbal forms and conjunctions required in the formulas of addition, multiplication, and the like. Then come counting-out rhymes, little poems, short stories, etc. With the second year the first book is employed, and that a reader. Here attention is paid, not only to pronunciation and such difficulties as the language presents, but also to the text itself, which must lie within the intellectual sphere of the pupil and (if possible) have connection with his other studies. Grammar is taught very slowly, one subject only being considered at a time, and that for several consecutive lessons. The use of the foreign language, even in the grammatical explanations, is insisted upon when possible; a translation into the mother tongue is at first required, but later a free reproduction in the foreign language preferred. The pupil's attention is early drawn to the fact that the foreign word does not always correspond to any one word in the mother tongue; later he is taught to distinguish classes of words, and to perceive the force of prefixes and suffixes; still later his attention is directed to figurative and idiomatic expressions, and to the conception underlying them. Translation into the foreign language is entirely discarded. This is, in brief, Dörr's method as he has worked it out in the past nine years, and with the success of which he is well satisfied. As sufficient evidence of its superiority to the usual method, he regards the greater spirit and pleasure with which he, as well as the pupils, come to the recitation and take part in the exercise, as compared with that in classes he conducted at the same time according to the old method. He seems to forget that this very enthusiasm with which he teaches his new method is largely the cause of that of his pupils, and a chief source of his success. He himself does not deny that

the method has its less sunny sides, and finds that it makes much greater demands upon the teacher, and is less successful in proportion as the language is inflectional; there being, indeed, a decided difference even between English and French.

In the succeeding discussion, the following points seemed to find nearly general approval, viz., that phonetic transcriptions were the source of more mischief than good; that translation into the foreign language should be kept up by the side of free reproduction; that, while there was much in the old system that was wrong or led to evil results, it was not wise to throw it entirely overboard, nor was full salvation to be found in the new method in its present form; finally, that reform was impossible under any method so long as the training of those aiming to become teachers is restricted to the subjects to be taught, and does not extend to pedagogical principles. This latter point will receive the hearty endorsement of all who have observed, by the side of the unequalled learning of German scholars, their deplorable ignorance of pedagogical principles and incapacity as teachers. Finally, a resolution was offered and passed to the effect that it was the sense of the Third German Modern Language Convention, that it is desirable that as many further experiments as possible be made with the method of instruction which treats the foreign language as a spoken rather than a written one, and has for the basis of instruction a continuous specimen of the language to be learned, instead of disconnected sentences. This resolution cannot be regarded as an unqualified declaration on the part of the Convention in favor of the new method; for, to say nothing of the guarded form in which it is put, it was passed by a majority vote at the close of the day, after a long discussion, and with the understanding that, should it not be passed, the discussion should be continued.

After some deliberation it was decided to withdraw from the *Neuphilologisches Centralblatt* of Hanover the privilege of designating itself the organ of the Association, and not to grant this privilege to any other journal nor establish a special organ, but to publish independent brochures for distribution among the members, as the Modern Language Association of America does.

A report was given as to the efforts made by the Association to induce the various German States to establish travelling scholarships, for the purpose of enabling students desirous of becoming teachers of modern languages to spend some time in the countries where those languages are spoken. Thus far Baden alone has taken steps in this direction, while in Saxony there is good prospect of speedy action. Prof. Stengler proposed that the Association give the other States a year to consider the matter, and then, if unsuccessful, "begin again, and bore and bore till the hard wood is bored through."

The Association now has more than 800 members, with an attendance on this year's convention of 126. Its membership, different from that of our association in America, is made up for the most part of teachers in the high schools and colleges of technology. Of university professors, besides those mentioned above, there were present R. Wülker, the chairman, Zupitza, Vollmüller, Viëtor, Kölbinger, etc. There were two from America present.

One novel feature connected with this year's meeting was an exhibition of pictures, books, etc., illustrative of the works and times of Dante, Shakspeare, Scott, Burns, Molière, and Sandeau. These collections were made by cer-

tain members of the Association from public and private libraries, and were arranged for exhibition in the rooms adjoining the hall where the Association held its sessions. The collections were not all made on the same basis; that pertaining to Dante including illustrated and other editions of his works and translations of them, while the others were restricted mostly to pictures and busts. The Dante exhibition, the most important, was made by Baron von Locella, who was loaned many rare and valuable works by Prince George of Saxony, the Department of Instruction of the Kingdom of Italy, the city of Florence, etc. A list of the subdivisions of the Molière collection will give a good idea of the best of the other exhibitions: Busts and pictures of Molière; pictures of the house where Molière was born, representations of his arms, and facsimiles of his autograph; illustrated editions of his works and other engravings and pictures illustrative of them; musical compositions of his works and representations of the musical instruments of his day; representations pertaining to the history of the theatre of the time and Molière's troupe; pictures of patrons and friends; engravings and other pictures illustrative of the civilization of the seventeenth century.

Sunday morning the members of the Association, accompanied by their wives, daughters, or friends, went by special train to Meissen. At noon there was a banquet in "Die Sonne"; later we made a tour through the beautiful halls and apartments of the Stammschloss of the Saxon kings, and in the evening took part in the ball, or sat near by, drinking coffee and chatting, or watching the comical performances of those who danced the *cottillon*.

GEORGE HEMPL.

Correspondence.

ON PARAPHRASING FROM THE GERMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Rosenkranz's 'Pedagogy as a System,' translated by Anna C. Brackett (St. Louis: 1872), we find the following statement:

"Cleanliness will not endure that things shall be deprived of their proper individuality through the elemental chaos" (p. 31).

On page 54 of Part Second we find Miss Brackett's paraphrase of this passage as follows:

"Cleanliness will not have things deprived of their distinctive and individual character, and become again a part of original chaos. It is only a form of order which remains all things, dirt included, to their own places, and will not endure to have things mixed and confused."

Finally, on page 96, we have a paraphrase by Dr. Harris:

"Cleanliness means 'a place for everything, and everything in its place.' To take a thing out of its proper relations is to 'deprive it of its proper individuality,' and in an 'elemental chaos' everything has lost its proper relations to other things, and has no longer any use or fitness in its existence."

These quotations illustrate the thought embodied in my note in the *Academy*, which has served your correspondent "X" as a text for his fine moralizing. All I intended to say was that the speculations of a German educational philosopher frequently need, not only to be turned literally into English, but to be paraphrased, as Miss Brackett and Dr. Harris have done in the

volume cited, in order to come within the ready comprehension of the ordinary reader. Any disparagement of German educational literature, as such, on my part, is a gratuitous assumption by my anonymous critic, for an unworthy purpose.

W. H. PAYNE.

PEABODY NORMAL COLLEGE, NASHVILLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I join hands with your correspondent "X" in his condemnation of Prof. Payne. I am myself one of those astonishing prigs who take their Kant in all his original Teutonicity in order to get "the flavor of the German," and I am sure that I can see in the German philosophers nothing but luminous simplicity and crystalline lucidity. Conceive, then, with what a shriek of *Zaghaftigkeit* I greeted the suggestion of Dr. Harris, in his introduction to Rosenkranz, that the translation is probably "more comprehensible than the original." What is this but saying that English common sense is superior to German philosophical ponderosity, and what is that but accepting the heresy of Prof. Payne? I declare, the discovery gave me such a turn as I have not experienced since I read the utterance of Carlyle (himself something of a German scholar) apropos of 'Wilhelm Meister': "Goethe is the greatest genius that has lived for a century and the greatest ass that has lived for three. I could sometimes fall down and worship him; at other times I could kick him out of the room."

Let us cry aloud to the errant members of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club to leave the primrose path of Miss Brackett and Dr. Harris, and make their way into the steep and thorny road of Rosenkranz.

Y.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me space for the following, to be set over against "Prof. Payne on German Books on Pedagogy"?

"On the whole, philosophical speculation has been a hindrance to the Germans, often bringing into their style an element of the senseless and incomprehensible. The more they have given themselves to certain philosophical schools the worse they write."—Goethe, through Eckermann. In another place Goethe, speaking of a German writer of his time who was under Hegel's influence, said: "In his book we come upon places where the mind halts entirely, and we no longer know what we are reading." Hosmer says, "The besetting defect of German writers . . . is an obscurity, proceeding sometimes from a wilful imitation of the conduct of the cuttle-fish, sometimes from want of the sense of proportion." Matthew Arnold has criticised severely the "ponderous, roundabout, inane," in German literature, and so have others; and so, perhaps, would "X" if he should try to explain Rosenkranz's thought in losing his "proper individuality in the elemental chaos." If any profit is to be got from such writers, surely a literal translation is not sufficient for the ordinary reader.

Prof. Payne is Chancellor of the University of Nashville, and in addition President of the Peabody Normal College. This position was taken, not for his own profit or convenience, but from the thought that in this place he could do most to advance the condition of the teachers of the South, and through them their schools. This work I hold to be akin to, but higher than, patriotism, and for this reason I am moved to speak against his would-be defamer. Yours,

FRANK M. DREW.

GENOA, ILL., October 16, 1888.

THE UNIVERSITY NEED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is gratifying, indeed, to read such sentiments as were expressed in your editorial on Columbia College in the *Nation* of October 11. Especially is it gratifying to students who have finished their undergraduate work, and are now looking about for still higher courses and broader opportunities for study. The time is now at hand in America when the leading universities must offer to their graduates superior advantages for original work, and more abundant opportunities for independent investigation than those prescribed in the regular college curriculum.

The history of the growth and development of seminary and post-graduate work at the University of Michigan well illustrates the exigencies of the times. In 1883 there were eleven students graduated with higher degrees; only about one-half of them, however, were really post-graduates and were pursuing seminary work in the true sense of that term. In 1887 there were sixteen successful candidates for degrees who were pursuing their work upon the University system. Thirteen of these were working for the higher degrees (M.A. and Ph.D.). According to the University Calendar of 1887-88, there were in all fifty-nine students pursuing courses of study under the direction of the university for the higher degrees. Nine of these received their degrees last June. The total number of students pursuing work on the university system last year was twenty-two, thus showing a marked increase in the popularity of this method of study among the students. (I may say in parenthesis that the university system is one of final examination, and not one of examinations upon each book gone through during the semester. It encourages investigation, and prompts students to original work, and is conducted in a similar manner to post-graduate work.) Already this fall more than fifteen applications are in for higher degrees from students in residence; and about one-half of these applications are for the Ph.D. degree.

Thus we can see the constant increase in the number of students pursuing higher work. The illustration furnished by the University of Michigan can, in a similar manner, be obtained from the other great universities of this country. But this is not all. We cannot suppose that these students, having pursued their special lines of work up to their higher degrees, are then to give up all their expectations of future study at some still higher institution of learning. On the contrary, it is safe to say that one-half of the post-graduates in our colleges now are contemplating extended courses of study abroad. The fact is, that not less than 20 per cent. of these post-graduates do go abroad for study, sooner or later, and many more would if their means would allow.

The question, then, that presents itself, not only to those who are now post-graduates, but also to those who are soon to be such, is, Why cannot America furnish as advanced instruction as Germany or France; and why cannot American college professors establish here in the United States *Seminarien* of as high grade as those of Leipzig, Bonn, or Berlin? It would be a far wiser outlay of money on the part of Mr. Clark in Massachusetts, or Mr. Sanford in California, to found for students, and professors, too, a school where the *depth of things* could be arrived at more nearly, and investigation be carried on for its own sake, than to found two additional universities like those already existing in this country.

The tendency of students at the present day

to become specialists brings this demand for higher instruction up to a necessity. That there is such a demand, every one can see; that it should be met speedily and adequately, no one will deny. And it is hoped that the time is near at hand when the idea expressed by President Barnard in his report will take tangible shape, not only at Columbia, but also at other of our great institutions of learning. Our great need, beyond all doubt, in this country is for a few "real universities." Yours truly,

F. C. CLARK.

ANN ARBOR, October 15, 1888.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your article on Columbia College, in the *Nation* of October 11, closes thus:

"The country needs all the help it can get from the very highest culture in resisting the torrent of materialism which has, ever since the war, been flowing over the land; and for such culture nothing would do so much good as two or three real universities."

No one will gainsay this. But in all those able and earnest discussions of the subject of a real university which of late years have from time to time appeared in the *Nation* and in some of the best periodicals, one very important thing is always overlooked. As matters now stand, I fear we are far from being ready for such a university; not, indeed, for want of preparatory colleges, nor for want of able professors, nor yet for want of sufficient desire on the part of our students for high attainments. And yet we should lack the students. In order that we might have the students, certain legislation would first be necessary, which, however, is not to be looked for in any of our States.

Let me explain. No one who has pursued a course of studies at a German university, and has become acquainted with the life there, imagines that a majority of the students there study because they love studying, or even from a desire for excellence. On the contrary, the real motive power is the fear of the difficult state examination, which must be passed in order to take any position of profit or honor. Take the case of the medical student. In the first place, he is not admitted as a regular student of medicine unless he has passed his examination of "maturity" at the gymnasium (only foreigners being admitted without this); but furthermore he is not allowed to practise, even after graduation, unless he has also passed that state examination. So it is again in the case of the lawyer, and likewise in the case of the divine.

We have on this side of the ocean no such regulations, nor are we likely to have them. Imagine a law to be made that no person should be admitted as a medical student, or as a law student, unless he were able to write, in good Latin and also in correct French, a composition upon a given subject, and unless he should have a pretty thorough knowledge of general history, etc. All this is out of the question. Nor shall we have, for a long time to come, anything like those state examinations. But it must be admitted that for the average student everywhere some such strong, outer motive is really necessary. The absence of some regulation similar to those mentioned produces with us this lamentable state of affairs, that such numbers of our doctors and lawyers are really uneducated and ignorant.

Let us, then, before we try to have a true university, endeavor to get some effective regulations concerning the licenses of our doctors and our lawyers, and soon our standard of ambition as to general acquirements will rise,

and we shall be on the way to get ready to have a real university. Respectfully yours,

WERNER A. STILLE.

St. Louis, October 15, 1888.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There is one sentence in your editorial on Columbia College that seems to me to be erroneous, or at least very liable to misinterpretation. It is this:

"The country needs all the help it can get from the very highest culture in resisting the torrent of materialism which has, ever since the war, been flowing over the land; and for such culture nothing would do so much good as two or three real universities."

As the subject is one of some importance, I beg leave to offer a few observations. From your main proposition, I think few intelligent men will dissent; as to the conclusion, the case is much less clear. On reading the article, one is led almost unconsciously to think of Germany, where there are more real universities than in any other country; and the question naturally suggests itself, Is materialism less prevalent there than among us? I have spent some years at different times in Germany, chiefly in the company of university men, and have for nearly a score of years been a diligent reader of German books, but my observations do not warrant the inference which seems to flow from your remark.

I am aware that the spirit of materialism usually manifests itself in one of two ways: the man of thought is often materialistic in his philosophy and spiritualistic in his life; caring little for those things that may be seen and handled, he sets a high value upon intellectual riches. On the other hand, there is the practical materialism which one meets so constantly in this country, no less among church members than among other people, that is greatly concerned about material prosperity, but comparatively indifferent about those things which persons of culture esteem above all else. This class is so numerously represented that we may well use the Horatian dictum "*Tanti quantum habes sis*," to characterize the most prominent trait of our contemporary thought. We may give a slightly different turn to an observation of Ampère on the poet Ausonius, by saying that the great majority of our church-members are Christians, and therefore spiritists, when they pray, but materialists during most of their remaining waking hours.

But I am led to think that a kind of materialism which has more or less claim to be called philosophical is very common in Germany. Often it is philosophical only in that it claims to be ratiocinative. "*Es glaubt kein Mediciner an einen Gott*," "*Alle Mediciner sind Atheisten*," are expressions that I have heard used more than once to designate the faith, or lack of faith, that is characteristic of a numerously represented and influential profession. This statement is, of course, not literally true, but I have seen no reason to doubt that it contains much of truth. It is well known, too, that the writings of such ultra-materialists as Büchner and Vogt are much read in books and periodicals. The materialism of other popular writers is less openly avowed, though hardly less patent. The signs of the times in France likewise indicate that there, as in Germany, the belief in a personal immortality is a rapidly decreasing quantity. If, then, it be our object to promote idealism in thought and life, without regard to the question of man's personal immortality, we cannot do better than to encourage the founding of real universities, in which instruction shall be absolutely unrestricted; but if it be our concern to encourage

Christian orthodoxy, of even the most liberal type, something else is needed. S.

ATHENS, O., October, 1888.

THE POINT OF VIEW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the matter of the religious condition of the back towns there will hardly be any dispute that a grave problem exists. What constitutes the cause of this problem, however, will be a subject of very great difference. To you, the cause of these facts, which, as you say, are "notorious," is the declining force of Christianity. To many of your readers, on the other hand, the cause will be found in the general drying up of country civilization. With scarcely an exception, the depleted church is the inevitable result of a depleted social existence. The back towns, for over a generation past, have yielded up most of their choicest elements. The young, vigorous, and creative life has sought its appropriate sphere in the cities. In most cases the actual numbers are very much less, and in all cases the proportion of actual business and enterprise is smaller than what it once was. Life, society, even humanity, are at a very low ebb in comparison with the state of former times. Now, that the church, which relies for its existence on the leading spirits of any community, should not be deeply, and in some cases hopelessly, affected by the deterioration of life in general, would be simply incredible.

The missionary, then, in the back towns is not trying to do over again a work which once flourished and now has fallen into decay: he is attempting a really new work. The field is the same, but an entirely new set of conditions make it an entirely new work. It is a new generation and a genetically different one. The missionary to the back towns of Vermont and western Massachusetts is really a pioneer, trying to make Christianity intelligible to a mind which, however it may have seen and known the form of godliness, has only in a few devout hearts known the power thereof. But, like a missionary to China or Japan, this Vermont missionary must learn the language of the people, and must know the language in which alone the Christian life is able to make itself understood to the people. The methods proposed in the late numbers of the *Andover Review* have just this end in view. They represent a desire on the part of the minister to be understood. You think these methods are grotesque, and that they are as little likely to promote religious feeling as the study of botany is likely to promote the scientific idea of taxation. But the problem is so difficult a one, and the conditions of success so complicated, that an opinion on the merits of such methods belongs of right only to those who are working in and among the people to whom they are directed. A summer acquaintance with the country will not do. Not the widest acquaintance with large tracts of country, or of innumerable instances of dwindling churches and contentious congregations, will aid much in judging of these proposals. But actual residence fits a man for speaking—actual sharing of what is a very hard and grinding lot; and no one can have the one and do the other without feeling how true and scientific these methods are—the methods you quote.

You will pardon a minister for dissenting from your view that the case is a hopeless one, the force of Christianity having spent itself. Nothing less than the strongest confidence that the force of Christianity has not spent itself, but is equal also to this hardest of problems in the hardest of conditions, could keep a serious

man an instant longer at such posts. But, reinforced by the feeling of whose service it is he labors in, and with such an appeal to his humanity and to his spiritual imagination, he can afford his utmost, and expect finally a religious success which shall be complete.

I am yours truly, JOHN TUNIS.

[Even though to the country minister alone an opinion "belongs of right," yet we may be allowed to remark that we did not say "the case is a hopeless one, the force of Christianity having spent itself." We said it is required to find why "there is no more power" in that force—*i. e.*, no more than there is. We know of no one who will say that that force in the "back towns" now is what it was when the disciples "were all with one accord in one place." But if the force of Christianity be not "declining," or declined, how comes it that "Life, society, even humanity, are at a very low ebb in comparison with the state of former times," with the church "deeply, and in some cases hopelessly, affected by the deterioration of life in general"? For what has "the proportion of actual business and enterprise" to do with religion?—ED. NATION.]

HOISTING THE ENGINEER WITH HIS OWN PETARD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I do not think attention has been called in your columns to a rather unexpected result of the activity of the American Protective Tariff League. Its system of offering prizes for essays by members of the Senior classes in colleges and universities began last year, the subject announced being "The Advantages of a Protective Tariff to the Labor and Industries of the United States." Among many competitors was Mr. Crawford D. Hening of that renowned stronghold of protection, the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Hening made a thorough study of the subject—so thorough that he not only won the first prize, \$250, but also became sufficiently interested to continue his investigation after his immediate work was accomplished. In time he became convinced that, whatever may have been the advantages of a high tariff in the past, what the country needed now was a thorough revision of the tariff, with a conservative reduction of duties, as proposed by Mr. Cleveland and the Mills Bill. The result was a new essay on "The Tariff and the Surplus," for which he chose as a motto Milton's words, "By this time, like one who had set out on his way by night, and travelled through a region of smooth and idle dreams, our history now arrives on the confines where daylight and truth meet us with a clear dawn, representing to our view, though at far distance, true colors and shapes."

The new essay has been printed by the Pennsylvania Democratic State Committee, in much better type than the Tariff League saw fit to use for the first one, and it deserves at least an equal number of readers. It is to be hoped that some of this year's essayists will be as successful as Mr. Hening in attaining the regions of "daylight and truth." Thus will the American Protective Tariff League become, though unintentionally, a blessing to the country. C. C. B.

PHILADELPHIA, October 22, 1888.

COTTON HOSIERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It has been stated by you that "free

wool" will be a benefit to the manufacturers of this country. If "free wool" would benefit them, why doesn't "free cotton" benefit them? With all the facilities and natural advantages we have in this staple, we cannot to-day compete with the manufacturers of England, France, and Germany in the production of cotton hosiery.

One of our city's greatest industries, up to five years ago, was the manufacture of cotton hosiery for men, women, and children. To-day this industry, in the finer grades of goods, is dead. I can give you the names of half-a-dozen mills in this city that, up to five years ago, turned out 10,000 to 12,000 dozens of cotton hose a day. To-day they do not make a pair. How do you account for this? No other mills have started up to make the same class of goods. The seamless goods have not driven them out of the market, because the gauge is too coarse, making the stocking too heavy and clumsy to take their place.

Look in our retail-store windows, and see the ladies' foreign-made hose selling at 15 cents to 25 cents per pair, men's half-hose 12½ cents to 25 cents per pair, children's hose from 10 cents to 20 cents per pair. These are the goods that have driven our goods out of the market.

What is the reason they have driven us out? Do not say, as Mr. Mills did, that the foreign manufacturer has a secret process by which he makes these goods. We can get the same machines he uses and can get the same skilled labor right here in this city to-day that has made goods like we speak of. Do not say the duty on dyes used in the goods is the cause. If the foreign manufacturer got his dyeing for nothing, it would only make a difference of 20 to 25 cents a dozen in his favor. May be you will say it is the protection that the spinner gets for his yarns that makes the difference. The yarn used in these goods is worth about 22 cents per pound. The duty on this is 10 cents a pound and 20 per cent. ad valorem. The goods weigh about 1½ pounds to the dozen. This would make about 25 cents per dozen. Here is a difference of 50 cents per dozen in favor of the foreign manufacturer, and remember this gives him his dyeing for nothing. To offset this the foreign goods have to pay a duty of 35 per cent. ad valorem.

At \$1.50 per dozen (which is a very low average), this would be 52½ cents per dozen added to their cost. And still, with all this "robber tax," as you term it, the foreign manufacturer continues to make goods for this market and make money at it, while our mills at home have to close up or get in some other branch. What is the reason of this? We can surely get the raw cotton as cheap as they can. But can we get the "labor" as cheap as they can? Would not the same state of affairs occur if we had free wool? Yours very respectfully,

JOHN J. ARMSTRONG.

NO. 27 BANK STREET, PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 13.

[There are two possible explanations of the misfortune which befell Mr. Armstrong's friends, the hosiery manufacturers of Philadelphia. One is, that they had too much tariff, for whereas the duty on cotton hosiery prior to 1883 was 35 per cent. ad valorem, it was raised to 40 per cent. by the tariff of that year. As Mr. Armstrong fixes the date "five years ago" when the industry began to decline, the coincidence seems rather remarkable.

The other possible explanation is, that they relied too much on the tariff and gave too little heed to industrial progress in the manu-

facture of hosiery. This would not be the first case in which failure had resulted from too close attention to business in Washington and too little at home. At all events, the cotton-hosiery manufacture is successfully carried on in Rhode Island; and what is done there ought to be done in Philadelphia with equal business qualifications. The tariff is the same in both places, and there ought not to be much difference in the rate of wages. There is no difference to speak of between the Rhode Island wages and English wages in the hosiery trade. Any industry which cannot get on under such conditions, with a protection of 40 per cent. (which, by the way, is not changed by the Mills bill), ought to be smitten with the great hammer of Thor.

Coming back to Mr. Armstrong's first query, we suppose he would not contend that a tax of 10 cents a pound on raw cotton would revive this ruined industry.—ED. NATION.]

THE PRICE OF STEEL RAILS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The protectionists "point with pride" to the tariff on steel rails, and claim it as a triumph of protection that it has reduced the price from over \$100 per ton to present price. I, of course, don't believe the protective tariff did it, but am unable to find an explanation of the decline in price. It seems to me the Nation would help the cause if it could find space to print a brief history of the steel-rail industry, pointing out the causes that have conspired to bring about the fall in price.

Respectfully yours, F. D. HUTCHINS.

LANCASTER, N. H., October 18, 1888.

[The answer to this question is summed up in the improvements and inventions applicable to the production of steel rails that have come in play during the past fifteen years. The details have often been published and are easily accessible. It is sufficient to say that, since the price of rails has fallen in England even more than in this country, the tariff had nothing to do with it.—ED. NATION.]

THE PRESIDENT'S ENGLISH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A writer in the last *North American Review*, under the head of "The President's English," attempts to prove Cleveland's intense egotism by contrasting his marked use of the first personal pronoun with the modesty of our earlier Presidents in referring to themselves as individuals in their public utterances. In proof of such offensive egotism, the writer produces an extract from Cleveland's letter of acceptance containing 712 words, in which he shows the use of the first personal pronoun 45 times, or once in every sixteen and a fraction words.

It is interesting to notice that Washington, the most notably modest of all our Presidents, uses in his Resignation of Commission speech, December 23, 1783, one first personal pronoun in every twelve and a fraction words. In his Inaugural Address, April 30, 1789, he uses, in the first paragraph of 315 words, 21 first personal pronouns, or one in every fifteen, while his Farewell Address, which has become an American classic, presents extracts which show

quite as free a use of the objectionable pronoun as the extract cited from Cleveland's letter.

Such an attempt to prove "personal egotism" must necessarily seem puerile in the last degree, even to a GOOD REPUBLICAN.

OCTOBER 12, 1888.

FRENCH CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The author of the article on "French Constitutional Amendment," in the last issue of the *Nation*, is slightly at fault in regard to the history of the constitutional changes introduced in France since the adoption of the present Constitution in 1875. Two revisions of the Constitution have taken place, but not in 1884 and 1885, as is stated by the author of the article. The dates are 1879 and 1884. The effect of the first revision was merely to decree the return of the Houses and President from Versailles to Paris.

Another mistake of the article consists in presenting the change from the *scrutin d'arrondissement* to the *scrutin de liste* as a constitutional amendment. The law governing the elections to the Chamber of Deputies was never a part of the Constitution. It could be, and was, changed in the same way as any other law, and no meeting of the National Assembly is now needed in order to prescribe a return to the former mode of voting. Students of French political matters may remember that the occasion selected by Gambetta's enemies to bring about his downfall, in January, 1882, was his proposal to establish the *scrutin de liste* and to make it part of the Constitution. As the law governing the elections to the Senate was a part of that instrument, Gambetta thought it only logical that the same character should attach to the law governing the elections to the lower House. The rejection of Gambetta's plan was what induced M. Ferry, two years later, to try a different system, and to take the law relating to the elections to the Senate out of the Constitution. That was the main change introduced in the Constitution in 1884, and the law abolishing life-senatorships and enlarging the constituency of the Senate, which was afterwards passed, was merely a legislative enactment, not a constitutional amendment.

Without entering upon any discussion of the present rather tangled revision question in France, I will say that I agree with the author of the article in thinking that the main change needed in the Constitution is an amendment making it more difficult in the future to amend it further. But, even while wishing for such a change, I might shrink from desiring a meeting of the National Assembly now, in the present unsettled condition of the public mind. An assembly of nearly 900 members is always pretty much of a mob, and no one can predict what would come out of such a meeting.

Yours truly,

A. C.
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, October 22, 1888.

[We must adhere to our words. The removal of the seat of government from Versailles to Paris in 1879 is not spoken of by French publicists as "a revision of the Constitution." What are known as "revisions of the Constitution" occurred in the years we gave, 1884 and 1885. The change in 1885 from *scrutin d'arrondissement* to *scrutin de liste* is called in all the books a revision, because it changed an electoral law passed by the National Assembly sitting as a Constitutional Convention, which law was, like a similar, "special law" providing for

the election of the Senate, to all intents and purposes a part of the Constitution, and differed from other parts solely in being amendable by the two Chambers acting in their ordinary legislative capacity, instead of by the two Chambers sitting together in National Assembly, or, as we should call it, the joint convention.—ED. NATION.]

"TO ELIMINATE" AND "ELIMINATION."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Having recently had occasion to look into Mr. E. S. Gould's *Good English*, I there chanced on the following sentence at p. 186:

"Others speak from the throat in a hollow, sepulchral tone, and with an elaboration of syllables and emphasis so mixed together that no ear can *eliminate* the individual words."

This is from the "revised edition" of 1880; but it appears, on turning to the preface of the first edition, that the sentence dates from 1865.

Mr. Gould's claim to a knowledge of the way we are to speak and write our language, if we would do so irreproachably, is most confidently implied throughout his book. Nor does any competent judge of that performance require to be told that his criticisms aim at conformity with all that is exact, not to say fastidious. An idea of his qualifications for handling the subject of which he thought himself a master is, however, furnished by the specimen of his composition given above. During the course of fifteen years he failed to discover that he had there used the verb *to eliminate* in a sense which, probably, no other writer has ever imposed on it, namely, that of 'to distinguish or 'to discriminate.' The error of somehow misusing the term is one that is common, and no less common, I believe, in the United States than in Great Britain. To call attention to it cannot, therefore, be amiss.

It is only as a verb transitive that we find our adaptation of *eliminare*. Almost invariably, above all in the present century, our best authors, in their employment of *to eliminate*, have, further, kept very close to the usual signification of its Latin original. Whether in popular diction, or in scientific, they have generally intended to convey, by it, with reference to what is superfluous, irrelevant, injurious, or unwelcome, the notion of its ejection, extrusion, removal, or riddance, or else, figuratively, that of its deletion or expunction. In passing, *to eliminate* was unknown to Dr. Johnson. As to *elimination*, he had to take it, unexemplified, from his predecessor Bailey; and Dr. Richardson ignores it entirely.

Numerous inaccurate writers that might be specified so use *to eliminate* that, for all the aid of contexts, the meaning which they attach to it is matter of uncertainty. Here and there, however, they clearly understand it to be one with 'to separate'; as though they had previously misapprehended some such phrase as "to *eliminate* impurities," or "to *eliminate* a poisonous element." And even professional guides to English have occasionally contributed to establish this corrupt innovation. One of these is the Rev. James Stormonth; and Dr. Worcester, besides partially misdefining *elimination*, taken as an algebraic technicality, represents Bp. Joseph Hall as identifying the word with 'separation,' though the passage to which he refers, cited in full by Archdeacon Todd, lends no support to such an equation.

I now come to the *Synonyms and Antonyms* of the Ven. C. J. Smith (1867), from which the

subjoined congeries of preposterously false philology is transcribed:

"ELIMINATE, *v. tr.* *E* and *limen*, a threshold. To bring out from the recesses of private concealment into the public light of day. Hence, 1, to explain; 2, to extract; and 3, to extract what is superfluous or objectionable.

Syn. Elucidate, Explain, Enucleate, Segregate.

Ant. Mystify, Obscure, Involve, Smuggle, Foist, Import, Confound."

It will not surprise any attentive reader of our older literature to be told that Horace's use of *eliminare* has been tentatively Anglicized.

"So settled, that, at no time . . . hee open himselfe, or suffer his tongue to *eliminate* any part of his thoughts." Daniel Tuvill, *Essays Politicke and Morall* (1608), fol. 114 v.

"Whatsoever it is that here we do is, by some that come hither, and write all they hear, presently *eliminated*, and carried to them, which hath caused many hard reports to pass of us, both with them and elsewhere." Rev. John Hales (1618), *Golden Remains* (1673), Part II., p. 64.

Elimination, to import 'unwarrantable disclosure,' 'indiscreet divuligation,' 'blabbing,' has also appeared in print:

"These curious quæres, and fabulous *eliminations* of hels secrets, which S. John properly calleth the deepnes of Sathan," etc. Bp. William Barlow, *A Defence*, etc. (1601), p. 175.

The strictly etymological sense of *to eliminate*, recalled to mind by Dr. Young's affected "*eliminate* my spirit, give it range," and seen in the ensuing extract, may be of infrequent occurrence:

"For God's love, Madam, help you to help *to eliminate* out of his house this offence." Abp. Matthew Parker (1567-8), *Correspondence*, etc. (1853), p. 314.

As to relevant quotations in which there is nothing either peculiar or objectionable, three will amply suffice:

"Its balsams, gums, resins, aromata, and all other bases of its sensible qualities, are, as is well known, mere excretions from the vegetable, *eliminated*, as lifeless, from the actual plant." S. T. Coleridge, *Literary Remains*, Vol. II (1836), p. 345.

"M. Comte's subjective synthesis consists only in *eliminating* from the sciences everything that he deems useless, and presenting, as far as possible, every theoretical investigation as the solution of a practical problem." J. S. Mill, *Auguste Comte and Positivism* (1865), p. 185.

"The most rigid Calvinist cannot *eliminate* his instincts." Mr. J. A. Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, First Series (1867), p. 399.

From among scores of authors who have misconceived the verb and the substantive under notice, it will be enough to cite a few who surely should have known better than to do so:

"The technical affixes employed in *eliminating* derivative from primitive words." Professor H. H. Wilson, *Sanskrit Grammar* (1841), Preface, p. vii.

"The Nature of the Soul is, also, conclusive; it being utterly impossible that such infinite ideas as God, eternity, space, extension, hope, and fear could ever be *eliminated* by either the will, the reason, or the finite evidence of the finite senses." *Foreign and Colonial Quarterly Review*, Vol. II (1843), p. 337.

"In answering these inquiries, we should have to consider separately every collateral influence and circumstance, and, by a most subtle analysis, to *eliminate* the real effect of art from the effects of the abuses with which it was associated." Mr. John Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849), p. 201.

"Classification sets itself to the arrangement of all those bodies which meet its view, and are possessed of common qualities; and thus general ideas are *eliminated*." "It is gratifying to watch the progress of discovery, and to imagine that we are elaborating truths, or *eliminating* principles, from facts that are patent to our own observation." Dr. Samuel Neil, *The Elements of Rhetoric* (1854), pp. 33, 213.

"The various events by which one people [viz., the Jews] was *eliminated* from the varied

racess of mankind." Sir J. P. Wood (now Lord Hatherley). *The Continuity of Scripture* (1867), p. —.

"Let us construct our hypotheses for an hour, or a day, or for years; they are of the utmost value in the *elimination* of truth." Dr. Michael Faraday, in *Lectures on Education* (1854), p. 68.

A good number of my quotations from which those immediately preceding are selected have, I find, already been produced in Dr. W. B. Hodgson's *Errors in the Use of English*. Dr. Hodgson's researches and my own discover that *to eliminate* has wrongly had attached to it, with more or less distinctness, the various senses of *to bring out*, *develop*, *distinguish*, *educate*, *elaborate*, *elicit*, *elucidate*, *evolve*, *free*, and what not. Such has been the result of a mere weakness for a learned-looking expression, without inquiry touching its meaning; and it certainly behooves any one who would escape the suspicion that, science left out of consideration, he is not even a moderate Latinist, to take heed how he *eliminates* and what he subjects to *elimination*.

The Dictionaries, to which I once more return, are, by reason of their meagreness, and on other grounds, far from being satisfactory in their treatment of *to eliminate*, especially as employed in non-scientific language. Archdeacon Todd and Dr. Richardson have, between them, as authorities for it, only Dr. Young, the poet, as cited above, Bp. Lowth, and Lovelace, of which three the last, in his "thou . . . *eliminat'st* thy door," makes the word denote "to pass beyond"; an interpretation not likely to be questioned by any one who consults Dr. Latham. Where synonymized, as by Dr. O. W. Holmes, with 'to deduce,' 'to infer,' Dr. Webster's editors now correctly characterize it as "recent and improper," after having, in 1864, simply recorded it, without an accompanying note of censure.

Your obedient servant, F. H.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, September 3, 1888.

—In the second column of your 152d page, l. 4, the printer has put "misusage" for "coinage." Among several other typographical errors in my letter on *Suppositious*, two more may be noticed. John Lawrence has "suppositious causes," not "cases." Again, for Vol. "XII." of the *Quarterly Review*, read "XIX."

Turning over a book published in 1854, I lately came across *supposititious* as a substitute for "suppositional," i. e., "hypothetical." *Suppositious* in the same sense, which is equally bad, is not very unusual in my experience of spoken English.

Notes.

A LIBRARY edition, 12mo, of Walter Besant's novels has been begun by the Messrs. Harper. The same firm have compressed the thirty-six volumes of John Morley's "English Men of Letters" series into twelve, making a "People's Edition."

D. Appleton & Co. will publish on November 1, 'On the Senses, Instincts, and Intelligence of Animals, with Special Reference to Insects,' an illustrated work by Sir John Lubbock.

Chas. Scribner's Sons have nearly ready the first volume of their 'Cyclopædia of Music and Musicians,' a work to be profusely illustrated, and printed only in a limited edition; a 'History of French Painting,' by Mrs. Clara H. Stranahan; and 'Gibraltar,' by the Rev. Henry M. Field.

'Musical Instruments and their Homes' is the title of a work announced by Dodd, Mead