

THE GREAT EXHIBITION.

ART DEPARTMENT.

FRENCH LANDSCAPES—SCULPTURE—ETCHINGS.
[FROM A STAFF CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

have made one of the most original and novel of modern sculptors better known to a country with which he has shown such loyal and intelligent sympathy.

Among the smaller pieces of sculpture that seem to us to deserve especial mention are Mr. H. Meissel's "Discovery at Pompeii." A young Neapolitan employed in the excavations has dug up a little bronze statue who is tipily dancing, and the boy himself is dancing with delight over his discovery. The "Sphæna" is a clever copy of a real antique, and the figure of the boy in its sprightly swing and gay pose has hardly been equaled by any modern figure since Donat made his well-known Neapolitan Dancer. Mr. A. Itasse, in his dozen or so little marble figures, no one of them too large for a mantelpiece ornament, meets the Italians in their own ground, and shows equal power to represent beauty, grace, the softness of infant flesh, and to make us smile and relent by his playful fancies. He knows, too, how to treat his marble so as to give it tone and something of the color that we welcome in the antique sculptures. Compared with his works, the Italian masters look crude and cold.

Scattered through the French rooms in the Annex are a dozen small bronzes by various hands—Pilon, Feron, Martin, Cahn, Stein, Lécheune, and others—but none of them noticeably superior to works of the same kind that we have long been accustomed to see in this country. It is to be regretted that so distinguished an artist in bronze, as Barthélemy, honored wherever his art is known for the accuracy and spirit of his reproductions, should have taken no part in our exhibition. By his influence and with his aid we might have seen copies of the masterpieces of modern French sculptors in these halls, where there is now almost nothing by which that art can be judged.

ETCHINGS.

At the end of the Main Corridor in the Annex, on the walls to the right and left, is arranged a most valuable collection of modern French etchings, which seems to attract no attention whatever. Often as we have been in this part of the Annex, we have never seen any one more than a glances in passing at these walls.

We suppose this is owing to the facts that the etchings are hung in a passageway that leads to nowhere in particular, and that they are neither mounted nor hung in a way to make them look as if they were things of value. They should have been put in the room that is given over to the few French architectural drawings—a barren ensemble showing neither talent in design nor exceptional skill in draughtsmanship, and they should have been so framed and hung as to have shown that they were considered to be worth respectful examination.

The great modern etchers are represented here, and in every case by impressions of the finest kind. It is impossible within our limits to examine the pieces separately, but we may call attention to a few of the most remarkable. The three etchings by Bracquemond, after Turner, No. 353, originally published in *The Portfolio*, have never been surpassed in delicacy by any engravings of this master's work. At the specimens of Gauchois's etching appeared in the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, as did also some of the finest work of F. Gallard, whose etching "A Statue from Michelangelo's Tomb of the Medici," No. 416, is one of the finest of modern works in this kind. By a mistake of the French, who study the mutual simplicity of line, avoiding incident, and content with the harmonies obtained by massing and by gradations. In this picture the bright after-glow of the sky reflected in the river, and the delicate tracery of the tree-jerossing both river and sky are poetically managed, and the picture makes us desire to know more of the artist. He does not appear here, however, with another landscape, but only as the painter of a clever figure, No. 334, "Evening in the Kitchen." We should think his landscape painting, if one could see more of it, would prove to be his more valuable work. "The Marshes of Longue," by A. E. Lambart, No. 241; "The Oaks of Grandmontin," by Ch. Daumier, No. 259, and "The Park at Sèvres," by A. V. Varenne, the painter of a good picture in Memorial Hall, Gallery I, "The Banks of the Seine," No. 183—are all valuable in their way, and afford some refreshment to the spirit in wading through this sandy collection. So, too, we may call the visitor's attention to "The Valley of Alzey," by J. Bellot, No. 302, a picture which is a reminiscence of Poussin's art of the so-called classic school, with influences from modern followers of the same teaching. It shows considerable independence, to have produced such a picture in these days when the stream is all the other way. "The Canal of Courrières," by E. B. Britton, No. 317, like "Village in Winter," No. 333, shows a scene of scenic effect and considerable strength, but not enough confidence in the power of sobriety and restraint. In these pictures hardly do English etchers who enjoy a high reputation—and it would be hard to settle the question of superiority among so many worthies—P. A. Rehn must not be passed over. His masterpiece here is the Portrait of John Stuart Mill, No. 409, called in the Catalogue simply, "A Portrait," but just as Flemish Rembrandt's "Sight Watch," No. 442, one of the great performances of modern times, is called an "etching," and nothing more. One hears much complaint of the meagerness of the Catalogue from people who want information and are not ashamed to say so. In the suit of Stephens against the Board of Education of the City of Brooklyn, tried yesterday before Judge Larremore, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the jury awarded a verdict for plaintiff for \$4,000.

Judges Curtis, Van Vorst, and Sanford, in Superior Court, General Term, yesterday, ordered the resolution of the meeting of the Bars to the Chief Justice Morris, as had previously published, to be entered in full on the minutes of the event.

Sigmund Boden, the lawyer who is charged with having forged the signature of a judge of the Court of Common Pleas to an order in supplementary process was brought, under the charge of Criminal Justice, before Judge Boden, at the Court of Common Pleas, to stand by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

THE LITTLE ACROBATS.

In the proceeding by Albert Smith to recover three little girls, taken from him at Pompeii, for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, for using them in acrobatic performances. Further evidence was taken yesterday before William Shriver, no referee. Dr. Hamm testified that the children in acrobatic exercises are required to do them for public exhibition, and a tendency to practice excessive action of the heart, frequently causing valvular disease, and a strain on the spinal muscles, leading to distortion of the abdomen and disease. It leaves infants even, in regard to the danger, to children and adults even, of falls from the trapzees.

CIVIL NOTES.

In the suit of Stephens against the Board of Education of the City of Brooklyn, tried yesterday before Judge Larremore, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the jury awarded a verdict for plaintiff for \$4,000.

Judges Curtis, Van Vorst, and Sanford, in Superior Court, General Term, yesterday, ordered the resolution of the meeting of the Bars to the Chief Justice Morris, as had previously published, to be entered in full on the minutes of the event.

Sigmund Boden, the lawyer who is charged with having forged the signature of a judge of the Court of Common Pleas to an order in supplementary process was brought, under the charge of Criminal Justice, before Judge Boden, at the Court of Common Pleas, to stand by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

IN THE SUIT OF THE MERCHANTS' EXCHANGE NATIONAL BANK AGAINST VELMAN AND OTHERS.

Edward D. Sturtevant, to be released from arrest before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, on the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the suit of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Fladrow against Fargo and others, brought against the trustees of the old American Express Company for an accounting as to the consolidation of that company with the Merchants' Union Express Company, a motion made to amend the answer in the suit before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Nelson against Nelson, Jr., the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

In the case of Flint against Flint, the defendant being the letter-writing spasmist medium whom we have already called attention to in his trial, before Judge Barrett, in Supreme Court, Circuit, the 21st, before whom he had been taken for trial, to be tried by his bond not to be disturbed. The court took the papers in the case, reserving its decision.

THE COURTS.

A PARTNER'S DEBTS.

SUIT TO ATTACH THE MONEY OF A FIRM.

In the suit of John Foley against Charles L.

Rathbone, Judge Barrett yesterday, in Supreme Court, Chambers, received the trials of Wetmore & Rathbone, from an injunction. The original suit entered into a partnership with one Wetmore, who was to furnish the capital to the concern. The subsequent proceedings against Rathbone was the more important defendant. The firm had \$13,000 in the continental bank, and shows equal power to represent the persons sought to be added as parties defendant herein. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a writ of certiorari is filed, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Rathbone agt. McLean—When a judgment is rendered with costs, the party against whom it is rendered is liable to pay the costs of the appeal, unless the party against whom it is rendered has filed a writ of certiorari. Foley agt. Moes—When a