

Marion, Iowa, Feb. 4, 1890.

My dear Judge:-

I sent notices of your book to two papers. I enjoyed the volume very much. I promised to call attention to one or two slight errors, that is, errors in my opinion. There is no doubt about one of them.

Notice a sentence on page 167: "He was one of a class whom it is the habit of many profound thinkers to declare were wheedled or forced into the army of the South." The part of the sentence from it to declare is parenthetical. Leave it out and the sentence reads:

"He was one of a class whom were wheedled or forced into the army." The subject of wheedled and forced is the relative pronoun and should be who. The reason for the mistake is most apparent. You have the transitive verb declare and without consideration you ~~was~~ gave who its form to make it the object. This is not the case. The real object is not the pronoun, but the thought expressed in the relative clause. It is a very common error, but I never found it in your writings before.

Lippincott's once boasted to me that their proof-readers

was one of the ten best in the land. It escaped his notice. Singularly enough the same work that I detected this error in "Gauge + Swallow" I also noticed the same error in Bystander's notes.

Turn to page 180. "Highly cultured, a musician of fine ability, and an artist of considerable merit, her books, her music, and her husband seemed to take all her thought." Now it is plain that cultured, musician, and artist are all used to explain or modify a word referring to lady. The sentence is not constructed so as to contain such a pronoun for the subject. My idea is that the sentence should read: "Highly cultured, a musician of fine ability, and an artist of considerable merit, she seemed to give all

her thoughts to her books, her music, and her husband".

It also occurred to me that your statement in the opening sentence of the volume and the following one where you speak of being in the service of "Judge & Swallow" and thinking such years of leaving it, does not agree with the statement on page 250 where you speak of leaving this service.

These are minor defects - if defects at all - too insignificant to speak of. It would take me a long time to tell you how many things in it I enjoyed.

"The Church of the Golden Lilies" is good, strong, vigorous, wholesome. The first Chapter of the last Advance perhaps XXI, is the best of all to my mind. You are speaking to a large audience in the Advance and your words will have great weight.

Do you see the Chautauquan? I have a short article in the February number.

I must say something about domestic matters. They employ not a little of my time and thought. Just before Christmas little Charley said he wanted to have a new ~~to~~ baby for Christmas. I told him we had a baby. He said that we had had him for two years and a half.

He wanted a little bit
of a baby, of course a
boy should be gratified
in so simple a request
as that. The goods, however,
were not delivered till
a month after Christmas
had passed. Now I
can sing with G. W. Cable:

"There came to port last
Sunday night,
The queerest little craft,
Without an inch of rigging on;
I looked, and looked, and
laughed.

It seemed so curious that she
Should cross the unknown water,
And moor herself right in my room.
My daughter, O my daughter,

4
She's no manifest but this
No flag floats o'er the water,
She's too new for the British Lloyds—
My daughter, O my daughter!

Ring out wild bells, and tamed ones, too!
Ring out the lover's moon!
Ring in the little worsted socks!
Ring in the bib and spoon!

Ring out the muse! ring in the
nurse!

Ring in the milk and water!
Away with paper, pen, and ink!
My 'daughter, O my daughter!'"

This is not wholly correct.
It is another precious boy.

Yours most truly,
W. W. Gist.