

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

The Metropolitan Museum and its Director.

A DISCUSSION concerning the Cesnola Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art has been in progress during the last two years in the columns of many of the leading newspapers and reviews of America. The time has come when it seems to us our duty briefly to review the controversy, and to tell what we ourselves have learned of the facts by personal investigation. As to the importance of the subject there can be no doubt, for not only the integrity of the Cesnola Collection is involved, but no less the entire management of a museum which we have been taught, by its promoters themselves, to regard as a public institution of the highest dignity and influence—a museum which rightly aspires to be the leading institution of its kind in the New World.

In the month of August, 1880, the charges against the integrity of the Cesnola Collection first appeared in the "Art Amateur." They were immediately and positively denied by General di Cesnola in the newspapers. They were also denied by him, generally and specifically, before a committee appointed by the Trustees.* Mr. Gaston L. Feuardent, who made the charges, is a dealer and expert in coins and antiquities, and a son of M. Feuardent of the well-known Paris house of Rollin & Feuardent. He at first refused to come before this committee. "Without taking any exception to the composition of your committee," he wrote, "permit me to say that common fairness, as well as the precedents usually observed in such cases, seem to me to require that I should have the opportunity of naming at least one of the gentlemen who are to sit in judgment on the charges publicly made by me,"—adding that he would be satisfied if he were allowed to name at least one additional member of the committee, who might, if the committee preferred, "be taken from the number of the Trustees of the Museum." The committee replied that they had no power to add to their numbers, and Mr. Feuardent finally consented to appear. The committee published a report (dated January 26th, 1881) completely exonerating General di Cesnola.

Not long after the committee's report was issued Mr. Feuardent began the publication of a series of illustrated "cards" which were intended as proofs that the committee had not reported strictly according to the facts. Other testimony was also made public contradicting the statements made by General di Cesnola before the committee. In the month of April, 1882, a pamphlet appeared, written by Mr. Clarence Cook, and published by Mr. Feuardent, bringing new charges against the Cesnola Collection, including the two statues, the Aphrodite and Eros, No. 32, and statue No. 39, which were said to be made up of unrelated fragments, probably by Cypriote dealers before they came into di Cesnola's possession. At about the same time were published several letters by

Mr. A. Duncan Savage, formerly the Director's first assistant, in special charge of the antiquities, and the most important witness in favor of General di Cesnola during the examination of 1881. In these letters Mr. Savage said that he found he had been mistaken in asserting that there were no restorations in the Cesnola Collection. "When," said he, "I discover my positive declaration that no restorations exist is false, through the discovery of many and serious restorations, students of archæology have a right to demand that I correct my mistake." Mr. Savage in addition gave lists of thirty restorations, without touching upon those charged by Mr. Feuardent, and stated that the two janitors had been discharged for pointing out restorations to him.

Up to the moment of the appearance of Mr. Savage's first letter we had ourselves neither formed nor expressed a conclusive opinion in regard to this unhappy controversy. Believing General di Cesnola's assistant to be an honest and sincere man, we naturally felt that, even if the charges against di Cesnola were true (of which, however, we were not convinced), no great additional harm could come to the collection so long as Mr. Savage retained his connection with it. Moreover, in the height of the early controversy Mr. Savage (then and until after the publication of his recent letters a stranger to us) personally assured us that if he should find to be untrue a certain important statement, made by the defense, he would resign his position.

When, therefore, we read Mr. Savage's first letter in the New York "Times," we determined to find out for ourselves, if possible, the exact situation of affairs. On account of illustrative work at the time in hand, and other work proposed, it was, moreover, absolutely necessary for the editor of this magazine to be assured as to the trustworthiness of the Cypriote antiquities, as discovered and exhibited by General di Cesnola. We could not, of course, ourselves examine every object in the collection, but we had to know whether, if we engraved one of the Cesnola antiquities, we could take the word of the Director for the fact that the object contained no restoration whatever. We must also know how far we could rely upon General di Cesnola's word as to the place and condition in which the object was discovered. In order to arrive at a just conclusion, we have taken no little pains to get at the facts as presented by both sides of the controversy.

THE ORIGINAL CHARGES.

In the first place, what is the nature of the charges? It should be remarked that repairing is generally understood to be the joining together of parts which have been broken asunder, while restoring is understood to be the imitation of missing forms in new material. The charges were of "deceptive alterations and unintelligent restorations." It was charged not only that fragments have been wrongly put together (wrong heads

*The Committee of Inquiry consisted of President Barnard of Columbia College, Judge Charles P. Daly, the Rev. Dr. R. D. Hitchcock, J. Q. A. Ward, sculptor (Trustee), and W. C. Prime (Trustee).

* Besides the general charges, the committee took up nine specific charges.

attached to bodies, etc.), but that lines of juncture have been hidden; also that restorations have been made and hidden from the eye. It was charged that steel tools had been applied to the surface of antiquities, and that an effort had been made throughout to give the collection a better appearance than it would have had if these things had not been done. Here is the final paragraph of Mr. Feuardent's article in "The Art Amateur" of August, 1880: "In conclusion, I desire to state that I have endeavored to place before the public some positive facts, and some theories. It must be understood that I am only a dealer in antiquities, and not a 'savant,' so, while I can guarantee the exactitude of the facts in the case, I leave others to judge the value of the theories. But I will add, addressing those who take an interest in the Museum of Art: you have an invaluable collection of antiquities in this Museum, although the specimens you possess cannot serve as art-models. They are of the utmost importance for the history of the art and mythology of the ancients. They are enduring documents of stone, but they are valuable only when they are reliable. If restorations are to be made, let such restorations be properly indicated and labeled on the objects. Only by so doing will you preserve the collection and keep up its value. Antiquities, especially of this class, need not be 'beautified;' they are only valuable because they teach us the customs and manners of the people who made them, and they must be absolutely trustworthy in the information they give. In fixing together fragments which are honestly believed to have belonged to each other, good work may be done; though it is important to indicate the condition of the object when found, in order to prevent any possible misconception. But, to amalgamate various pieces, strangers to each other, in order to complete an object, and not publicly to indicate it, is not only bad faith, but positive vandalism. To endeavor to increase interest in a collection by deceptive alterations or restorations can only be called a miscalculation, a profanation, or a fraud."

THE DENIALS.

All these charges have been distinctly and repeatedly denied by General di Cesnola, and the Committee of 1881 and the Board of Trustees are pledged to the truth of these denials. The following paragraphs are from General di Cesnola's signed statement, dated January 1st, 1881 (the italics throughout this paper are our own):

"The general charges are, in brief, that the collection contains 'a long list of restorations' of statues and objects in stone, which are characterized as 'worked up in order to give a better appearance to the collection.' My answer is: In the entire collection *I have not made a single restoration of any object or part of any object in stone, and there exist, in the whole collection of thousands of objects, so far as I know, only two instances of such restoration, neither of which is by me.* There are also only two restorations among the potteries, not necessary to be here described. The instances in stone objects are as follows:

I. Case FF.; Inscription No. 16.—A slab found in fragments, part wanting, repaired and missing portion restored by the repairer of the British Museum, without my knowledge, while it was in London, by request or with consent of my brokers' agent (the present accuser). The restoration is correct.*

II. Case 24; No. 43.—Upper corner of *Ædicula* correctly restored by some one, unknown to me, while the Museum was in Fourteenth Street.

"I know of no other instance of restoration in the collection. * * *

"I sum up my reply in a few statements:

"*First—There is no instance in the entire collection of a retouching or tampering with the surface of any object.*

"*Second—There are but two instances of restorations among stone objects and two among potteries in the entire collection, namely, those above described. I say this only to contradict the charge of 'unintelligent restorations.'* I should have been fully justified in following the universal custom of European museums in restoring missing portions of objects, especially points of noses on heads otherwise perfect and fine. *I have abstained from so doing, leaving restorations to the future pecuniary ability of the Museum.*

"*Third—Repairs of broken objects have been made with cement invented for our own use to stand the New-York climate, which leaves a film of less than one-fortieth of an inch between fragments brought together.* The surface of the lines of repair has been covered with water and air-proof cement, to preserve the inner cement from swelling and loosening, this being needed by the peculiar porous calcareous stone of Cyprus; and this is done in accordance with the proper custom of archaeological museums."

President Barnard asked General di Cesnola, before the committee, whether it was not a duty sometimes to make restorations. In his reply the Director stated: "*I am personally opposed to making restorations.*" We quote as follows:

"PRESIDENT BARNARD. You did not make the repairs to the statuary yourself?

"GENERAL DI CESNOLA. I was responsible for them and they were made under my supervision. We have about a ton of fragments, but we are not sure as to exactly how they belong together. In every case of repairs I was personally satisfied that it was correctly done, and nothing of importance was done in the way of repairs when I was not present. I have visited the repair shops fifty times in one day."†

The committee's report followed minutely the line of General di Cesnola's defense, and declared that "each and all of the charges" were "*without foundation, that there have been no restorations and no cutting or engraving of objects, but simply repairs by the replacing and reunion of such original fragments as existed and could be identified,*" adding, in reference to the whole collection, that they had "found nothing in their investigation to cast a shadow on its reputation." The committee said also that if the Director "had erred at all" it had been "in too rigidly refraining from making repairs whose correctness was reasonably certain." Furthermore, the Board of Trustees passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to the Director the assurance that this investigation has been made solely because of his interest*

* In referring to this slab, as showing restoration, the Director implies a definition of the word to which we do not propose to hold him. We should say that the slab showed repair, rather than restoration, as the broken parts are simply held together by what seems to be plaster inserted flat to fill up the breaks, and with no attempt to round out the missing human forms. We do not know why the Director failed to mention the north end of the Amathus sarcophagus, which is frankly repaired in the same manner. This sarcophagus is evidently *restored* as well as repaired.

† "New York Tribune," Jan. 6, 1881.

and repeated demand that it be made, and not for the satisfaction of the Trustees, *who have always known the falsehood of the published charges, and who have never ceased to entertain the highest confidence in his devotion and faithfulness to the interests, not alone of the Museum, but of truth in art, scholarship, and history.*"

EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN CHARGES.

On the 28th of March, 1882, the two statues Nos. 32 and 39 were placed in the middle of the main hall, and "members of the Museum, the public, and especially editors of public journals, sculptors, workers in stone, scholars, and all persons interested in the truthfulness of archæological objects," were "invited to make the most careful examination of the statues."

As to the charge made by Messrs. Cook and Feuardent that not merely the feet and lower parts of No. 39, but the main part of these two statues, were built up of unrelated fragments (probably by Cypriote dealers)—we had examined, with the eye only, these statues in their cases before a knife or chisel had been applied by sculptor or stone-cutter, and had told several of the Trustees that we were not convinced by Messrs. Cook and Feuardent's arguments, and therefore should be astonished if the charges were correct. We therefore were not surprised when closer examination, by others more competent than ourselves, confirmed our opinion—though we fear that the question cannot be considered as definitely settled without a more thorough use of chemicals and baths than has yet been made. If it should be considered as established, by the printed informal reports, that Mr. Feuardent and Mr. Cook are mistaken on this point, it is, of course, an error which will justly affect the reputation of these gentlemen for judgment in such matters, especially as their language was so positive and injurious.* But such a mistake in opinion as this would not affect other ascertained facts with regard to these very statues, nor other ascertained facts concerning other objects in the collection.

We ourselves were not only generally, but personally and particularly invited to take part in one of the late inquiries, and during their progress we urged the authorities to make the examination formal and sweeping. But they refused to do this, assuming at that time—which, be it remembered, was after the discoveries of Mr. Savage—to be still perfectly satisfied with the conduct of the Director. Discerning, as we did, in what spirit these inquiries were promoted by the authorities, they had to us the air of an attempt to distract attention from other damaging accusations made by Messrs. Feuardent and Cook, and from the fact that Mr. Savage's discoveries had proved true the charges concerning the existence of restorations. Even if not so intended, this was exactly the effect upon the uninformed part of the public, and the public was just so far misled and deceived. We have to say, in addition, that before the report of the informal committee appeared not a little stress was laid upon the opinions of the sculptors St. Gaudens and Warner, and that the solicited opinions of those gentlemen—opinions, it has been publicly stated, less

favorable in some respects to the Director than those of the other sculptors—were omitted from the report; nor have they, up to the time of writing, been given to the public, although called for in the public press. Now, we maintain that the public is not interested in "catching" Messrs. Feuardent and Cook, on the one hand, or General di Cesnola on the other. What is desired is a knowledge of the Director's treatment of the entire Cesnola Collection; of his trustworthiness as the historian and guardian of that collection; and of his ability to "direct" faithfully and intelligently a great public museum of art.

Let us now consider what the situation was at the Museum previous to March 28th, 1882. The visitor to the Museum who had taken the word of the Director, the Committee of 1881, and the Board of Trustees for the facts, would expect to find there no restorations whatever, among the stone objects, except in the two objects mentioned by General di Cesnola in his published reply dated January 1st, 1881. But, where broken fragments were put together, he would expect that there would be no attempt to hide the lines of juncture, as this was one of the points considered by the Committee of 1881. The first of Mr. Feuardent's accusations, considered by the Committee of 1881, includes the assertion that "the points of junction [in statue No. 22], which were left quite apparent then, have been completely hidden, so that the statue looks as if it had been found perfect." In the affidavit of Mr. Cox (the photographer formerly employed by the Museum), to which the committee referred in their report, it is stated as follows: "As regards the covering up of evidence of restorations with stone, plaster-of-Paris, etc., I myself furnished Mr. Balliard [the present repairer of the Museum], on his own request, with sulphate of iron, which I know he used with other materials to color the stone or plaster at the points of junction of the parts, after it had been made rough with the file or graver's tool."

The fact is, however, that whoever visited the Museum during the month of March, 1882 (unless he were an expert in such matters), could find no surface indications at all of either repairs or restorations in the entire list of stone objects, with the exception of the north end of the Amathus sarcophagus, and the slab mentioned by General di Cesnola as having been put together by the repairer of the British Museum. These repairs (not restorations), we say, were, up to March 28th, the only apparent ones in the entire collection of stone objects. No restorations whatever among the stone objects were evident to the untrained eye, nor was there, so far as we know or can find out, a single card on any object to tell of any restoration, nor was a single restoration mentioned in the hand-books of the Museum.

Except two of the sarcophagi, all the exhibited objects of the Cesnola Collection are kept in glass cases, for protection, it is claimed, from the disintegrating effects of the American climate. After the 28th of March the visitor to the Museum found statues Nos. 32 and 39 taken from their cases and placed in the middle of the main hall. But we ourselves can testify that, as thus displayed, these two statues presented quite a new appearance to the eye. The neck of the Venus had been washed, and small triangular pieces had been removed from the head-dress, showing for the first time the

* No. 32 was declared to be "a fraudulent patchwork of unrelated parts," and No. 39 to be "built up of several fragments belonging originally to different statues of various sizes."

line of juncture between the head and neck. The most striking change was in the feet and base of No. 39, which, having been washed and scraped for separate exhibition, were now discovered to be made up of large and small pieces of stone and plaster. This statue had been previously illustrated with an apparently different base, and without heels, and with a small piece of drapery missing, and it was exhibited in Fourteenth street without any feet or base at all. According to the explanation now given, all of the stone-wall visible below the drapery, a large part of the base, and several inches of the drapery over the right foot, are new. The only antique part of either foot is the front of the foot to the middle of the instep in one, and to a little back of the middle in the other; the back part of each foot up to the wall is made of newly carved stone, with some plaster inserted in the left foot to help round out the shape. Before the 28th of March there was a gash visible in the drapery at the side of the right ankle; but the feet and base showed otherwise no lines of juncture either with the upper part of the statue or between the various pieces of which they are composed. The feet and base *appeared* to be all part of the original statue, and there was no visual reason to suppose that they had ever been separated therefrom, unless the gash in the drapery were taken as such an indication. The lower part of the statue was tinted and treated not only so that the lines of juncture could not be seen, but so that the feet and base, stone, plaster and all, had a general resemblance in color and texture to the upper part of the statue.

The feet, base, and lower portion of the drapery of No. 39 had, in fact, been "partly remade," and the restoration had been hidden from sight. But the public had been told by General di Cesnola and the Examining Committee of 1881 that no part of any stone object was "restored" by him. Not only that—but the lower portion of this very statue was brought into question before the Committee of 1881 by means of the sworn affidavit of Mr. Cox, the photographer. A statement of the repairer Balliard was made public, at the time of the examination of 1881, that "the only thing done to it [the statue] was to place a piece of stone in the rear to support the figure." But it was not stated that this block was carved into the shape of human feet, and into the shape of drapery, and that, of course, was the important point at issue. We have been told that there was some confusion in Mr. Cox's verbal testimony; but in his published affidavit Mr. Cox stated: "The restoration of the large headless statue, holding a cow's head, which is illustrated in full page in General di Cesnola's book, was too much for Mr. Balliard's skill as a stone-cutter. *The feet which are now on the statue are partly remade.* The work was done by a stone-cutter who was brought into the Museum for the purpose. The pedestal of this statue is now of stone, and it and the feet are one piece." Yet, in speaking of this charge and of one other, and referring directly to the affidavit, the committee reported: "These [objects] the committee examined, and find the charges in relation to them to be *without the slightest foundation.*"*

* It should be added that one of the janitors has since publicly confirmed Mr. Cox's testimony about the stone-cutter who was brought into the building. If the Director's statement to a "Herald" reporter is to be taken literally—that it became neces-

It is not only apparent that statue No. 39 has been "restored" in order that it may "stand on its feet," but that statue No. 32, of which the lower part is missing, has had a slice of its drapery sawn off, so that it may stand on its wooden pedestal. The statue thus treated has been described by its discoverer as "of a pure and very excellent style" of Greek Art. We, ourselves, have found, moreover, by comparison with early photographs, that it has been customary to saw off the lower parts of detached heads so that they also may stand on their pedestals.

We will now return to Mr. Savage's charges. In his letters to "The Times," he reports his discovery of twenty-nine restorations in seventeen pieces of stone sculpture, and one restoration in a terra-cotta statuette. Of these, three were discovered in the stone objects by himself, and all the others were discovered by him through the janitors. Of this latter group twelve restorations in six pieces of stone sculpture were tested by him. In a lecture on the Cesnola Collection, before the Ladies' Art Association, Mr. Savage stated, in effect, that he thought some of the charges brought against the collection extravagant and untrue, but that, after his experience, he would not pronounce a positive opinion on any piece of sculpture in the collection without examining it himself carefully, for "there are many restorations; these are serious; they were concealed; they have been denied." In his letter herewith published Mr. Savage makes other and very grave accusations.

The explanation offered as to the existence of the restorations discovered by Mr. Savage (though it is claimed that some of these are "repairs" merely) is that they were temporary and were made in the old Fourteenth street building; General di Cesnola's statement to Mr. Savage being that they were made during his absence in Cyprus, without his knowledge, and against his orders. But it is not claimed that statue No. 39 was restored in Fourteenth street, and the photographer and the two janitors testify that restorations were made in their presence, and under the Director's supervision, in the present building. Nor does it appear that the restorations made, or remade, in the present building were less radical and deceptive than those made in Fourteenth street. On the contrary, more pains were taken by Balliard, the present restorer, than by Gehlen, to hide repairs

sary to bore the statue's legs to insert supports, and to get the metal rod through the pedestal "without showing, it was deemed advisable to *bring the foot more under the body,*" then the left leg also must be partly new. The public has further reason to doubt the scientific accuracy of the examination and report of this committee. It is now acknowledged that they were mistaken in their report that the right hand of No. 22 is "a solid, unbroken part of the statue, against the side of which it is supported." But it was not acknowledged till after Mr. Feuardent's card No. 1, reproducing that portion of the photograph in the Corcoran Art Gallery, had been unfortunately pronounced a forgery by authorities of the Museum. It is a matter of sworn evidence that a copy of this photograph was preserved in the sample-book of photographs of the Museum till removed by the Director, after the appearance of Mr. Feuardent's card.—In regard to the sarcophagus of Golgoi, which has been twice repaired, we find grave discrepancies between the original photographs of it and the sarcophagus in its present condition. It is possible that these discrepancies may be occasioned by the temporary painting done on the sarcophagus in Cyprus for photographing. It should be said, however, that on the two unrepaired or slightly repaired sides we have not been able to find any serious discrepancies. This sarcophagus is the other object referred to in the Committee's reply to Mr. Cox's affidavit. We do not take up the others of the nine original points considered by the Committee, but merely remark that their report was largely based upon General di Cesnola's explanations.

and restorations from the eye. As to the work done by the former repairer, Gehlen, in Fourteenth street, the evidence is strong to the effect that Gehlen had to do only with the first Cesnola Collection; that the stone objects of this collection were got ready for the "opening," by Gehlen, under General di Cesnola, and that General di Cesnola did not go to Europe till after the "opening."* We quote from Gehlen's own recently published testimony :

"I was a repairer at the Metropolitan Museum of Art when it was in Fourteenth street, and worked under the orders of General di Cesnola until the whole collection was ready. All that I did was under his command. He saw every day what I had done—the noses, heads, and different parts of the bodies which I had arranged. We took plaster-of-Paris; sometimes pieces of the same stone. Every day, I repeat, he saw what was done. I am a draughtsman, and I kept as nearly as I could to what were the forms. General di Cesnola was so well satisfied that when he was in Cyprus he wrote me a letter of thanks for what I had done. I did not attempt to color the statues, but they are now quite different from what they were when I had finished with them."

Mr. Gehlen adds that only pottery was restored in Cesnola's absence, though by his command, and says :

"To shift any blame on me is most unjust on the part of General di Cesnola, for I never did anything without his orders. That he was perfectly satisfied with me I can prove by his letters. Mr. Hutchins ought to be called for. His testimony would fully substantiate what I have stated. Some of the statues, as they came to New York, had already been mended with plaster. Whether done in Cyprus or London, I do not know."

Mr. Hutchins, who was superintendent during part of the time at Fourteenth street, in his recently published statement says :

"What he [Gehlen] did was done under the direction of General Cesnola. The building-up here, making a foot for this statue, an arm for that, was done by the direction and by order of Cesnola."

The printed testimony of the head janitor, Charles Henkel, confirms the testimony of Gehlen, Hutchins, Alley, and Cox, as to the Director's knowledge of and responsibility for all restorations. We have ourselves obtained from Mr. Henkel, in addition, a brief statement of the case. According to Henkel it is true, as said in the last annual report, that the stone objects were cleaned after removal to the present building; but it is not true that this was done with a view, as implied, of preventing the exhibition of restored objects. On the contrary, all the objects from which Gehlen's restorations were removed were restored over again by Balliard. In some instances Gehlen's restorations were retained, but were covered with a wash, as were all of Balliard's restorations. So far as Mr. Henkel can remember, the restorations made in the present building were more completely hidden than Mr. Gehlen's; for instance, the restoration of the small Hercules (No. 380), and the Priest (No. 39). Mr. Balliard, in washing over repairs, restorations, and sometimes the whole statue, used in the wash the stone-dust made by sawing up fragments, or

sawing pieces off the statuary. The object of recoloring a whole statue this way was to hide the discrepancy in color made by his insertions. For instance, the small Hercules was entirely repainted in this way, and so was the Sphinx (No. 35). Mr. Henkel adds that no stone objects were removed from exhibition until after the appearance of Mr. Feuardent's first charges; but that in the autumn, after those charges appeared, Mr. Balliard, by the General's order, removed from the cases two heads which had been restored by Gehlen. In these heads nothing was done except the faces. The backs of the heads (including the ears in one at least) were made of plaster. At about the same time the General ordered some restored noses to be taken off,—but a good many were left on.*

Concerning alleged wrong repairs, we give the following from the statement of the assistant janitor, Dickson D. Alley :

"As to the terra-cotta statuette, No. 829, about which Mr. Savage writes in his letter to 'The Times' of March 24, I can give the following explanation: On a table had been arranged quite a collection of small terra-cotta heads, which had been classed as Oriental, Greek, and Roman. General di Cesnola told me to find if I could a head for the body of a statuette which he put in my hands, and said that if I did not find the right head I might take any other head that would come near to it. I found four heads that might do, although none of them fitted, and so I selected the one I thought was nearest in size to the body. This head had a neck one-eighth of an inch too wide. I showed it to General di Cesnola, and he said, 'Just the very head,' and so Balliard filed down that neck and made it fit, and it is to-day much admired as the No. 829, though its neck, according to my judgment, is still a trifle too long; but I make no claims to being an archæologist, being only a printer by trade."†

Evidence has also been published strongly corroborating certain of Mr. Feuardent's original charges, not here alluded to; but we do not go into the details of these charges, for we wish to lay before our readers only facts which we consider unquestionably proved. In doing this we have not reprinted a title of the evidence tending to disprove General di Cesnola's signed denials and the report of the Committee of 1881, nor have we reprinted, or here first published, any evidence without verifying the same ourselves by examination of witnesses or of documents.

THE ARTISTIC AND ARCHÆOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

But how did such things come to pass ?

We can discover no evidence that General di Cesnola has any other claim to the holding of the four high offices of Trustee, Member of Executive Committee, Secretary, and Director of the Metropolitan Museum, than in his connection with the Cesnola Collection, or collections, which were bought from him at a total cost of about one hundred and thirty-nine thousand dollars, the last installment of which was paid to him after the annual report of 1881. We see no evidence of anything but (perfectly legitimate) speculation in his connection with that collection, which was dug and gathered by him in Cyprus, to which country he happened to be sent as Consul of the United States.

* Taken from our own memorandum of interview with Charles Henkel, and marked "correct" by him.
† "New York Times," April 10, 1882.

* See Annual Report, 1874.

We find that he was greatly assisted in the getting of so large a collection by his official position; in fact, that it would have been well-nigh impossible for him to have got it otherwise, and that he therefore announced his desire that the bulk of the collection should be secured to his adopted country. We find that by means of public auction in Europe, by sales of smaller collections to the Berlin Museum, the Cambridge Museum, the Kensington Museum, the Vienna Museum, and the Boston Museum, and by the large sales to the New York Museum (the first collection being bought by New York not till after failure to make a bargain with the British and other museums), General di Cesnola has doubtless secured a fair moneyed return for his labors in Cyprus, having also justly gained the reward of celebrity as the discoverer of Cypriote antiquities.

But General di Cesnola, before going to Cyprus, had led the life of a soldier. He had fought in three wars: in Italy, the Crimea, and the American Civil War. Energetic, skillful in winning and commanding men, and (on his own showing) quite unhampered by Anglo-Saxon scrupulosity—he was just the man to extract this antique loot from the Sultan's domains; he did it by methods of which a full and naïve account is furnished in his own work on "Cyprus." * But those who read that book carefully will, we think, conclude with us that while General di Cesnola was undoubtedly the man to *get* the collection, he was not the man to take care of it; and that, least of all, has he the scholarly equipment, strict conscientiousness, accuracy, and artistic taste necessary for Director of a great art museum. He has treated his statues like a dragoon, or, rather, let us say, like a martinet; he has brushed, touched, and patched them up to make a good appearance on parade—probably without at first fully realizing the harm he was doing. But, most melancholy of all, after doing it he has denied it, and even after the fullest private and public exposure, he has been sustained in his denials by gentlemen whose indorsement should be the amplest guarantee for the scrupulous fidelity of the official whom they publicly sustain and honor.

General di Cesnola was, we suppose, placed in charge of the whole Museum primarily because it was thought necessary to employ him to "put together" the fragmentary collection which had been bought from him; because, furthermore, of his executive ability, and probably also because of the *délat* of the name of the discoverer of the "Cesnola Collection." In his highly responsible and entirely novel position, a position for which his whole career had completely unfitted him, on the æsthetic side, it is not strange that he should have proved a failure.

* See, for instance, "Cyprus," pages 208, 209. Also chapters I. and IX., where the General explains his manner of dealing with opposition of any kind. "From that day," says the author, "I had a grudge against the Caimakam of Larnaca, Genab Effendi, and I promised to repay him whenever an occasion should present itself." On pages 56 to 59 (chapter I.) will be found a detailed account of the unrelenting pursuit and punishment of Genab Effendi. In chapter IX., pages 221 to 225, he tells how he acquired the nick-name of "the devil" for procuring by threats the imprisonment, without trial, of two Turkish gentlemen, who had, according to his own showing, committed no intentional offense,—his avowed object being the intimidation of the neighborhood. On page 226 he relates how he had a Turk "and his several wives arrested and locked up in the fort" for resisting the attempt of the General's men to encamp in a grove of trees belonging to the Turk! We must say that such incidents and the tone in which they are related, create a very painful impression. The only agreeable episode that we can find in his narrative is Cesnola's timely assistance of the Greeks in Cyprus.

Through his conduct, and the conduct of those who have generously, though mistakenly, thought it necessary to make his cause one with that of the institution, the Museum has been brought into conspicuous and lamentable disrepute. The recent spectacle of a museum finding it necessary to endeavor to regain public confidence by inviting and permitting editors, stone-cutters, and sculptors to gather around two of its costly antiquities, and to scratch, scrape, hack at, and chisel these unlucky objects, in order to have it proved that they are genuine antiquities, and not fraudulent patchworks of unrelated parts—such a spectacle never was seen before by men or angels. We do not know how it could ever have been made necessary had the Museum's affairs been managed with perfect frankness.

After first declaring his opposition to all restorations, and indignantly denying that any exist, the Director, we think, has had it proved upon him that they do exist, and with his knowledge. He cannot with dignity now plead the custom of European museums, or the severity of the American climate. But he has thus pleaded, and his apologists have done so for him. To this we may answer, that the Director's sensitiveness on the subject, as shown in his early denials, reflects the general and proper feeling of archæologists. Restoration was once customary, but it has done so much harm in past centuries that at present it is rarely ventured upon. In the British Museum, sculptures of the first importance are never restored; those of the second importance are sometimes restored, but no attempt is ever made to conceal restoration by color or otherwise. The original surface is never interfered with. As to the American climate, we do not see why *all* the broken surfaces should not be supplied with stone and plaster coverings (instead of a silicate glaze, for instance), if *any* must be, nor do we see why such coverings should necessarily take the supposed form of the missing member—back of a head, nose, ears, chins, large parts of legs, and parts of feet, hands, and drapery. Moreover, we are positive that there is absolutely nothing in the American climate that makes it necessary to deny the presence of restorations that are known to exist.

The worth of the Cesnola Collection is by no means confined to the statuary and pottery—the jewelry, gems, and glass are of considerable value. But among the stone pieces there are hardly more than a dozen or two objects of beauty; a large part of the stone collection consists of amorphous and hideous objects of archaic or provincial workmanship, which can teach this generation nothing in the way of art. It is mainly as a record that the collection is valuable. As a record, the more highly we appreciate it, the more unique we declare it to be, the more deeply must we deplore any suspicion thrown upon its complete authenticity. But there is a special reason why such a suspicion is damaging. The Trustees themselves will, perhaps, not deny that we have too much of Cypriote handiwork in the Metropolitan Museum, and that the sooner a portion of it is sold to or exchanged with other museums, the more room will there be for the display of other sorely needed and still more valuable examples of the world's art. Of course it may be less easy to dispose of antiquities which have been brought under any sort of suspicion.

THE MORAL CONSIDERATION.

This subject has a moral as well as an artistic side, and with such gentlemen as constitute the Board of Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum the moral consideration will, we are sure, not be regarded as the least important. If it is true (as we believe it to be) that the conduct of the Director, in connection with the Museum, has not been such as should meet with the hearty and complete indorsement of these gentlemen, then they should, of course, make haste to withdraw that indorsement. For the spectacle of an unworthy servant upheld by a large part of the solid wealth and morality of the community, while a conscientious scholar, like di Cesnola's first assistant, and the two other faithful servants of the museum, are dishonored for doing their simple duty—such a spectacle cannot be considered edifying or wholesome. We confess that we love fair play, and that the good name of a worthy though obscure individual seems to us as well worth protecting in a Christian community as that of any more famous and fortunate citizen.

A SUMMING UP.

To sum up the result of our inquiries: It appears that in the Cesnola Collection of stone antiquities there are innumerable repairs, most of them probably correct, but others of doubtful propriety; that there are in the same collection numerous restorations, some of the latter being serious and unwarrantable, and others probably unimportant if explicitly acknowledged—though it would doubtless have been wiser to make no restorations whatever in such a unique series, at least until each object had been fully studied by archæologists, and definitely assigned to its proper date and locality. But it appears, moreover, that all points of juncture, and all restorations have been hidden from the eye; that when plaster has been inserted, it is treated in some way both as to superficial texture and color so as to resemble antique stone;* that, notwithstanding all that has been said on the subject since August, 1880, not one object in the collection has a card upon it announcing a repair or a restoration; † that the public has no means of finding out what objects are restored; that these numerous restorations have been only accidentally discovered by the public,—after it had been indignantly denied that there were more than two in the entire collection of stone objects; that, even if General di Cesnola were not responsible for any other restoration beside that of statue 39, it is undeniably true that, after having his attention called to the matter by public charges so long ago as August, 1880, and after having pledged his own word as to the purity of the collection, and having permitted the Examining Committee, his first Assistant, and the Trustees to pledge their honor as to the unrestored condition of the entire collection, he has continued to exhibit a number of restored objects, and has permitted photographs to be

sold of such objects in the Museum, and to be made for illustration in THE CENTURY MAGAZINE, without any information being given by him that they were so restored. We find, also, that the testimony goes to show that all the restorations in stone objects made both in Fourteenth street and in the present building were, in fact, made under di Cesnola's authority, and mainly in his presence. It appears, furthermore, that he has made different statements, at different times, with regard to the places from which the objects were obtained, attributing them at one time to a tomb, at another to a temple, now to one ancient city, and now to another; and that this has so frequently been the case as to cast a suspicion upon all his ascriptions of localities, and all his assertions as to the original condition of objects.

It also appears that General di Cesnola, in Mr. Savage's presence, inserted three new objects in a procession which, in his own book published years before, had been fully and consecutively described as containing only six objects. We find that, whereas he and the authorities for him now claim that the Director ordered the search or searches which Mr. Savage made for restorations,—in point of fact, these searches were made by Mr. Savage without General di Cesnola's knowledge; that the janitors who pointed out most of the restorations to the Assistant were actually discharged for so doing, and that Mr. Savage was himself censured by General di Cesnola for taking the time of the Museum in such searches. It appears that, contrary to the published statements of the authorities, the only "searches" General di Cesnola ever made for restorations after the opening of the present building were those which were kept secret from the Assistant, and took place *after* Mr. Feuardent's charges first appeared—when certain restorations were undone, and certain extensively restored objects were taken from the shelves and removed from exhibition.

In regard to the managers of the Museum, it would seem that they have been too much inclined to look upon the examinations instituted, promoted or permitted by them, rather as "defences" of the Museum, than as thorough "inquiries" into the condition of the Cesnola Collection; and that these investigations have been confined to a few objects against which specific charges were made; that the Committee of 1881 not only failed to examine the statues themselves (outside of these few), but that they did not call for the repairer, Gehlen, or the two janitors to whom the public are primarily indebted for the recently published list of restorations, or Mr. Hutchins, the former superintendent. We find that, whereas General di Cesnola was defended in the original investigation by the repairer Balliard and the Assistant, Mr. Savage,—the more important of these two witnesses, a man of honor and of conscience, having found himself imposed upon, has now laid before the world facts which must seriously impair public confidence both in the scientific accuracy and the good faith of the Director; and we find that this assistant did not make public these facts till he had tried in vain to open the eyes of leading members of the Board of Trustees to the true situation of affairs.

The trustees of the Metropolitan Museum, in endeavoring to establish a great museum of art in a commercial, not to say sordid and selfish metropolis,

* Mr. Cox has stated in print that he explained to the Committee of 1881 "how plaster was rubbed on the new paint and worked over with a wire brush, so as to make it 'an antique.'" This in relation to one of the objects which Mr. Savage has now discovered to be restored.

† A few objects which were washed during the recent informal investigations, have not been restored to the condition they were in before the investigations.

entered upon a difficult and praiseworthy task. The errors they have fallen into have been mainly errors of ignorance. They are such as could hardly have been committed in an Old-World community amply supplied with trained artists, educated critics, and professional archaeologists—all helping to create a sound and sensitive public opinion. But we cannot help believing that those of the managers who have conducted General di Cesnola's "defense" have been led into serious error and into gross injustice by their loyalty to each other and to the man of their appointment—and by their own natural indignation at the personal bitterness of certain of their public assailants, manifested on this and on other occasions.* Some of the most devoted and generous friends and officers of the Museum are thus in the strange predicament of having unwittingly done a grave injury to the institution for which they have so long labored.

This magazine, we respectfully submit, has a special right to criticize and to censure in the interests of truth and fairness; but we do so with the greatest reluctance, and not without waiting long to find whether the Trustees would not show some disposition to see things as they are. Last autumn we obtained permission to photograph objects in the Cesnola collection to illustrate Mrs. Mitchell's history of antique sculpture, now appearing in these pages. After the photographs had been taken, our Art Department received a letter from Mr. Savage, who was no longer connected with the institution, saying that four of these objects contained five restorations, more or less serious. Word was sent to Mrs. Mitchell, who had gone abroad to continue, near the British and Berlin Museums, the preparation of her essays. In acknowledging to us the copy sent her of Mr. Savage's letter, Mrs. Mitchell says: "I cannot tell you how little surprised I was by its contents. When in New York I attempted to gain some information as to some of the pieces—where they came from? temple? tomb? how they stood, etc., etc., all questions of vital importance. * * * It was always in vain. * * * Besides, I felt unhappy myself in studying the stainless collection, so monotonous in its whiteness, for objects which had lain centuries under the earth, and many a time came home distressed with uncertainties which I do not feel anywhere else. I hope that Cesnola will be made to feel the great wrong he has done science and the American people in thus imposing upon them patched-up restorations of homeless figures."†

We now invite the special attention of our readers to the letter from Mr. Savage, herewith printed. That he is to be implicitly believed we can have no higher assurance than the testimony of the eminent men who here (without his knowledge) gladly record their opinion of his scholarship and integrity. It is safe to predict that every frank and honest man on the Board of Trustees, or in any way connected with the Museum, who has not till this moment fully acquainted himself with the facts, will not be long in letting his colleagues and the public know precisely where he stands in this extraordinary controversy.

* Perhaps the least said on this subject, however, the better—for we fear that expressions of greater indelicacy have been used by "the defense" than by "the attack."

† Published by permission.

LETTER FROM MR. SAVAGE.

NEW YORK, June 6, 1882.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CENTURY MAGAZINE.

SIR: You ask my opinion of the rumor that General di Cesnola has contradicted himself in stating the places where he found a number of his antiquities, now ascribing a statue or a vase to one spot, now to another. Before I left the Museum I had begun to suspect this to be the case, but, instead of recollections of my own, I refer you for examples to publications authorized by General di Cesnola, premising that in Handbooks Nos. 2 and 3 of the Metropolitan Museum, on the Potteries and Sculptures of the Cesnola Collection, wherever the place in which an object was found, or—to use a convenient word already borrowed by German archaeologists from the Italians and French—its *provenience* is stated, I received the information from General Cesnola in person, noting down in the presence of the objects his answers to my questions. Handbooks 2 and 3 were written by me, except the preface of Handbook No. 2 ("Cesnola Potteries," pp. 3-6), which was written by one of the Trustees. Both handbooks were read and approved by General di Cesnola before they were sent to the printer.

General di Cesnola, in his "Cyprus," p. 94, describes six terra-cotta statuettes found by him together in one grave, forming a procession. In Handbook No. 2, published three years and a half later than the "Cyprus," this procession has grown from six figures to nine, and the heart of the funeral in its new arrangement, namely, the figure of a woman stretched out on a bier with a cow's mask covering her face, is not mentioned in the earlier description. (See Handbook 2, p. 42, No. 265.) That the additional figures were not members of the procession at the time when the book "Cyprus" was written, is made plain by the way in which the description excludes, by implication, all others than those mentioned. So also in Doell's illustrated catalogue of the first Cesnola Collection (published 1873) in which the procession is engraved, only six figures appear, the same as those described four years later in the "Cyprus." This series of terracottas was arranged in its present order by General di Cesnola himself in my presence.

Since receiving your letter, I have examined the "Cyprus" (published 1877) specially with a view to this question, also an article in "Harper's Monthly Magazine," July, 1872, also a paper by General di Cesnola laid before the Turin Academy of Sciences, January, 1871 ("Atti" of the Academy, vol. 6, p. 554), also Metropolitan Museum Handbooks 2 and 3 (published 1880), and I find that this portion of General di Cesnola's archaeological labors is in shocking confusion. This examination of several publications authorized by him shows that it would be a service to students of ancient art to place before them the many and striking proofs of the following thesis: General di Cesnola's statements of the places where he found his antiquities are full of contradictions; must be used only after careful comparison with one another; the results thus painfully sifted out will always be uncertain, where there are no statements of other explorers to confirm them.

In your second question you ask me what I have to say to an assertion in the "Mail and Express" of March 27th last, which article gives itself out as coming from the authorities of the Metropolitan Museum. The assertion is that the restorations in the sculptures communicated by me to the "Times" of March 12, 14, 24, were in reality not discovered by me, but by General di Cesnola, it being by his instructions that I made search for restorations overlooked by him in a previous search; General di Cesnola thereupon reporting to the trustees the result of the search ordered by him. This asser-

tion I pronounce false, and declare that never did General di Cesnola direct me to look for restorations, but that the search I made was solely of my own motion, and because I wished to find out whether General di Cesnola had spoken the truth in publicly declaring that he knew of only two restorations in the sculptures. A similar assertion was made in the last annual report of the Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum, namely, that when the Museum was in the Fourteenth street building, the stone sculptures and other antiquities were restored, where portions were missing, in order to shut off the air from the exposed surface and thereby prevent decay, but that these restorations were intended only as temporary; that "when these [*i. e.*, antiquities of the Cesnola Collection] were removed to the Park building in 1879, the entire collection was carefully cleaned, the temporary restorations were removed, with the exception of six or eight which escaped notice, and the whole were placed in tight glass cases." I came to the Museum in June, 1879, to be General di Cesnola's first assistant and to take charge of the antiquities, but neither at that time nor afterward was I told by General di Cesnola, nor by any other Trustee, nor by any one connected with the Museum, not until I made my discovery in September, 1881—by no one was I told that restorations had been made in the sculptures before the Museum was moved to Central Park. On the contrary, General di Cesnola, as soon as Mr. Feuardent made his charges of concealed restorations, denied the accusation and bitterly denounced its author not only in public, but again and again to me in private. Nor, during my stay of more than two years in the Museum, did I hear, until the close of that period, of any search for restorations ordered by the authorities of the Museum. In the last week of September, 1881, while I was making my own search without orders from any one, during General di Cesnola's absence in Europe, I discovered for the first time that General di Cesnola had already made a search and had removed restorations from a number of the sculptures. This search was not made before the sculptures were exhibited to the public, as a consequence of taking possession of the permanent home of the collection, in 1879, but in the autumn of 1880, after Mr. Feuardent had published his charges of concealed restorations, and after General di Cesnola, then out of town, had telegraphed to deny in the newspapers the "slandrous assaults"—so he called them. This removal of certain restorations by General di Cesnola was kept secret from me.

So far from ordering me to make any search for restorations, General di Cesnola reproved me for so doing, by expressing surprise that I should have thought myself entitled to divert to such researches my time, which belonged to the Museum. General di Cesnola reported to the Trustees the restorations discovered by me only after I had resigned my position of first assistant, and after I had left the Museum, because, so I have reason for believing, he found that I intended to lay the matter before them myself.

Until lately, I had hoped never to publish the history of my resignation. My relations with General di Cesnola had been so friendly that it was most painful to go and tell him that I wished no longer to be his assistant. It was this feeling which caused me, in writing to the "Times" last March, to confine myself to correcting my mistaken declaration, and to suppress everything but the restorations. So also my letter to the "Times" of April 17th would not have been written had not the "Mail and Express" been authorized to say that the two janitors had been dismissed for neglect of duty, when I knew well that these two excellent, honest, faithful servants of the Museum had been turned off solely because they had told me of the restorations in answer to my questions.

But, since I published the restorations last March, I have found myself surrounded by so many misrepresentations, that I am glad of this opportunity to correct some of them afforded by your second question.

In the early controversy General di Cesnola had accused Mr. Feuardent of forging a photograph brought in evidence against him. Some months later, in August of last year, I made a discovery which led me to believe that in making this charge he knew he was not speaking the truth. I thereupon resigned my office in the Museum, but was persuaded by the Trustee in whose hands I had placed my resignation to stay until the return of General di Cesnola from Europe, in order to give him an opportunity to explain the matter. This first discovery led to my discovery of the restorations.

When he returned to the Museum and we discussed the cause of my resignation, he declared by two things he held sacred, on his word of honor and before God, that when he made those declarations about Mr. Feuardent's Card No. 1, he did not know he was mistaken. I replied that I would let that matter drop and base my resignation on something I had found out since August, something which I knew of my own knowledge and not merely on the testimony of others—concealed restorations. Upon this he assured me positively that all had been done without his knowledge and against his orders, most of them during his second absence in Cyprus (1873-77)—some, as it now seemed, after his return to New York. I will remark here that General di Cesnola was in error as to the dates of the restorations. Some were done in Cyprus, while he was still owner of the collection (before 1873); others in New York, in the Fourteenth street building, under his supervision, and before his return to Cyprus; the rest, after he came back to New York, in the collection's permanent home in the Central Park building, during his directorship, in 1879.

After making several attempts to induce him to publish the restorations at once, instead of the very distant date which he proposed, I resigned, in the determination, however, to wait till then. As my resignation had to be presented to the Executive Committee of the Trustees, I wrote a new one, leaving out all mention of my discoveries, in order to help him to keep the matter secret even from the other Trustees until the time came which he had appointed. But during the following month I determined, for reasons which I communicated at the time to General di Cesnola, not to wait till then, but to ask the Trustees to publish my discovery. Accordingly, I laid the matter before them through a leading member of their board, in a detailed communication, and was led to hope by their answer that they would publish the restorations in their forthcoming annual report. When this report appeared I found that the restorations had been concealed a second time, and was thus compelled to publish them myself.

I am, respectfully yours,
A. D. SAVAGE.

LETTER FROM THE REV. DR. CROSBY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CENTURY MAGAZINE.

MY DEAR SIR: You inquire regarding Mr. A. D. Savage. I take great pleasure in replying that I recommended him to General Cesnola as his assistant because of his archæological scholarship. Mr. Savage is a gentleman of refinement and delicacy, of truth and honor, and highly esteemed for his scholarly qualities and his genial fellowship by his associates and friends, of whom I am happy to be one.

Yours very truly,
HOWARD CROSBY.

116 East 19th St., June 5, 1882.

LETTERS FROM PRESIDENT GILMAN AND PROFESSORS
GILDERSLEEVE AND MORRIS, OF JOHNS
HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BALTIMORE, June 2, 1882.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CENTURY MAGAZINE.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry of yesterday, it gives me much pleasure to inclose these letters from Professors Gildersleeve and Morris, and to add that, although I do not know Mr. Savage as well as they do, I heartily concur in their estimate of his trustworthiness. Yours very truly,

D. C. GILMAN.

BALTIMORE, June 2, 1882.

I have known Mr. A. Duncan Savage some sixteen years. For four years he was a student of mine at the University of Virginia, where his progress was steady and satisfactory, and where he took the degree of Bachelor of Letters. I followed his subsequent career with warm personal interest, and, when I accepted the call to the Johns Hopkins University, I was glad to nominate Mr. Savage for a fellowship in Greek, which he filled with much credit to himself for two years. From the beginning of our acquaintance he was a welcome and not infrequent visitor at my house. I have had abundant opportunity of estimating his character, and I know him as intimately as I do any young man of his time. He is remarkable for his minute faithfulness to the smallest details of truth, and a delicate regard for the rights and interests of others; and my confidence in his honor is absolute. I will allow myself to add that, to my personal knowledge, Mr. Savage has been true to his convictions in circumstances which would have sorely tried a man of ordinary moral constitution, but what might have been temptation to others seemed to have no hold on his singleness of purpose.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

BALTIMORE, June 2, 1882.

My acquaintance with Mr. A. D. Savage goes back only to the year 1876, when he was appointed one of the Fellows in this University. I have had, however, from that time unusual opportunities for forming an estimate of his character. For several months we sat

at the same table at our meals; and he was during the time of his residence in Baltimore on terms of the closest intimacy with me, being a constant visitor at my house. He has also, on several occasions, been a guest for many days together at my country home. I feel, therefore, that I have a full and true insight into his character; and I say, without any hesitation, that I do not know any man in whose honor I have a more absolute confidence, or of whom I could less easily believe that he had been led by any self-interested motive to do or say anything which was not dictated by the purest considerations. I am perfectly convinced that, whatever statements Mr. Savage may have made as to his own reasons for acting in this or that way, or as to facts which have come under his observation, may be implicitly relied on as being the utterance of a nature which is sensitively anxious to be just and to speak the truth.

CHARLES D. MORRIS.

FROM PROF. HARRISON, OF THE WASHINGTON AND
LEE UNIVERSITY.

LEXINGTON, VA.

I was several years with Mr. Savage at the University of Virginia (1866-8), and we were afterwards together in Europe studying. During the last twelve years he has been one of my most valued friends and correspondents. The integrity of his character has never been questioned, and the honesty and conscientiousness of his conduct, his accurate scholarship, and his painstaking endeavor to get at the foundations of whatever he undertook, have always been conspicuous characteristics of the man.

In the controversy between him and General di Cesnola, whatever may be the truth with regard to the latter, Mr. Savage is above suspicion. The son of an honored and accomplished minister of the Gospel of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a student from his earliest years, a man most highly thought of and recommended by the foremost institution of learning in this country, an honorary M. A. of Yale College, Mr. Savage, in my long acquaintance with him, was always distinguished by the utmost scrupulousness of mind, by carefulness and caution in the expression of his judgments, and by fearlessness in the discharge of his duties.

JAMES A. HARRISON.

LITERATURE.

Lodge's "Alexander Hamilton." *

THE story of Hamilton's public career is so well known, and has been so often told, that Mr. Lodge could hardly be expected to add much to it. As a biographical study, however, his volume possesses many features of interest. Hamilton was, in more respects than one, an extraordinarily interesting man. His great precocity, the combined variety and solidity of his talents, the great power of his imagination, his remarkable public triumphs, his attractive private character, and his tragic death, all combine to render his figure the most picturesquely attractive of the revolutionary and post-revolutionary periods. Mr. Lodge has examined with a good deal of care the facts connected with the duel with Burr, and makes the position of Hamilton in the matter, at least, entirely intelligible. Burr, of course, forced Hamilton to fight

him, but why did Hamilton allow himself to be forced? Hamilton had a standing in the community which, even at that day, would have enabled him to refuse to go out. His courage was beyond question, and the statement of his reasons, made by himself at the time, shows that he considered himself as acting in "conformity with public prejudice." It was, to use his own language, the necessity of being able "to be in future useful, whether in resisting mischief or in effecting good, in those crises of public affairs which seem likely to happen," that induced him to do so. Mr. Lodge shows by some very significant extracts from his letters what these words probably meant.

The fact is that Hamilton's conservatism led him to anticipate serious trouble in the United States from the same disorganizing causes which had produced such startling and even appalling results in France. The Federalists had with wonderful energy and resource created a country out of a political chaos. To them,—or at any rate to Hamilton,—Jefferson and his followers were not merely a party endeavoring to accomplish

* American Statesmen: Alexander Hamilton. By Henry Cabot Lodge. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1882.