from the fact that a set of claims near North San Juan, which had been worked for years, was lately sold to an English company for $185,000 in gold. The purchasers are said to be perfectly satisfied with their investment, while the vendors, who have great skill and experience in this pursuit, purpose expending the purchase money in the development of similar mines.

In many other parts of the State, quartz and gravel mining are pursued with more or less success; and if the results do not always justify the sanguine anticipations of the operators, they serve to inculcate a lesson which many have been slow to learn, viz.: that this industry, which generally involves a considerable outlay of capital before any returns can be realized, cannot reasonably be expected to prosper unless conducted with skill, economy, and judgment. It is not many years since it was thought that any intelligent man of ordinary business education was competent to superintend the opening and working of a mine; indeed, for a long time, it was almost impossible to find a person possessed of the knowledge or experience now considered indispensable for such a position; but the wasteful expenditures and frequent failures of such superintendents have instructed mine proprietors, who now demand, and are usually able to secure, good engineering, mineralogical, and metallurgical talent in the persons whom they intrust with their interests. It is apparent, however, that the best American metallurgists have yet something to learn, since they have not been able to discover a process by which the precious metals can be extracted from the ores at a reasonable cost. Most of the copper ores of California and Arizona, and some of the silver ores of Nevada are shipped to Swansea, Wales, for treatment, while some ores of gold, containing considerable quantities of sulphur and base metals, are difficult to reduce by any known process.

Most of the silver produced in this country comes from Nevada, although several of the territories possess excellent mines of this metal. Even in this State, despite of the "scientific" theory that there are no considerable deposits of silver on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada mountains, some argentiferous lodes have been discovered which will one day pay handsomely for working. One of these lodes, in Placer County, assayed about $16 in silver and a small quantity of gold to the ton. Another, in Mariposa County, yielded nearly twice as much. Within the past month a silver mine, said to be very rich, was "located" near Camp Cady, on the Mojave River, about 50 miles east of the San Bernardino mountains. If this and other mining locations made in the same section, can be profitably worked, the fact will doubtless hasten the measures which have been proposed in the State, and which will probably be brought before the Legislature now in session, and ultimately before Congress, for the reclamation of agricultural uses of the Colorado desert, which, with a fertile soil and a hot climate is now almost a barren waste for want of water, but can be brought by irrigation to a high state of productiveness, in which event it would be especially adapted to the growth of semi-tropical herbs and fruits.

The celebrated "Comstock Lode" of Nevada is not at present yielding as largely as in times past, owing to fires, "caves," &c., by which some of the miners have been greatly damaged, and to the difficulty of working others on account of the depth which has been reached in them, and the constantly increasing labor and cost of drainage and hoisting ores. It is stated that the cost of draining the lode by means of steam pumps is $2,000,000 per annum. The mines will be relieved of this expense, and their working greatly facilitated by the Sutro Tunnel, now boring, which will strike the lode at a very low level, and permit it to be worked with profit for many years to come. None of the incorporated mines on this lode are now paying dividends; but no less an authority than Mr. Conrad Wiegand, formerly chief of the assaying department in the United States Branch Mint in this city, who has lately spent much time among the Nevada mines, asserts that very rich deposits of ore have been struck in nearly all the principal mines on the Comstock Lode, and that the facts are concealed by the directors from dishonest motives. One day or another the stockholders will learn whether theses charges are true or otherwise; but their knowledge may come too late.

The Esmeralda district, Nevada, was greatly over-rated, and in the heyday of a fictitious prosperity induced by the combined agencies of unparalleled misrepresentation and reckless speculation, it suddenly collapsed, to the ruin of many. The few good mines it contains are now being worked with judgment and profit. Pahranagat has some good mines, but labors under the disadvantage of isolation. In the Reese River district, many of the most promising mines "pinched out" at an inconsiderable depth, and their owners have not yet had the courage to dig downward in search of them, although experienced miners are of the opinion that the lodes would be found at no great depth. At White Pine, the last great mining sensation, there is some work and a good deal of speculation going on, the latter being the more profitable occupation to those who have poor mines to sell. There are several other mining districts of more or less note in Nevada, which are not now attracting special attention, and there is a large scope of country but partially explored, which is believed to be rich in the precious metals. The development of mining in Nevada has resulted in the discovery that a great deal of that State, heretofore supposed to be barren, is very productive, and that even among the sage-brush crops can be produced with moderate irrigation—in some exceptional seasons without irrigation at all. The White Pine region is said to be especially fertile, and many settlers are preempting homesteads there.

In Arizona and New-Mexico, notwithstanding the depredations of the Apaches, mining and prospecting are more active and more successful than at any previous period within the memory of Americans. In Colorado, Idaho, and Montana, the placer mines are failing, but the quartz mines are being worked with increasing success. Wyoming has long been trying to get up a mining reputation, and is apparently on the point of succeeding.

THE NORTH-WEST.

ST. LOUIS, March 15.—One of those giant undertakings of modern enterprise and capital is going rapidly forward to successful accomplishment which cannot fail to have an important bearing upon the well-being of this Empire City. I mean the construction of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids and Minnesota Railroad. If another Missouri or Mississippi River were to burst in upon us from a region hitherto beyond our commercial reach, it could scarcely have a more important relation to our success as a commercial center than this on-coming railway. The fact is, experience has proved that our railways *with* our rivers are even of more importance than our rivers—*i. e.*, we could better spare the River Mississippi above this point to St. Paul than a railroad from the same point. It is because I know the missionary work that these railroads are doing that I propose to preach so often a gospel according to this grand doctrine of internal improvement to your readers. Let it therefore be understood in the beginning by your readers that grain can be carried in light-draught vessels from St. Louis to Boston, or any other port south of it, or to any European wharf, at a figure considerably lower than via Chicago, and you will at once perceive the importance of this new St. Paul connection, via Burlington and Cedar Rapids, to St. Louis. I need not tell your intelligent readers that this road runs through the richest wheat and other cereal-producing region in all the West. Why, if we look only at the counties through which this road runs, we shall find that two years ago, 3,276,010 bushels of wheat were raised, and last year it was more than doubled, raising 6,918,653 bushels of the same grain. Look, again: two years ago, 12,256,686 bushels of other cereals were raised, and last year this item was the enormous yield of 20,664,155 bushels. Just so is it of all esculent roots, fruits, butter, pork, cattle, wool, etc.—almost all the productions of the American farm. The increase is absolutely enormous, and mind you, I do not now speak of any other than the identical counties through which this road runs. When I tell you that this road drains in the greater part of its course a country stretching for hundreds of miles to the north, the west, and even eastward, and when I add that no fewer than thirteen confluents, as I may call them, (being nothing more than the roads crossed by this road, and thereby making two streams to enter at such junction with this great road), join with it in draining the greater parts of the grain and produce-growing States of Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and even the great Red River region of the North, so recently become famous, you will not fail to wonder with me that this road had not been built before. To illustrate more fully the value of this new opening up of this Cedar Valley and regions tributary and beyond to commerce, let us look at the earnings of the Chicago and North-Western Railroad for five years just past. Five years ago, $7,921 per mile; four years ago, $8,807 per mile; three years ago, $9,952 per mile; two years ago, $10,956 per mile; one year ago, $12,163 per mile.

Now, when we remember that this Chicago and North-Western Railroad runs through a country far inferior to the Cedar Valley country in productiveness, (as any one who knows anything of these great North-Western States can verify), we can predict as great if not greater gains for this splendid enterprise. But allow, if you please, only a minimum figure for earnings, and when we remember that this great Cedar Valley road cost from $35,000 to $40,000 per mile, we see how soon such a road will pay its bonded debt. To state it in a nutshell: if you put $20,000 into this road on bond and mortgage, you get nearly 10 per cent. on your money, and the road is completed and earns for the mile of the road you have mortgaged to you, say $12,000 annually,—more than one-quarter the cost of your mile of road, and over one-half of your whole investment. Do you think it any risk to take stock in such a road? I do not wonder that so much of its capital stock is taken by the farmers along the route of the road. But if the stock be a risk, what shall we say of the bonds, since there is not a road in all the West that does not pay its interest, and this road can even give the amount of your bond in less than two years? This road is to be 350 miles in length. It is to be it the greater part of two States. It is to connect with another road, meeting it at Mankato from St. Paul. Then there will be one continuous straight line of rail from St. Paul to St. Louis, 580 miles. As I said before, into this great artery 580 miles long, will be poured not only the products and passage traffic of the counties through which it runs, but the 13 confluents of the Burlington, Cedar Rapids and Minnesota Railroad—but with its connection, from this city to St. Paul, some 30 or more tributaries in all. I think, therefore, I was not extravagant in my starting out, when I said that the opening up of this new road is a matter of greater moment than if we should wake up some morning in St. Louis and find a new river as noble as the Mississippi or the Missouri was flowing into one or other of these rivers before our city.

But there is another, and even a more important item of great import. If Jay Cooke builds the Northern Pacific Railroad, and other roads are opened up into Winnipeg, the Red River, the Saskatchewan Territory, and other great wheat lands, such grains will never go by Duluth, over Lake Superior and the endless system of lakes, but into this great artery of the Cedar Valley must be poured the greater part of all the traffic from these wheat-fields of the North and West. And the lumber. I wish I had time and your patience, to speak of this, the lumber of the North. Why, every rod of fence, every shingle and clapboard, the very posts for fencing, everything in the prairies that is wood, must come from these regions. And what but this Cedar Valley road must bring the lumber to market?

Now, I have spoken thus enthusiastically of the bearings of this enterprise on St. Louis, but candor must compel me to deny that its importance to Chicago is not the less, so long as Chicago continues to be the great depot for grain and lumber. This road to Burlington is one of Chicago's most important tributaries. Then, again, the new arrangements of the Pennsylvania Central, by which some 150 miles of travel are cut off, and we of all this valley are brought so much nearer the East. I say, if trade sets this latter way, the Burlington, Cedar Rapids and Minnesota Railroad must still be benefited as well as the rest of us by this shorter route. In any case, all success to this new railway! I see that one of the most sagacious and far-sighted brokers of Wall-st., Henry Clews, has the bonds for sale at 95. Eastern capital could not flow in a safer, and at the same time a more lucrative channel. I bespeak an early completion of this road, and I still believe it will do much to make St. Louis the metropolitan center of the West. We have only to complete our bridge across the Mississippi, and to get hold of the Union Pacific Railroad in some way, to accomplish very much toward that result.

COAL.

ARE OUR COAL MINES INEXHAUSTIBLE—HOW TO ECONOMIZE OUR COALS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I have read with lively interest your article on "Steam to the Mediterranean," published in this day's issue of your paper. Without doubt, an almost unlimited quantity of bituminous coal could be furnished by this country to supply the present and future wants of the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, because the supply of this variety of coal in the United States is practically inexhaustible, and it would, if the trade in it could be established, fairly prove a great source of wealth to Virginia, and other States lying on the Atlantic slope, and having this variety of coal.

Not so, however, with our Anthracite coals. Of this variety we have none to spare to a foreign country without endangering our own future resources for power as a nation. For, like Great Britain, we are limited in our supply of anthracite coals, and though this country probably contains more than five times the quantity that Great Britain has, it is all confined to a limited area, and nearly all developed in a greater or less degree; in fact, some sections have been entirely mined out. During the past year, the various companies who were mining anthracite coal took out, used, and transported about 16,000,000 tuns, and should the annual increase of consumption be as great during the next ten years as during the past five, it will be seen that by the year 1880 more than 30,000,000 tuns of this kind of coal alone will be annually required, which amount is, according to the estimate of practical mining engineers, greater than the profitable maximum product of all the anthracite fields.

It is now a well-ascertained fact, that the yield of coal per acre has been largely over-estimated in former years, and that the estimated area of anthracite territory, 420 square miles, is equal only to one small county, of which many square miles has been exhausted of its coal. These lands now vary in price from $250 to $1,000 per acre, according to their situation, "dip" of vein, or quality and quantity of coal. The yield varies from 20,000 to 50,000 tuns per acre, averaging, perhaps, less than 30,000 tuns per acre. Estimating the latter quantity as about a fair average yield, it will be seen that the last year's product exhausted about 533 acres, and that when the maximum production of 30,000,000 tuns is reached, say by 1880, we shall be exhausting more than 1,000 acres annually.

A strong point to which I wish to bring public attention is the relation this variety of coal has to the production of iron in the United States, and the relation iron has to the power of a state or nation. It is estimated by practical iron men that our production of iron will reach 2,000,000 tuns in 1871. We shall probably use more than that quantity of domestic and foreign make, and assuming that our population increases as rapidly during the next twenty years as it has the past ten years, and the make and use of iron in various ways increases in a like ratio, the product of iron in the United States by the year 1890 will reach fully 5,000,000 tuns (it ought to exceed that figure), which will be the largest annual production of any nation in the world, as before that time Great Britain's product will producing districts will have by that time been used up, have become less than it is now. It may be estimated that the manufacture of 5,000,000 tuns of iron per year will, in putting it into various shapes, require an annual consumption of not less than 15,000,000 tuns of coal, fully three fifths of which would be anthracite, for next after charcoal anthracite is the most desirable fuel for making iron, as well as the cheapest, provided this coal is not monopolized or controlled too much by a few leading corporations.

I have already alluded to the fact that several corporations have fortified themselves for the future, each owning, it is said, from 8,000 to 20,000 acres of the coal lands, selected with reference to *quality, quantity, and locality*, embracing nearly one-half of the whole area of the anthracite coal territory of the Union. They have far-reaching and controlling ramifications in the way of railroad and canal communications, and possess a future power, if they chose to exert it, equal to, if not greater, than that once held by the British East India Company. Pennsylvania, as it already produces more than half the iron of the country, and as her coal and iron make her truly the Keystone State, owes it first to herself to prevent any company hereafter organized within her borders to holding more than 3,000 acres of coal lands, and to forbid any two or more such companies to consolidating their land or interest. Let this matter be looked into at once by those having the power to act, and as we have millions of millions of tuns of bituminous coal in Maryland, Virginia, and Western Pennsylvania, and in our Western States let us use that and save our anthracite.

You have already done the nation a noble and valuable service in urging its people to spare its forests for future uses. Forests can, to some extent, be reproduced, but coal mines never. You can do a still greater good if you will assist in preventing the further monopolization and waste of the anthracite coal of this country. Give us the steam line to the Mediterranean, and export by it all the bituminous coal we may; but let us keep our anthracite coal here, in the hands of many owners, to be used in building up our own country and making it what it ought to be by 1890—the greatest iron producing country in the world. Yours, respectfully, KEYSTONE.

Pottsville, Pa., March 7, 1870.

THE BEGINNING OF THE ANTHRACITE TRADE

LETTER FROM THE HON. HENDRICK B. WRIGHT.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I wish, through you, to vindicate history, as to the commencement of the Anthracite coal trade. The statistical tables, heretofore published, represent the coal trade as beginning in 1820, with a shipment that year of 120 tuns by the Lehigh and Delaware Rivers to Philadelphia. I inclose you herewith an *Account Current* of Messrs. Price, Waterbury & Co. of New-York of Feb. 1, 1813, with Messrs. Abijah Smith & Co. of Plymouth, in this county, five miles below Wilkesbarre, I having the receipts of two cargoes of coal, its sale, and the names of the purchasers. This coal descended the Susquehanna, in arks, to Baltimore, and thence by sea to New-York. As this *Account Current* is an ancient paper, and contains the names of some of the early New-York merchants, I hope you may have the space to publish it entire.

Abijah and John Smith, from Bridgeport, Conn., were the pioneers of the coal trade. They came to this Valley in 1808, and from that time they yearly mined and sent coal to market till their respective deaths. Abijah died probably about 1826, and John several years afterward. I knew them both well; and, for the first two years after coming here, they boarded with my father, who resided near their mines. One of the same mines I now own.

The mineral, in their deeds of purchase, is described as "pots of coal." While coal had been used here for smith purposes, before 1808, it had not been sent elsewhere. Judge Jesse Fell of this place is entitled to the merit, that same year, of the discovery of burning it in a grate without an air blast—and that same grate is still to be seen here.

You will thus see that the commencement of the coal trade was, some time before 1820, as the present tables exhibit. I address this note to you, knowing, as well as appreciating your care and attention, in selecting and preserving statistics of the trade, business, and general events of the country, and in the hope that so important a matter as the coal trade may be properly registered, I am, Sir, your very obedient, HENDRICK B. WRIGHT.

Wilkesbarre, Penn., March 23, 1870.

NEW-YORK, Feb. 1813.

MESSRS. ABIJAH SMITH & CO.—*Gentlemen:* Having lately taken a view of the business we have been conducting for you this some time past, we have thought it would be gratifying to have the account forwarded and therefore present you with a summary of it up to the 18th January, 1813, containing, first, the quantity of coal sold and to whom; second, the amount of cash paid by us from time to time; third, the amount of interest, cash on the various sums advanced, the credit of interest on sums received, and, lastly, the quantity of coal remaining on hand unsold. Should you, on the receipt of this, find any of the items incorrect, we need hardly observe that the knowledge of such an error will be corrected with the greatest pleasure. As it respects our future place of procedure, we shall expect to see one of your concern in the city some time in the Spring, when a new arrangement may be fixed upon. Our endeavors to establish the character of the coal shall not at any time be wanting, and we calculate shortly to dispose of the remaining parcels of coal unsold.

1812.	
June 8.—By cash of Doty & Willets for 5 chaldrons coal	$100 00
By cash of John Withington for 5 chaldrons coal	100 00
By cash of Coulthaud & Son for 10 chaldrons coal	200 00
By John Benham's note (60 days) for 10 chaldrons do.	200 00
By cash of G. P. Lorrilard for 1 chaldron coal	20 00
By cash of J. J. Wilson for 4 chaldrons coal	80 00
June 13.—By cash of Doty & Willets for 5 chaldrons coal	100 00
By cash of G. P. Lorrilard for 11½ chaldrons coal	230 00
By A. Fearey's note (90 days') for 23 chaldrons coal	475 00
By cash received of T. Coulthard for 5 chaldrons coal	100 00
By M. Woman's note (90 days') for 20 chaldrons coal	380 00
By half measurement, received for 1,620 bushels	6 33
By B. Ward and T. Blagge for 1¼ chaldrons at $20	25 00
By Willingham for 1½ chaldrons coal	10 00
June 25.—By Pirpont for ½ chaldron coal	11 00
By Mr. Lands for ½ chaldron coal	12 00
July 16.—By Robert Barney for 17½ chaldrons at $22 ⅌ chal.	395 00
Sept. 15.—By cash for ½ chaldron coal	12 50
Oct. 9.—By William Colman for ½ chaldron coal	12 50
By Sexton & Williamson for 1½ chaldrons coal	37 50
Oct. 24.—by cash for 1 chaldron coal	25 00
Oct. 29.—By cash for ½ chaldron coal	12 50
Nov. 12.—By cash for 1 chaldron coal	25 00
Nov. 7.—By cash for ½ chaldron coal	12 50
Nov. 16.—By Mr. A. Le Britton for 12 chaldrons at $25 ⅌ chal.	250 00
Dec. 5.—By cash for ½ chaldron coal	12 50
Dec. 11.—By cash of A. Daily for ½ chaldron coal	12 00
Dec. 14.—By cash for ½ chaldron coal	12 50
1813.	
Jan. 4.—By cash for 1 chaldron coal	25 00
Jan. 18.—By J. Curtis for 9 bushels coal	0 27
By amount of balance this day	751 12
Total	$3,691 39

Errors excepted. PRICE & WATERBURY.

STRAY SKETCHES.

LEAVES FROM A LECTURER'S NOTE-BOOK.

I.

WOMAN IN THE LYCEUM.

"Any woman who lectures is unfeminine. She is a disgrace to her sex!" exclaimed a man of society, recently.

"Did you ever hear a woman lecture?" I asked. "No, and I never shall."

"Did you ever know a woman lecturer?" "No, thank God!"

"Then what evidence can you advance to substantiate so sweeping an assertion?" "The mere fact of a woman's lecturing is proof positive."

"Why is lecturing unfeminine?" "Because it is!"

I dared question no further. Wrecked on the Scylla of Society, I was soon after swallowed up by the Charybdis of the Pulpit.

"Women have my sympathy in many ways," said a clergyman, "but when they attempt to overthrow Christianity, I am against them."

"Pray tell me in what way a woman lecturer overthrows Christianity?" "St. Paul declares that no woman shall speak in public."

"I think you are mistaken; but, granting that St. Paul *does* so decree, where are you to draw the line? Shall the prima donna cease from singing?" "That is different."

"But a prima donna is frequently called upon to speak. And how about church choirs? Chants are but one remove from recitation." "I tell you that is very different."

"Shall Fanny Kemble stop reading?" "No."

"Well, then, there is the actress. She certainly speaks in public. Shall she be abolished?" "No; St. Paul did not mean that."

"Then what *did* he mean?" "He meant that a woman was not to lecture."

"Ah!"

Preserving that silence which is said to be so excellent a thing in woman, I withdrew to consult St. Paul. And what did I find?

"Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the law."

"And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church."

What is to become of the wretched women who have no husbands? And what shall be done with the Quakers? What punishment shall be meted out to such sinners as Elizabeth Fry and Lucretia Mott? "As also saith the law?" This was the law of A. D. 59. If there be no such law now, where lies the force of this injunction? Do any other Corinthian laws prevail to-day? But Paul seems to contradict himself, for in this same epistle he says, "every woman that prayeth or prophesieth *uncovered*, dishonoreth her head." Women are allowed to pray and prophesy, *provided* their heads are covered. As churches are the most appropriate places for prayer and prophesy, even women of Corinth must have ignored the laws. At the worst, however, St. Paul says nothing about *lecturing*. "Women shall keep silence in the churches!" Relieved beyond expression at the explicitness of St. Paul, I read on until I came to still another command.

"But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."

Yet, in his Epistle to Philemon, St. Paul says, "Help those women who labored with me in the Gospel." What does this mean, if it does not mean teaching and preaching? In that same chapter of Timothy where women are counseled not to teach, women are told to adorn themselves in modest apparel, and not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array. One edict is as binding upon us as the other. What becomes of Esther, who, when she would save her people, made herself supremely beautiful by her gorgeous robes? What becomes of all the professed and professing Christian women who not only wear broidered hair of their own, but unknown quantities of that which is by no means "native and to the manner born," whose pearls are of great price, and whose silks and satins are as costly as the length of their purses admits? A little further on I read again, in Timothy:

"Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities."

Where, *O* where are the Prohibitionists? "Ah, but," say they, "that was Paul's advice to Timothy, who was ailing!" Well, then, 'tis a poor rule that does not work both ways. If this be granted, why may not Paul's instructions with regard to women's preaching and teaching have been purely local? But how can Prohibitionists stand up against scriptural authority when Christ himself turned water into wine? when in the psalms we read of wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and in Judges of wine "which cheereth *God* and man?"

I hear women condemned because of a few words emanating from St. Paul, and flatly contradicted by St. Paul, yet I never heard the most violent anti-Prohibitionist argue against the Maine Liquor Law on the ground of its being contrary to Scripture. It is astonishing what a difference there is between one and the same thing. St. Paul is easily reconciled to the situation; but still do I hear the echo of that verdict pronounced by society, "A woman lecturer is unfeminine; she is a disgrace to her sex." "Vain is it to say," writes Madame de Stael, "such a man is not worthy of judging, such a woman is not capable of understanding me; the human face exercises a great power over the human heart; and when you read in this face secret disapprobation, you are troubled in spite of yourself; the circle around you succeeds finally in concealing all the rest of the world; the smallest object placed before your eyes, will shut out the sun!" Society, *not conscience*, makes cowards of all women. "Do not do it," said those very dear to a woman about to lecture. "We had rather see you dead," said others earnestly. One cannot but smile at this; for it is singular how even the best of us had rather see our friends *dead* than have them do some particular thing that we particularly dislike; while there is not one of us but would clutch at the flimsiest straw, rather than pay this inevitable debt a moment earlier than Nature claims it as her due. There would have been no such violent opposition had the profession selected been that of the stage, yet in choosing for a woman between lecturing and acting, observation leads me to prefer the former, unless, of course, there be evidence of decided dramatic ability. While I firmly believe and know that the most refined of women need not lose one iota of delicacy by daily contact with the stage, it is a fact that the theatrical profession admits of greater temptation. Though a Siddons or a Ristori breathes the breath of life into the masterpieces of classic poets, still is the theater nothing more than a place of amusement to the votaries of fashion. Its priestesses are fair game, and want of success is not due to the virtue of their admirers.

Lecturing tells another tale. Free from the envy, jealousy, and malice of rivals in popular applause, with no necessities of wardrobe, untrammeled by managers and rehearsals, the lecturer delivers her essay, within the limits of an hour, receives her check, and may lead the least exciting of public lives. There is no fear of persecution from the *jeunesse dorée*. If there is one creature more obnoxious than any other to the professional pleasure-seeker, it is a woman who attempts to talk sense. A woman with brains enough to keep her out of mischief, is marked "dangerous." And a woman-lecturer, why

She "is a monster of as frightful mien,
As to be hated, needs but to be seen!"

Therefore our daily prayer, "Lead us not into temptation," is much more likely to be answered in the lyceum than in the theater. Let me make haste to add, however, that the evils of the stage are *off* not *on* it.

The worst stigma, apart from vice, the world can cast upon a man is that of unmanliness; the worst accusation the world can bring against a woman is that of unwomanliness. I think a woman of sensibility would rather starve than live by that which conscience tells her is unwomanly. I say I *think*, because until fully tested, we know not to what false gods we may bow down. There is the pretty myth of the ermine that, when hunted, had rather be caught and killed than escape by going through mire and soiling its beautiful skin; but it is only a myth, they say. I do not feel public-speaking to be unwomanly. The prejudice against women lecturers is merely temporary, and will disappear as soon as women upon the platform cease to be a novelty. Every step forward taken by women has been over burning plow-shares, and we can always look back to a time when the occupation most advocated by our fastidious friends, was of all others the most compromising to womanhood. Old though the drama be, it is only within a couple of centuries that women have stood behind the footlights. Boys in fardingales were Shakespeare's heroines. Handsome as Edward Kynaston may have been,

"A man's a man for a' that."

and to have had a performance delayed, as happened in Charles II.'s time, because, forsooth! the Queen was not shaved! strikes us as absurdly incongruous. All this has been, and so have male sopranos. The singing-voice of woman is a modern invention.

When Harriet Hosmer first went to Italy she was regarded as a *lusus naturæ*. No words could express the horror of many good people of a woman who had stepped so far out of her sphere as to set up a studio of her own! But, as one extreme always begets another, these same good people *now* grow ecstatic over the work of this former disgrace to her sex, and to her is assigned the execution of the Freedmen's Monument to Abraham Lincoln. Miss Hosmer has positively made sculpture so fashionable, that every silly girl who pinches clay and makes a tolerable bas-relief, is called a genius, and straightway begins where Michael Angelo left off. Ten years ago every female human being taller than an infant, that wore a round hat, was considered unfeminine. Now, round hats are poised on the most fashionable noses, at an angle that would drive Euclid wild. Lecturing to-day occupies the position formerly accorded to the round hats. Ten years hence, society will draw the line "unfeminine," say at women who, having too much honest pride to hang as burdens about the necks of their friends or relatives, take up active business and dare to make as much money as their brothers. Evidently Society would go to pieces did it not insist upon drawing the line somewhere. To my conscience it is vastly more unfeminine to be guilty of the Grecian Bend, to enamel, to make conquests of men merely for the sake of counting scalps, to indulge in slander, to dress extravagantly, to sit in the parlor, and allow the cook to *overdo* or *underdo* everything edible in the kitchen, to feed children on pastry and hot bread, to consign little ones to incompetent nurses—than it is to lecture. Yet the dear creatures who indulge in these sins, are rarely called unwomanly!

After all, the prejudice against lecturing arises in great part from the fact that a woman thereby advocates her own ideas. A singer interprets some male composer; a reader colors the fanciful drawings of a master; an actress illustrates the dramatic poet's genius; but a lecturer thinks for herself, and employs that egotistical pronoun I. This is the unpardonable sin. "The delicacy of the sex," says that garrulous biographer, Boaden, "while it becomes accustomed to repeat the sentiments of others, shrinks from the seeming boldness of publicly uttering their own. But there was a male dignity in the understanding of Mrs. Siddons that raised her above the helpless timidity of other women." Why a male dignity? did not Mrs. Siddons belong essentially to her own sex? Was she peculiar except in being greater than the women about her? Need her dignity have been other than that of a noble womanhood conscious of extraordinary power? Boaden insults the character of the very woman whom he thinks to praise.

What matter where Truth comes from, so long as it is Truth. Shall it be asserted that the whole of Truth has been revealed to but one-half of the human race? Shall the relic of barbaric law be religiously preserved? "*Baron et femme*" the old law phrase runs—the master and his woman. It is the duty of the slave to amuse—to teach—never! The queerest part of all this "ineffable business" is, that lecturing by women is nothing new under the sun. "We forget," says Higginson, "that wonderful people, the Spanish Arabs, among whom women were public lecturers and secretaries of kings, while Christian Europe was sunk in darkness. In Italy, from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century, it was not esteemed unfeminine for women to give lectures in public to crowded and admiring audiences. They were freely admitted to learned societies, and were consulted by men of preëminent scientific attainments as their equals in scholarship." Nor is this all. "In the middle ages women preached in public, supported controversies, published and defended theses, filled the chairs of philosophy and law, harangued the Popes in Latin, wrote Greek and read Hebrew. Nuns wrote poetry, women of rank became divines, and young girls publicly exhorted Christian princes to take up arms for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre." And none of these women were regarded as unfeminine! In those dark ages the being able to do a thing was the open sesame to its execution. There was the maiden Novella of Bologna, who studied law and conducted her father's cases, *railed*, in order that her beauty might not lead justice astray. At 26, she took the degree of laws; at 30, she was elevated to a Professor's chair and taught law to scholars from all nations. Her example was followed by others of her sex. No one accused this brilliant and beautiful woman of being unwomanly. What horrible names she would be called did she live to-day! and, at the same time, how we all delight in Shakespeare's Portia, and how we applaud her, even in male attire, when she pleads the cause of Antonio and makes that noble speech on mercy! Portia loses none of her feminine fascinations because she possessed an intellect equal to an emergency of life and death. But this is on the stage. Madame Roland defended her husband at the bar with firmness and eloquence. Even to-day she is proclaimed a glory to womanhood. Jane de Montfort fought for her Duchy of Bretany, and has been made the heroine of a tragedy! Why, even Semiramis, who subdued the East and the Amazons, who conquered Asia, were never accused of being "strong-minded!" Pray what is the improvisatrice? The lovely, heart-broken Corinne, over whom, with the aid of a dictionary, school girls weep, is a lecturer. "This is all very well," argues some good friend, "but you must confess that lecturers are insufferable bores. Deluged *now* with male lecturers, what *will* become of us when female lecturers are multiplied by twenty? We shall be drowned in a sea of words!"

To an educated person the ordinary lecture is an insufferable bore. It is an exceedingly lazy method of getting at nothing, instituted, perhaps, for the benefit of country lads and lasses, that they may have a not too loud accompaniment to the whisperings of their hearts. But it seems to me that if lecturing be tolerated at all, it should be from the lips of woman, and for this reason. Ever since the subsidence of chaos, men have been talking. For 6,000 years, at least, they have stumped creation, and have been listened to by attentive audiences, largely composed of women. By this means the world has been "thoroughly informed" of men's views on all subjects. But we have seen all things in profile. Now an artist will tell you that no two sides of the same face are exactly alike. I pray you, therefore, let us have the other profile, whereby we may see the entire face, gaze into tell-tale eyes, and thus get at the *soul* of all things! "Genius has no sex," declared Madame de Staël, and many women quote her dictum with unctuous satisfaction. I believe no such dogma. Madame de Staël is her own best contradiction. What man could have written *Corinne?* There is as much sex in mind as in matter. "Men and women are eternally equal and eternally different," states Wendell Phillips. It is this formula to which I subscribe with my whole heart and head. It is this difference in equality that renders each sex so charming to the other. There *is* sex in thought, and it is the feminine side of thought, ignored for centuries, that now would be heard. Whether it be better or worse than man's, is not the question. The right of hearing only, is asked. If the thought be good for nothing, no harm is done; if it be good for something, the whole world is the gainer, for every truth belongs to all humanity. Men have pronounced a verdict not only upon themselves, but upon women. It is time that women tried their own case. It is possible that such a jury impanneled in this age may pass a milder sentence upon women than Blackstone has passed. The world moves, and there are intimations that what is sauce for the gander is sauce for the goose! This is revolutionary doctrine, certainly; nevertheless, it is whispered in Gath and named outright in New-York.

The question of the latter half of this century being woman, woman must take the field in her own behalf. Does it not therefore become apparent that women are more needed in the Lyceum than men? And lecturing upon living subjects should not only be tolerated, but approved, for it is to Lyceums that we turn for enlightenment in such matters. People and things, dead and gone, are embalmed in books, and the majority of those who attempt their resurrection, show us but the mummies that we can privately exhibit to ourselves. But in what book can we find solutions to those problems of "suffrage," "the political crisis," "the duty of the hour," and equally vital questions? Some one tells me that women have no voices for public speaking. No voices! Is not the actress heard as well as the actor? It is the exceptional man that makes the orator, and it will be the exceptional woman also. If the majority of women are bad speakers, it is not surprising. They stand upon the platform without previous training, with no stock in trade but the truth that is in them, and for orators, this is very poor capital indeed. Their action is elementary, because they have not learned the alphabet of forensic manner and grace. Their arms are pinioned to their sides, because Society insists that women shall go about after the manner of trussed fowls. The first lesson taught to girls in New-York boarding-schools is not to swing the arms in walking. It is vulgar. I have met troops of such girls taking their "constitutionals" in Fifth-Avenue; and I have sometimes noticed very reprehensible conduct on the part of maidenly eyes, but I never saw a pair of arms doing duty to lungs and biceps. What grace can come from such rearing? When girls are educated physically as well as mentally; when they are taught the use of their arms; when they learn to recite as boys learn to declaim; when they are made to comprehend the advantages of a clear, resonant enunciation, and that to murder language by swallowing it whole is not a sign of true womanliness, there will be sufficient material out of which to make good speakers. Men are naturally more awkward than women; yet the former are infinitely less awkward on the platform, because they have been reared to it.

Taking for granted all that is known and said about women, they ought to make more attractive lecturers than men. I do not think they are, but they ought to be. And these are my data: Women are born more graceful; they have the great gift of beauty, and the great privilege of dress. Hence they are a greater gratification to the eye, and the majority of the people hear with their eyes. Women are more impulsive, more sympathetic, more persuasive. Therefore are they more likely to touch the heart, and when you have made an audience feel, half the battle is won. Pray who does the greater part of lecturing in private? Mr. or Mrs. Caudle? Were I a man I should hail public lecturing as what Jefferson Davis would call "a blessing in disguise." When Vesuvius is in a state of eruption Ætna is quiet! Fluency of diction is a desideratum in speaking. If tradition be correct women are not lacking in this requirement. Indeed, it has been seriously questioned whether women partake of celestial joys, for the reason that once upon a time there was silence in Heaven for the space of half-an-hour! "Women," says Rousseau, "have a flexible tongue; they speak more rapidly, more easily, and more agreeably than men; they are accused also of talking more; that ought to be, and I would gladly transform this reproach into eulogy: with them, mouth and eyes have the same activity and for the same reason." If the eyes speak as rapidly as the mouth, then women should attain eloquence while men are meditating it. I say *if*, mark you, and my authority is a man who has never given aid or comfort to the modern idea of woman.

Egypt, wisest and greatest of ancient nations, clothed in female form its representative of a superintending Providence, and gave to Isis a homage never accorded to Osiris. "I am what has been, what is, what will be! and no mortal hath lifted my vail!" is the mighty epigraph of the mysterious Isis. Will the vail be lifted and removed by one of her own sex? In Greek mythology it is Pallas Athene who embodies wisdom. The muses are women. From whom else should come lectures? Greek oracles proceeded from the lips of women. No man ever sat upon the Pythia's tripod. The greatest orators of Hellas did not scorn to be taught their art by women. Plato tells us that Socrates learned rhetoric from Aspasia who composed the funeral harangue delivered by Pericles. It was to their mother Cornelia that the Gracchi owed their eloquence. All sibyls were women, for to women is credited greater susceptibility of inspiration. The Druids looked to their priestesses for oracles. In modern times Sybils and Druidesses give way to improvisatrici. Men also improvise, but women command the greater interest. It is to Eve's persuasive pleading that we owe *all* knowledge, and Eve, by the way, was the original orator. In Biblical history we read that the first ode on record was the joint effort of Moses and Miriam. Miriam was among the first to prophesy, and she it was who taught music and sacred harmony to the young Israelites. Deborah's canticle preceded Homer by 13 centuries (B. C. 2285), and by some the blind Greek is supposed to have taken it as a model. Deborah was elevated to the dignity of Judge of Israel.

Who make the best teachers? "Women," reply the Public School Committees, and pay them less than they pay men. "Virtue is its own reward," say the copy books, and the copy books are about right. What is lecturing but an airy and entertaining form of teaching? Precedent after precedent might be brought forward to prove woman's natural right to the Lyceum. All that holds her from it, is the fear of that terrible African deity, Mumbojumbo, who, after all, is nothing more than a man disguised in horrible attire, and raised by a crown of straws to a gigantic hight. Once dare to lay that crown low, and Mumbojumbo's "*ji! fo! fum!*" will cease to terrify the fainting hearts of women.

And now without "