continued the tradition; then Thomas Carlyle and Thackeray made their way through the magazines; Walter Bagehot and Matthew Arnold and J. R. Green did their turn in journalism; and to-day John Morley and Leslie Stephen, though unoccupied of the new style, manage to get a hearing. Now the implication that there was or is anything esoteric about these men, that writing to-day their too leisurely style would be found lagging behind our recent intellectual development—requires no very serious discussion. The writer who wished to reach our public would do much better, we believe, to study the "leisurely style" than to strive for that "nervous" quality which the modern magazine reader is supposed to require.

As a matter of fact, the deaderaded style for the times has had a pretty thorough trial. The late G. W. Steevens certainly wrote it; Mr. Kipling writes it and produces six distinct electrical discharges in the space in which the leisurely writer would grudge him self one; Mr. Maurice Hewlett, although he is still avaricious to the general, has all the nervousness and picturelessness that any editor could desire; and Mr. J. P. Mowbray fairly flings his bawdry into the face of the expectant public. But these examples of the modern style hardly encourage us to believe that nervousness lies that way seems to us, in short, that Mr. Page's conception of a deliberate attack upon the larger reading public, of a general attempt to measure up, or down, to the standards of those who, at bottom, have learned to read only between pictures, is fundamentally erroneous. We do not believe that the style which the great majority of children, by descent, prefers is a good style. The fact is that, while the "intellectual contributor" is often a dull person, the writers of to-day are less at fault than the public. It is the public that needs to be converted to intellectual leisureliness; not the writer who needs to catch the fever of modern life.

It is a very natural and in an editor a very amiable illusion—that of imagining the scramble for money and place and distinction to be more intellectual than it is. It is easy to mistake a certain progress in accustomed ruts for that unaméllmed flight of the mind which is the condition of literary production and appreciation. Mr. Page is too modest in feeling that the failure to interest people who have little capacity for the pleasures of the mind is criminal. The newspapers and magazines that cater to listless intelligences, languid tastes, and raving attentions—it is these that have already discovered the style for the times which Mr. Page with generous desires. Should they be praised for the discovery?

We have fallen upon dull times for editors. The "intellectual class" probably writes less interestingly than it did, say, from 1800 to 1870. If any one wishes to appreciate the full seriousness of the case against the "intellectual contributor," let him read thoughtfully "Literary Boston of To-day"—a book which, by sheer coincidence, but a felicitous one, appears within a week of Mr. Page's protest against the literary. Before, however, he despairs utterly of the intellectual class, and undertakes the desperate attempt to contrive a style for the times, we advise Mr. Page, and the more philosophical editors generally, to take counsel of this wise saying, which may be found in the current World's Work: "It is a delusion to conclude that, because able men read a silly book, he would read a good book if he didn't have the silly one. That kind of man will never read a good book." With the single change of "article" for "book," this covers the case. One should not go too far with this kind of reader. We are bound to write for him who runs, but we are not bound to make his haste our own.

AUTHORITY IN LANGUAGE.

In April last the French Academy admitted to its Dictionary the word chic, without hesitation for the meaning 'improvisation of the artist with words, but not a model,' but only after much discussion for the sense 'taste of the day,' 'caprice of fashion.' If some critics would have barred out the word altogether, others complained that it would destroy the Chiffon, Négligé, which Litré was hospitable long ago. and which Sanders embraced in his 'Verdichtungsworterbüch' (1884) was said M. Émile Poulain, slang of the clerks of the Palace, works much in the seventeenth century, with a relation to obscur. But when it reappeared in the second third of the nineteenth century, it had in the steele a quite different significance, and gained general currency as 'stylish' or 'smart' still later, between 1850 and 1899. Now, it is almost quite superseded by stranger forms—pachet, s'lan, surv, bath, chomette, dans le rivage (in the swim), dernier bat, and our English smart. All admit, however, that the Academy is exercising its proper function in fixing the limits of the allowable in correct French.

This function was invaded, in a way, in 1890, by Mr. Keynes, Minister of Public Instruction, who was not influenced by the agitation carried on during the previous years by the Society for Spelling Reform. In a decree issued on the 22d of February, 1890, the Minister of Public Instruction, and dated July 31, 1900, he prescribed a number of licensees, both in spelling and in syntax, which examiners should tolerate in rating for certificates—for example, in the placing of adjectives and compound nouns, in hypophora, in the regimen of the past participle, in the use of unsupported so after certain comparative expressions, etc., in the placing of adjectives after or the noun—matters in which there is considerable doubt and inconsistency in the prevailing usage. The storm of protest which this decree evoked led M. Leygues (who, the wits declared, should begin by simplifying his own name to Légues) to take advice of the Academy, which reported, through M. Hadoz, against all the substantial changes proposed. M. Leygues, in a new decree, dated February 28, 1893, anticipated any intention of attacking the purity of the language or the work of grammarians, and drew a line (surely futilo in practice) between strictures of teaching and strictness of examination.

The subject has just been reviewed, in a Besprechung to the Programm of the Mulhausen Gymnasion, by Joseph Lesiberie, who is engaged upon an extensive work on the transformation and deformation of the French language during the past century. He marshals, rather obscurely because of poor typography, the arguments of the reformers and of the purists, who are not unevenly matched in learning and reputation. When Ariste Darmesteter pronounces French orthography the most intolerant and complicated of modern spellings, except the English, Brunetière points to the unprecedented expansion of the globe notwithstanding, while Britail, far from wishing to write formae for pharmacie, fisticum for physique, or to translate (as the new Germans have done under imperial pressure) such terms as 'funktionär,' advocates the greatest possible similarity in scientific and technical terms, for the sake of European solidarity. Other writers answer the solicitude of the reformers in behalf of foreigners as well as of schoolchildren, by denying that there can be any real increase in facility of acquisition, whereas foreigners already in possession of the tongue would be compelled to unlearn and study anew. Would an Englishman be helped to recognize, say, manding in English if it were spelt muer, as is proposed, or pison for pigebn? It may be set down for certain that any general disregard of the present orthography would separate French from English, and that the French would never so much from the French; and that such typical changes as a&ison for attension od aprenissors, would serve to make English more a Latin tongue in resemblance than ever.

The battle has raged hottest, perhaps, over the proposed uniformity in the past participle of active verbs, instead of the usual concordance with the preceding object. Because the regimen of could is quite without rule, and because the past participle generally is conventionally constant or changeable in form, there is a desire to cut the knot at once by making this particle invariant. When, however, it is used adjectively, a difficulty immediately arises, for it is justly contended that gender neglected in the participle would tend to be neglected in the adjective, and that the language would approach English in the absence of inflection. English influence, it may be, is already making the post-position of the adjective less rigorous than formerly, but the other revolution would be far more sweeping.

At this point the poets take a hand in the controversy, and make an anxious plea for the integrity of the mute e of the feminine termination of the vowel. As to reported M. Hainaut, harmony and rhythm would perish from French verse; and Larroumet declares that it is "a rare and precious resource of classical prosody, from which the sixteenth-century poets de-
Correspondence.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SOUTH IN CONGRESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

Sir: Such a criticism of the actions of Southern politicians as appeared in the current Nation is not only merited, but badly true. Perhaps it is explainable by the fact that the leading men of the South take not the interest in politics that they formerly did. Such a corner-grocery element has entered Southern politics that not very many gentlemen enter it; hence the absence of Calhouns, Clayes, Madison, Stephensons, Benjamins, Hamptons, Bonn, and the like in Congress. Jef. Davis of Arkansas surely is not a type of the gentleman of the South of to-day. He is merely a specimen of the low grade to which Southern politics has now fallen. There are very few of us down South who adore either "Red Shirt" Tillman or Imperial McLaurn. Senator Bailey, also, has lost many friends by his pusilligous encounter with Beveridge.

Northerners may be assured that all Southerners hate to have such encounters as have taken place recently. Also, let them know that the South is trying to reform, and hopes, in the near future, to send more men like Congressman John S. Williams of Mississippi, to represent her at Washington.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM KERMAN DART.

BAY ST. LOUIS, MISS., AUGUST 20, 1892

THE ART OF UNLOADING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

Sir: The article entitled as above, in the Nation of August 21, seems to me worth to any thinking man the cost of a year's subscription, and, perhaps, of a whole lifetime of such subscription to some. The article has an economic as well as intellectual value, for at a former time there have been such gigantic efforts made to inject vast amounts of worthless "water" into the country's securities, in the hope of thereby transferring the public savings into the pockets of such unprincipled speculators. Of course, it is chiefly the credulous and inexperienced, who still believe that their own especial genius can get something for nothing, that fall into these traps. But the public press professes to lead and teach the people, and, though the nets are shamelessly spread in sight of the game, scarcely a journal in the country has ventured to expose the frauds with which their advertising columns are more or less filled. And yet the safety and happiness of countless families are endangered by every considerable amount of incorporated "water" which the promoters succeed in unloading upon unsuspecting and helpless people.

Your theme is so timely, so well treated, and likely to benefit so many that I hope you will give us more of it, even "line upon line, and precept upon precept."

Yours respectfully,

W. PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST 31, 1892.

THE ARRANGEMENT OF PHOTOGRAPHS.

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: I have recently been making an effort to arrange a collection of some thousands of photographs of historical works of art, so as to be able to refer to them easily. My experience may be of interest to some of your readers. The first decision I had to make was as to division into sizes. One buys an artist or a school and must arrange all together. The bulk of the collection must be small. After many experiments I fixed on the maximum size for the mounts of small photographs as a shade under 1/4 inches by 1/6 inches—a little larger than music—are made of strong mill-board and covered in cloth. They are quite cheap. All photographs too large for these boxes are of a size that should lie flat in some kind of portfolio. Most working photographers will enter the boxes, though sometimes with very little margin. Personally I do not mount my photographs as a rule, they pack so much closer unmounted. I keep them strictly for use, and I write on their backs all the notes I want; but if I had time, I should mount the photographs. They can be able to do this. The boxes stand on shelves on their longer edges, the shelves being 15% inches deep and 11% inches apart. Thousands of photographs can thus be stacked in a small space. I am sorry now that I ever bought any photographs and am half fagged to cut most of them in half and hinge the halves together. The arrangement of the groups of photographs within the boxes is, of course, strictly chronological; according to the dates and all the arts of one period being boxed together.

LORD, August, 1892

Notes.

John Morley's Life of Gladstone easily leads me to reflect upon the following: 'I was President,' said Mr. Gladstone to me once, 'that the person who was the best known to me was Edward Everett Hale's 'Memories of a Hundred Years,' Further items are 'Essays, Historical and Literary,' by the late John Fiske; 'The Loyalties in the American Revolution,' by Claude Halsey Van Tassel; and concluding volume of Edward McCrae's 'History of South Carolina,' by Marion and Greene for the chief figures; 'Historical Lectures,' by the late Lord Acton; 'History: Suggestions as to Its Study and Teaching,' by Prof. Louis Maynard Salmon; "Oceana," the 'List of the Vestals,' by F. Marion Crawford; 'Kotô, Some Japanese Curios, with Sundry Curiosities,' by Lafacide Hearn, 'The Splendid Isle Forties; Stories.