The Sun.

SUNDAY, APRIL 25, 1909.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Laffan, 170 Nassau street. The office of Secretary of the Association is temporarily vacant.

London office, Effingham House, 1 Arundel street, Strand. The daily and Sunday SUN are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street, and Daw's Steamship Agency, 17 Green street, Leicester Square.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 77, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The Palace Guard at Constantinople.

The presence of the Young Turks within the walls of Constantinople and their attack upon the palace of the Sultan significantly indicate whom they consider the chief front of their opposition. The palace guard, that institution which CONSTANTINE brought with him and which no ruler at Constantinople has ever since dispensed with, fell as it has fallen before in defence of a declining ruler. The Young Turks' victory marks the end of ABDUL HAMID'S absolutism. It may, in the present uncertain times, mean the end of even his titular reign. Still more to the outside world, it marks the end of the boasted bloodless revolution.

The moderation with which the Young Turk leaders are credited, their protection of foreign embassies, their interest in the welfare of foreigners, show that they are fully aware of the change that they have made in their course of bringing liberty and progress to the Ottoman Empire. Civil war and bloodshed means the interference of the Powers, and there might be as much to fear from this source as from domestic turmoil. Will not Europe, in the bloodshed at Constantinople, in an imprisoned or fugitive Sultan, and in the daily massacres in Asiatic Turkey, find a reason for interference? The Powers have availed themselves of much slighter pretexts. Certainly out of it all must come a very decided change of feeling in several European courts. A Sultan without favors to grant is less desirable under present conditions than a victorious Young Turk party. Kaiser WILHELM may condole with his personal friend; but England has long inclined to the Young Turks, and when the Constitution was promulgated the British Ambassador received almost as great an ovation on the streets of Constantinople as did the most popular hero of the ascendent party.

The Quicksand at Albany.

After forty years of faithful, persistent and unfailing service in supplying the genial taxpayers of the State with scandals innumerable, the State Capitol at Albany has apparently yielded the field to the newer Educational Building just across the street. True, only the bare foundations of this latter structure have yet been laid—or not laid, for here is the scandal—yet already all the old familiar cries of fraud, faulty construction and actual disregard of ordinary laws of gravity are to be heard again, all those old outcries which have enlivened the history of the still unfinished Capitol for more than a generation.

True or false—and the statement of the circumstantial details by the Albany newspapers is positive in the extreme—the latest development in State construction is thoroughly interesting. The main charge is that the concrete filling which should have been placed under the great iron girders supporting the main weight of the building has been omitted and that the omission has been concealed by a concrete shell laid in the small hours of the morning. All this is denied by the contractor and charged by C. V. MERRICK, who represents the architects and the State in the construction of the new building. The whole affair is now to be investigated, and presently the people of the State may be permitted to know whether the great iron girders, designed to bear a weight of 390 tons each, have been laid in concrete as the contractor says or on the natural quicksand that underlies this side of Capitol Hill as the critics say.

Pending the investigation as to the facts, however, it is interesting to recall the fact that one side of the Capitol itself has also slowly but surely settled down on this same quicksand. There can be no more amusing reading than the reports made from time to time by the various investigating committees appointed to probe various defects. As far back as 1869, before the Capitol was begun, the existence of the quicksand was disclosed. In the early '70s another commission disclosed the fact that the contractors in dealing with the quicksand had thoughtfully removed a portion of it and supplied its place with "puddled clay." Upon this firm foundation, moreover, the enormous granite mass of the Capitol was erected. The early reports reassuringly announced that there would be no danger of actual collapse in the Capitol—just the possibility of cracks in the walls and staircases. Sure enough, in due time the cracks came, the Assembly staircase was pronounced unsafe, the plan to build a tower over the whole building had to be abandoned, and within the past few years the staircase itself has had to be rebuilt. There is then a very illuminating volume of history in existence upon the subject of foundations of State edifices on Capitol Hill; and apparently a new chapter is now to be added.

It is perhaps worth while to recall also that when the first commission reported upon the probable cost of the new Capitol it fixed the outside figure at $4,000,000. It has now cost $26,000,000, and, as every one knows, is in a hopeless state of incompletion in many parts. It is for $4,000,000, moreover, that the present Educational Building is to be erected. Obviously the inspiring work of exceeding the estimates has already begun here. Even at this remote date it is hardly necessary to recall the long and splendid record of scandals in the Capitol history, culminating with the magnificent papier maché ceiling incident, which is still the classic example of graft in Albany.

After all, the main fact is that the State is building again—building on the same firm foundation of native quicksand, with an apparent recurrence to the ancient and honored customs of earlier days. Hopeful Albany correspondents may now look forward cheerfully to a new opportunity and a further opening for investigation and exposure, while the sturdy taxpayer may expect personal acquaintance, through a pleasant return to direct tax, with a new example of efficient administration.

All that is now lacking to carry us straight back to the stirring days of ten or twenty years ago is some wholly enlivening revelation regarding the construction of the $101,000,000 barge canal. That this want will be filled ere long and to the limit of public desire we do not hesitate to assert without fear of the fate that awaits false prophets of evil.

Rank Growth of a Pay Roll.

A mighty interesting problem in cancellation could be created by any one who should take the Department of Agriculture, the Geological Survey, the Census Bureau, &c., and make a careful study of the extent to which they overlap each other in various respects, duplicate each other's work and generally multiply the pay roll of the Government. Something has been said about the propriety of examining the proposed appropriations for the different executive departments, and it seems to us that a beginning may auspiciously be made at the point we have indicated.

It is the history of almost every branch of the public service that the chiefs have always exercised a sleepless vigilance in the matter of extending the duties originally devolved upon them, reaching out for additional responsibilities, increasing their authority and their political influence. From modest beginnings the Department of Agriculture, for instance, has steadily dilated its scheme of activity until it embraces nearly every ramification of industry, occupation, even daily life. If it has not yet reached that point it is rapidly approaching an absorption of the two Interior Department bureaus of Forestry and the Geological Survey. It has grown like the beanstalk of the nursery tale until nothing less than a palatial public building will accommodate its managing staff, while the entire surface of the country is crowded with the subordinate professors, observers, experimenters, chemists, horse doctors and assorted functionaries, and matching this spectacular progress is the fast recruiting army of the salaried.

Well may Senator ALDRICH call attention to this lush growth and warn Congress against its encroachments on the Treasury. It is like the evolution of a plague of locusts.

The Revolution in Our Highway System.

An interesting controversy has arisen in Suffolk county on Long Island between the Board of Supervisors and the State Civil Service Commission at Albany. The Board of Supervisors of Suffolk county undertook to appoint a County Superintendent of Highways. The State Civil Service Commission had furnished the board with a list of persons whom, as the result of a competitive examination, it had determined to be eligible for appointment to the office. Instead of selecting its appointee from the three names at the head of the list as prescribed by the civil service rules the Board of Supervisors named the candidate who stood fourth. The Civil Service Commission has refused to recognize this appointment and the Board of Supervisors must now appoint one of the first three in the list or litigate the matter.

Many important changes in the public roads system of this State were made by the new highway law which was enacted by the Legislature of 1908 and went into effect on January 1, 1909. This statute provided for the establishment of a Department of Highways at the head of which should be three Commissioners to be appointed by the Governor subject to confirmation by the Senate for a term of six years. These officers are expressly commanded to devote all their time to the duties of their office. One of the Commissioners must be "a practical civil engineer, who shall have had actual experience in the construction of highways and bridges." One must "belong to the party casting at the last preceding State election the next to the highest number of votes for Governor." This requirement compelled Governor HUGHES to appoint a Democrat, and it will be remembered that his first effort to comply with it did not satisfy the Senate. The chairman of the Highway Commission is designated as such by the Governor when the Commissioners are appointed and is paid more than his associates. They receive $5,000 a year each, while his annual compensation is $6,000. As the chairman's duties are no more onerous than those of the other Commissioners, all being required to give all their time to the service of the State, this distinction seems unreasonable. The chairman receives too much or his associates receive too little.

To the Department of Highways thus established is committed the duty of supervising the construction of the elaborate system of State highways for which the people of this State voted to incur a bonded indebtedness of $50,000,000 by an amendment to the Constitution adopted in 1905. Outside of cities and incorporated villages prior to 1898 the expense of constructing and maintaining highways was borne by the townships in which they were situated. In that year the State began to aid the towns by contributing a percentage to the maintenance of the highways. The new system provided for by the act of 1908 contemplates three classes of highways: (1) State highways, constructed or improved solely at the expense of the State; (2) county highways, constructed or improved at the joint expense of State, county and town, and (3) town highways, constructed or improved by the township with the aid of the State. In short the State supports one class wholly and helps both the others.

The new highway law expressly prescribes thirty-seven routes for State highways to be constructed or improved at the sole expense of the State. According to the report of the legislative committee which drafted the statute these comprise an aggregate of 3,332 miles, of which 560 miles have already been constructed or improved. The routes are along the principal lines of travel in and between the several counties and indicate in a general way the scheme in the mind of the Legislature, at the same time leaving to the Highway Commission considerable discretion as to the precise location to be adopted in such case.

The State Highway Commission will exercise exclusive jurisdiction over the construction and improvement of these great public roads of the State. Over the county highways there will be county superintendents appointed by the boards of supervisors, and over the town highways town superintendents, elected at the biennial town meetings or appointed by the town board, as the voters may determine. In case the Board of Supervisors of any county fails to appoint a county superintendent the State Commission of Highways may place the county in a highway district with other counties similarly situated and may appoint a district superintendent therefor with the same powers as a county superintendent.

In the case of Suffolk county we suppose the State Commission could treat the attempt of the Board of Supervisors to appoint an unqualified person as a failure to appoint at all, and could thereupon proceed to place the county under a district superintendent of its own selection—assuming, of course, the Supervisors can legally appoint only in conformity to the civil service rules. The State Commission, however, will hardly manifest a martinet spirit in the administration of a new law of such importance, and will doubtless readily permit the Suffolk county Board of Supervisors to correct its mistake if the members of the board frankly admit that they have erred.

Dr. Barton's Theory.

The Rev. JAMES L. BARTON, foreign secretary and executive head of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, is reported as having said in Baltimore that the Armenians themselves provoked the Moslem outbreaks in Asia Minor in the course of which such frightful violence has been committed. He declares that the Armenians have been conspiring ever since the Young Turks came into power, intending to set up a kingdom of their own, and that the present bloody culmination was of their deliberate contrivance.

We do not know how true this is. Perhaps it is only a shrewd guess on Dr. BARTON'S part, though he should be in a position to know whereof he speaks. Certain it is that for many years we have not heard of any murderous demonstration by the Mohammedans against people within their empire excepting the Armenians. Many millions of non-Mussulmans live under the rule of the Caliph—Jews, Greeks, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Mennonites, &c.—yet they all live in peace and security, and instead of being persecuted seem to receive justice and protection.

If Dr. BARTON is correct in his analysis of the situation the essence of his message is that the Turkish attack upon the Armenians has been inspired by politics and not religion; that will remove many misapprehensions, though of course it cannot mitigate the horrors which have ensued or the perils in which so many innocent Americans now find themselves involved.

The Democratic Party Under Two Great Shocks.

Mr. ALDRICH of Rhode Island in a colloquy with Mr. BAILEY of Texas in the Senate the other day dated his Republicanism from the time he became "a member of the Union army," which was in 1862. In that year he enlisted as a private in Company G, Tenth Rhode Island Infantry, and for nine months served in the garrison of Washington on the Virginia side of the Potomac.

Most of the sketches of Mr. ALDRICH'S career say nothing about his soldiering, and as the most modest and reticent man in the Senate he keeps the reminiscences to himself; but we undertake to say that surprised as his colleagues were, with rare exceptions, to learn that Mr. ALDRICH was a veteran of the civil war, not one of them doubted that the young Providence volunteer became one of the most competent privates in the Tenth Rhode Island and mastered the duties of the infantry soldier as few of his comrades did.

Having paid tribute to Mr. ALDRICH'S versatility and thoroughness, it is allowable, and even necessary in the interest of history, to point out that the Senator underestimated the number of Democrats in the North during and immediately after the war when, assuming that service in the Union army converted a Democrat into a Republican, he intimated a paucity of Democrats above Mason and Dixon's line as one of the results of the conflict. As a matter of fact they were much more numerous in the election of 1864 than LINCOLN'S tremendous majority of the electoral vote over MCCLELLAN would indicate. Only the Northern and Western States were polled, of course. MCCLELLAN received 1,802,237 votes to LINCOLN'S 2,213,665, and the soldiers' vote was: LINCOLN, 116,887; MCCLELLAN, 33,748.

In the Grant-Seymour campaign of 1868, when all the Southern States voted but Virginia, Mississippi and Texas, the Democratic total rose to 2,703,249, the Republican being 3,012,833. Even GREELEY polled 2,834,079 votes to 3,527,970 for GRANT in 1872. Four years later TILDEN had a popular majority; GARFIELD and HANCOCK ran almost head and head in 1880; and CLEVELAND in all of his three campaigns, in 1884, 1888 and 1892, received more votes than his Republican opponents.

It was not until the Bryan blight fell upon the Democratic party that it proved to be a bad second in the quadrennial Presidential contest. In short, the Democracy was not blasted by the civil war, but emerged from it with a certain robustness and was soon a formidable opposition party in the North as well as in the South.

The Panther Circular.

Our acquaintance with the Hon. GEORGE VON L. MEYER does not permit us to ask a personal favor at his hands, but we do wish that some one more happily situated would persuade him to put an end to this prolonged and persistent controversy over what has come to be known as the "Panther circular." As a matter of fact, we should think he would do it on his own account, for he can hardly relish this constant solicitation to speak when there is nothing to tell, to throw light into dark places that do not exist.

Those naval officers at the League Island Navy Yard who recently prepared and forwarded to Washington their criticisms of the Newberry edict of navy yard reorganization not only acted well within their rights, they did what the Department requests and requires them to do, what has been done practically ever since there was a navy. To make these observations and comments is as much a part of their professional duty as to walk the bridge or inspect the manholes. That hints of their proceedings have leaked out is the fault of no one of them or no two or three of them, or consciously of the whole lot of them. The proceedings of the executive sessions of the Senate leak out too. These conclusions seem to be inevitable; but what the officers in question actually did was done strictly in the line of duty, and the Department will save itself a vast amount of annoyance by proclaiming this fact without further ado.

It is with uncommon surprise that we notice that the Hon. THOMAS M. OSBORNE has been constrained to deny the authorship of a Christmas cantata recently presented at Saratoga "on English and Irish harps." Moreover, we thought that the Hon. TOM did it. Our mistake was of course due to the fact that we have become so accustomed to the notion that harps were the exclusive instruments of Public Service Commissioners.

The "Stocking Club" was entertained by Mrs. WILLIS PIERCE Thursday night.—*Lyons Republican.*

We wonder where WILLIS went.

Professor BURT G. WILDER of Cornell in a lecture to the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia on Friday night "compared the brain of a negro janitor in his collection with that of a New York politician and commented favorably on that of the negro." The bare statement as reported is not at all illuminating. We do not know whether the negro was a full blooded African, and we know nothing about the politician. In the absence of particulars, which probably would not be forthcoming, the professor's comparison is not instructive.

Declaring that there were six thousand clergymen who would take issue with Governor HUGHES for having refused to sign his bill providing for the incorporating of the World Bible League, the Rev. C. E. Ford of New York, who has been the champion of the measure, left the Capitol last night filled with anger.—*Press Knickerbocker.*

The last straw.

A Cambridge despatch informs us that more candidates responded to a call for volunteers for dramatics than for football. Evidently the National Theatre has come none too soon.

The Beautiful Art of Bookbinding.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The third annual exhibition of the Book Workers Guild opened to the public on April 21 and closed to-day, Saturday.

In this small but interesting exhibit two books stand out as notably original in design and strong in technique, Otto Zahn's "Christ Child" and H. Chatfield's "Isaiah."

Mr. Zahn's book is bound in dark green seal with a design of lovely half curves on the front cover, which uniting with the half curves on the back cover form perfect circles of gleaming gold. It is a small book, very simple, very exquisite; the forwarding and finishing is faultless.

Mr. Chatfield's "Isaiah" is covered with scarlet levant and when open shows a snow white doublure; this is significant, for on the cover in letters of quaint beauty is the promise "Though thy sins are as scarlet they shall be white as snow." A design climbing up the back of the book and reaching over onto the covers grips the leather like bands of gold metal. In construction and detail this design is a masterpiece of book decoration. Here is no suggestion of the great designers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mr. Chatfield has discovered a new and unique use of abrupt lines and contrasting curves. His technique lacks the brilliancy of Cobden Sanderson and the perfect finish of Zahn; often it is crude, but always clean, true, and of a nervous strength that is interesting. Other admirable books are Tennyson's "Lyrics" by Cobden Sanderson, whose tooling is as clear and bright as liquid gold.

Grabean's "Book of Ruth" is beautiful and dignified in design.

A very handsome folio of the Psalms by Miss Dhiel, bound in cream white levant with relays of brown leather and copper shields.

Mr. Mason's excellently tooled Book of Common Prayer. Good work is shown by Miss Haskell, Miss Freeman and Miss Cole.

JOHN VREELAND.

NEW YORK, April 24.

In the *Burlington Magazine* for April there is notable improvement in the quality of the process pictures. Mr. C. Ricketts describes the art of the late Charles Conder, Mr. R. L. Hobson begins a series of articles on the "Wares of the Sung and Yuang Dynasties," and Mr. G. F. Hill continues his papers on Italian medals. Two portraits by the Persian painter Behzad are described. Mr. Roger E. Fry deals with the "Fair Women" exhibition in London, and Mr. A. Van de Put with the Golden Fleece exhibition at Bruges. Mr. Osvald Siren continues his account of Trecento paintings in America. There are the usual interesting notes on all sorts of art matters.

"VELASQUEZ."

Why so well known and authoritative a work as "Velasques," by Aureliano de Beruete, should have been so long in reaching America is a puzzle when you consider the velocity with which the Atlantic Ocean is traversed by many mediocre books on art. The first Spanish edition of the Beruete monograph appeared about 1897; the same year saw it in French, and from the latter tongue it was translated into English by Hugh E. Poynter in 1906. (It has been imported by Charles Scribner's Sons.) Señor Beruete is considered with reason as the prime living authority on the great Spanish realist, though his study is not so voluminous as Carl Justi's. The Bonn professor, however, took all Spain for his province. "Velasquez and His Times" is the title of his work, the first edition of which came out in 1888, the second in 1903. Beruete (whose portrait by Sorolla was one of that master's most characteristic pictures at the Hispanic Society exhibition) is not at odds on many points with Justi; but more sceptical he is, and to R. H. M. Stevenson's list of Velasquez pictures, 231, Beruete opposes the comparatively meagre number of eighty-nine. He reduces the number of sketches and waves away as spurious the Velasquez "original" in Italy, several in the Prado, the very stronghold of the collection; and of the eleven in that famous cabinet of the Vienna Imperial Museum—to which we went as to a divine service of eye and soul—he allows only seven as authentic. The portrait of Innocent X. in the Doria palace, Rome, is naturally a masterpiece, as is the bust portrait of the same subject at the Hermitage, St. Petersburg; but the Boston Museum full length of "Philip IV." is discredited as a copy—perhaps a copy by Velasquez himself?—only the "Prince Don Baltasar Carlos Attended by a Dwarf" being admitted in the company of the true Velasquezes.

Of the "supposed portrait of Cardinal Pamphili," a real Velasquez, now hanging in the Hispanic Society, 156th street, Beruete writes: "In the winter of 1902 there appeared in Paris a bust portrait of a cardinal brought from Italy by Messrs. Trotty & Co., which had been alluded to by Professor A. Venturi of Rome in the review *L'Art*. It is life size, representing a person about thirty years of age in the dress of a cardinal, with smiling face and black hair, mustache and pointed beard, good carriage and a touch of levity not in keeping with the dignity and austerity of a prince of the Church. The beretta and cape, of a fine red color, the latter painted in a uniform tone and without a crease, harmonize with the roseate hue of the features and the plain gray background. Every detail reveals the hand of Velasquez, and it can be classed without hesitation among the characteristic works of his second style. It is on that ground that I make mention of it here. However, in Rome at the house in which this picture was found it was held to be the portrait of Cardinal Pamphili, nephew of Innocent X., who according to Palomino was painted in Rome by Velasquez at the same time as the Pontiff, that is in 1650."

Beruete believes that Palomino was wrong in declaring that Velasquez painted the young Cardinal in Rome; Madrid was the likelier city. The style proves an earlier date than 1650. The Cardinal withdrew from the cardinalate after three years, 1644-47, and married. The portrait was acquired by the American artist Francis Lathrop. We described it some time ago. Stevenson grants to the Metropolitan Museum a fruit piece by Velasquez. Not so Beruete. J. H. McFadden once owned the "Dona Mariana of Austria," second wife of Philip IV., in a white and black dress, gold chain over her shoulder, hair adorned with red bows and red and white feather, from the Lyne-Stephens collection in the New Gallery, 1895—and is so quoted by Stevenson; but he sold the picture and Beruete has lost track of it.

Whereas Stevenson in his invaluable book studies his subject broadly in chapters devoted to the dignity of the Velasquez technique, his color, modelling, brushwork and his impressionism, Beruete follows a more detailed yet simpler method. Picture by picture, in each of the three styles—he adopts Justi's and Stevenson's classification—he follows the painter, dealing less with the man than his work. Not that biographical data are missing—on the contrary, there are many pages of anecdotes as well as the usual facts—but Beruete is principally concerned with the chronology and attribution of the pictures. He has dug up some fresh material concerning the miserable pay Velasquez received, rather fought for, at the court of Philip, where he was on a par with the dwarfs, barbers, comedians, servants and other dependents of the royal household.

The painter has been criticised for his attachment to the King; but as he was not of a religious nature nor did he paint religious pieces with the gusto of his contemporaries the court was his only hope of existence; either court or Church. He made his choice early, and while we must regret the enormous wasting of the hours consequent upon the fulfilment of his duties as a functionary, master of the revels, or what not, we should not forget how extremely precarious would have been his lot as a painter without royal favor in the Spain of those days. He had his bed, board, house, and though he died penniless—his good wife Juana only survived him seven days—he had the satisfaction of knowing that he owed no man and that his daughter had married his pupil Mazo. Velasquez was born at Seville in 1599; died at Madrid, 1660. His real name was Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velasquez. He was a Silva—for the "de" was acquired from the King after much pettifoggery on the part of that degenerate monarch with the prognathic jaw—and he was of Portuguese blood. He signed Velasquez—a magic grouping of letters for the lovers of art—though born as he was in Spain his forefathers came from Portugal. The mixed blood has led to furious disputes among hot-headed citizens of the two kingdoms. As if it much mattered! Beethoven had Dutch blood in his veins, Rembrandt Jewish. One could not have been more German, the other less Hebraic. Velasquez's son-in-law, by the way, Juan Mazo, was the author of a number of imitations and forgeries. He was a true friend of the picture dealers.

Velasquez belonged to that rare, small family of sane genius. He was eminently the painter of daylight and not a nocturnal visionary, as was Rembrandt. Shakespeare, who had all the strings to his lyre, also had his daylight moments. Mozart always sang them, and how blithely! No one, not Beethoven, not Raphael, not Goethe—to name three widely disparate men of genius—saw life so steadily as the Spaniard. He is a magnificent refutation of the madhouse doctors who swear to you that all genius is a disease. Remember, too, that the limitations of Velasquez are clearly defined. Imagination was denied to him, asserts Beruete; he had neither the turbulent temperament of Rubens nor the strained, harsh mysticism of El Greco—a painter of extraordinary imagination and the only painter allowed by Beruete to have affected the Velasquez palette. In a word, Velasquez was a puzzling comminglement of the classic and the realist. He had the repose and the firm, virile line of the classics, while his vision of actuality has never been surpassed. The Dutch Terburg, Vermeer, Van der Heist, Franz Hals saw as vividly the surfaces of things material; the latter alone was the match of Velasquez in brushwork, but not Rembrandt recorded in his anatomy lesson the facts of the case as did Velasquez.

Señor Beruete wittily remarks that "Las Borrachos" ("The Topers") of Velasquez is the truer anatomy lesson of the two. A realist, an impressionist, as Stevenson has it, the Spaniard was, but he was also something more. He had a magic hand to define, the rendering of the magical mystery of space and atmosphere. Grant that he was not a colorist in the sense the Venetians were, or Rubens, yet how much more subtle, noble, more intellectual is his restricted tonal gamut. Those silver grays, resonant blacks, browns, blues and reds sing in your memory long after you have forgotten the tumultuous golden waves breaking upon the decorative coasts of Rubens. We are constrained to question the easy way Beruete and other critics deny the attributes of imagination and poetry of Velasquez. There is perhaps a more sublimated poetry in his pictures than in the obvious religious and mythological and allegorical set pieces of Rubens, Murillo and how many others. His realism did not run to seed in the delineation of subject. He was as natural as Cervantes, the one great man of Spain who may be compared to him, and he saw the larger patterns of life, while never forgetting that the chief function of a painter is to paint, not to "think," not to rhapsodize, not to be literary on canvas. His cool, measuring eye did more than record sordid facts. He had a sort of enraptured vision of the earth as beautiful, the innocence of the eye we encounter in children only. Stevenson rages at those who say that Velasquez was not a colorist—and Beruete is of them, though he quotes with considerable satisfaction the critical pronouncement of Royal Cortissoz (in *Harper's Magazine*, May, 1895) that "Las Meninas" is "the most perfect study of color and values which exists."

The truth is that Stevenson, Cortissoz and Beruete are all three in the right. That Velasquez when in Rome studied the pictures there; that he didn't care for Raphael; that he very much admired the Venetians, Titian, Tintoretto; that he admired Rubens, with whom he associated daily on the occasion of the Flemish master's visit of nine months to Madrid—these are truths not to be denied. Beruete claims that the Rubens influence is not to be seen in Velasquez, only El Greco's. Every object, living or inanimate, that swam through the eyeballs of the Spaniard—surely the most wonderful pair of eyes in history—never was forgotten. His powers of assimilation were unexcelled. He saw and made note of everything, but when he painted his spectators saw nothing of any other man, living or dead. As great a space composer and draughtsman as Raphael, and a more vital portraitist, a wielder of the brush with few peers, a manipulator of modelling and color; was not the spiritual impulse missing in this man? He couldn't paint angels, because he only painted what he saw; and as he never saw angels he only painted mankind. Life, not the "subject," appealed to him. He had little talent, less taste, for the florid decorative art of Rubens and the Venetians; but give him a simple, human theme (not pretty or sentimental) and he recreated it, not merely interpreted the scene; so that "Las Meninas," "The Spinners" ("Las Helderandas") the hunting pictures, the various portraits of royalty, buffoons, beggars, outcasts are the chronicles of his time, and he its master psychologist.

Beruete says that Ribera more than Zurbaran affected Velasquez; "El Greco taught him the use of delicate grays in the coloring of the flesh." Hot, hard and dry in his first period ("Borrachos"), he becomes more fluid and atmospheric in the Breda composition ("The Lances"), and in the third period he has attained absolute mastery of his material. His salary at the court was two and sixpence a day in 1628. Haydn and Mozart did better as menials. Yet some historians speak of the liberality of Philip IV. An "immortal employee" indeed, as Beruete names his idol. Luca Giordano called "Las Meninas" the "theology of painting." Wilkie declared that the Velasquez landscapes possessed "the real sun which lights us, the air which we breathe, and the soul and spirit of nature." "To see the Prado," exclaims Stevenson, "is to modify one's opinion of the novelty of recent art." To-day the impressionists and realists claim Velasquez as their patron saint as well as artistic progenitor. The profoundest master of harmonies and the possessor of a vision of the real world not second to Leonardo's, the place of the Spaniard in history will never be taken from him.

Mark Twain, Jr.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I write to call attention to an error in your very readable article on "The Negro Roustabout" in the paper of April 11. The writer confounds the deckhands with the "rousters." The deckhands on the big packets were always white and generally numbered four to six. Their duties were primarily to stow the cargo as brought aboard by the roustabouts so as to keep the boat on an even keel, while the mates stood at the gangplank directing the work of loading and hustling the crew along. The deckhands were in fact petty officers, better paid than the roustabouts, and on the big Magenta and the old Richmond they had a messroom.

I "decked" on the Magenta in 1868, when her captain experimented with whites as one-half of the crew in the belief that race rivalry would expedite the handling of cargo. It did, but developed such a spirit of strife and hatred that he eventually was forced to let the whites go. A volume could be written on the thrilling experiences in the lives of the old time Mississippi River roustabouts, and I have often wondered that somebody hasn't tackled the job.

A MISSISSIPPI DECKHAND.

PARK RIDGE, N. J., April 24.

Swinburne and the Cabman.

From the Pall Mall Gazette.

In his youthful days Swinburne had a quarrel with a cabman over his fare. The cabman abused the poet mercilessly. Addressing him Swinburne said: "And may I invite you to descend from your perch and hear how a poet can swear?"

Mr. W. D. Howells in *Harper's Monthly Magazine* for May chats about Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield. Mr. Robert Shackleton describes the picturesqueness of Rothenburg. Mr. E. S. Martin has a charming essay on the out of door pleasures of New York, and Mr. and Mrs. Beebe tell of natural history quests in Venezuela. There are appreciations of Mark Twain and of his country home. Mr. Abbey's Shakespeare illustrations are for "King Henry V." Professor R. K. Duncan writes on the chemical interpretation of life. The anonymous serial continues, and there are eight short stories, among the authors being Mrs. Spofford, Alice Brown, Herbert D. Ward and J. M. Forman.

THE PERFECT PLACE.

The College Incorruptible Described for the Emulous Eli.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* What joy Mr. Thomas R. Shepard must have felt when he returned from his thirty-five years on "our country's far frontier" and found that his notions as to the frivolity of the students were all wrong. What a thrill of loyal pride was his when he discovered after three months of close observation that Yale was after all the "perfect academy"—the place where there is no hint of any vice, where all is virtue and hard work and clean living; where the spirit of democracy reigns supreme, consigning to outer darkness and deep damnation the gilded youth who makes Bones, or whatever they call it. No wonder he is proud of this Yale, this mother of civic reformers, this breeder of the "missionary ardor," this undeserving victim of the "thoughtless jesters of the press."

But I hate to think that Mr. Shepard is going about New Haven filled with such unqualified admiration for Yale when there are other universities, and one in particular, which for downright godliness make even the Yale of Mr. Shepard seem like a select inferno. For instance, he says that he listened to much intimate talk among students who were unrestrained by any notice of his presence and that he found it clean. I will not stop to inquire whether he was under the bed or in the closet or by the keyhole during these conversations, but since he has set the fashion in the matter of applying whitewash to one's alma mater let me make a few remarks of a like nature about the university of which I have had the honor to be a member for some years past. A clean speaking lot at Yale? Delighted to hear it, Mr. Shepard, but for truly sanctified purity of thought and expression permit me to recommend the particular college mentioned above. Why, I can declare with the utmost solemnity, and with at least as good a chance of being believed as Mr. Shepard enjoys, that no word was ever uttered on our campus by student, professor or proctor, sane or insane, waking or sleeping, sober or otherwise, which Mr. Shepard would not be willing, nay, delighted, to repeat to his small daughter (if he has one). Wait. My conscience whispers that once I did hear a student under extreme provocation so far forget himself and his college as to utter an oath, "darn," I believe; but I hasten to add that the extenuating circumstances were numerous and of great weight.

The champion of Yale goes so far as to admit that the men there have been known to desert the leadership of the "manly student" for the worthless company of the "high flier." Needless to say, this is a proceeding wholly foreign to the practice and traditions of our college. In fact those of us who are so unfortunate as to come of plutocratic stock are soon made to feel such shame for the swollen condition of our forefathers that we make every attempt to deflate them and to remove the ex-Presidential stigma from our fathers' names by effecting a redistribution of wealth, chiefly along Broadway.

Furthermore, we rise and retire very early each day and say our prayers morning and evening, and sometimes in the middle of the afternoon, especially about the tenth inning, when a hit will bring in the winning run. Our demeanor is uniformly earnest and devout, verging on the pious. Nothing is further from our minds than inattention to our studies. Nothing hurts us so much as failure in them, and nothing except a letter from our lady gives us such pleasure as success in them. As for drinking, Mr. Shepard's statement that he has seen none at Yale might of course imply nothing but defective eyesight, but we make no such allegation. We only wish to call his attention to the fact that his position on that particular point is weak, and that it would have been more forceful and no less credible to have come out boldly with the following statement, which we unhesitatingly apply to our own university: It is the pride of the W. C. T. U. Nothing is more certain to cause a unanimous vote of censure from the entire student body than the use of alcohol. In fact so strong is the feeling against the deadly fluid that nothing is ever burned in the lamps of chafing dishes but kerosene. Smoking too is looked upon with disfavor, and gambling is quite unknown. It is universally true of the student that he never was intoxicated in his life, cannot tell the difference between a Martini and a Manhattan, never played marbles for keeps, never kissed a chorus girl, never cut a lecture, never, in short, did anything which might be of interest from a Mephistophelian point of view.

NEW YORK, April 23. SNICKER.

SUBWAY CARS FOR WOMEN.

The Necessity of the Accommodation Denied by One of the Sex.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The demand for special subway cars for women sounds like the trumped up grievance of women who never had a real one. It is interesting to note that it seems to be not the business women but those whose duties would rarely require them to travel during the rush hours who think they see the need of a special car. The fact is interesting, but hardly surprising, since it is frequently those least familiar with conditions who are most ready to regulate them.

The demand seems to imply that men are not courteous to women in the subway crowds. I believe that the man who is intentionally discourteous to women is as rare in the subway as in the office, whereas the woman who will take a man's seat without either looking or saying "Thank you" is to be seen in every car. Not only are men not discourteous in the subway but many of them are very kind about letting women enter cars ahead of them and about giving up their seats. The much talked of "woman with a baby" (when she is foolish enough to take the baby into the subway) rarely has to stand.

Regardless of whether it is quite fair to ask that a common carrier grant women special favors, it is hard to see what is to be gained by having a separate car. Certainly there will not be any more seats. The seating capacity of a car is the same whether occupied by both men and women or exclusively by women. In the whole of a subway train it is probably safe to say that the women always have more than their proportionate share of seats. If any great number of women used the car the crowding to get in would not be less, particularly as the rear car is always the first to be closed. The danger of accident might be even greater with women crowding women, for as it is now there are always some men who try not to push against the women. In the remote possibility of a collision the rear car might be a most undesirable place for timid females. While it is not possible to prophesy, it is probable that a "ladies' car" would appeal only to a few man haters and to those shrinking creatures who, seeing anywhere the sign "Ladies," make for it. Self-supporting women, who more than any others travel in the rush hours, do not care for any Ladies-Boudoir-Jim-Crow cars.

ELIZABETH ELLSWORTH COOK,
Secretary Equality League of Self-Supporting Women.

NEW YORK, April 23.

Erasmus Galton.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I was much interested to read in THE SUN of April 4 a biographical sketch of Francis Galton, for I had the privilege of knowing for some years his brother, Mr. Erasmus Galton, who died at Leamington on February 27. Born a little before the battle of Waterloo, Erasmus Galton at the age of 93 was one of the most entertaining and best informed men I have ever met. He was as interesting when quoting from Tennyson or discussing the comparative defects of aeroplanes and dirigible balloons or the events of the China and Crimean wars as when telling of the first occasion when he, a midshipman serving in the San Josef, a three decker taken from the Spaniards at Trafalgar, first beheld her to whom he always referred as "her Majesty"—then the Princess Victoria.

It is certainly remarkable that brothers, both of such unusual mentality, should have been first cousins to the Moses who has led human thought out of the desert where it had wandered for twenty centuries—Charles Darwin. W. S. C.

LONDON, April 14.

Sheridan's Spelling.

From the London Evening Standard.

The author of "The School for Scandal" had highly original views on the rules of spelling. In his *Critic* days, for instance, a "thing" to Sheridan was always a "think," and never by any chance did he remember that a "which" or a "where" to be really respectable must needs possess an "aitch apiece." This rule of omission he also followed sheepfike in "wether" for "whether." Moreover, he scorned the use of a double "m" or a double "s." For example, "blessedness" was always "blesednes."

The Difference.

Knicker—Why the dickens has it taken you an eternity to dress?

Mrs. Knicker—And when it took you five years to propose I said: "This is so sudden."

Advance.

Stella—Is she up in society?

Bella—Yes; she used to "do" her hair, and now she colls it.