

something to be done, in the way of missionary effort, for the thinkers. There are a great many men and women who bear the reputation of being irreligious, simply on account of scrupulous intellectual honesty. They do not attend church and are in danger of being entirely lost to religion. At the bottom man is a religious being, and the intellectual are not less religious than the ignorant. The ignorant and vicious classes have their missionaries, their mission halls and their "Gospel Meetings," and a great many Christian people are nobly devoting themselves, in increasing numbers, to the study of the problems which these classes present. But the thinkers, those who *seem* to repudiate religion, or repudiate the point of view of the "orthodox" Churches in whole or in part, are the subjects of no organised special effort at clarifying the religious problem. Here is a great field, demanding real piety and trained intellect.

Since you have originated the idea, the credit of it belongs, of course, to you. The work begun by the Parliament of Religions ought not to stop. Cannot some sort of systematised effort be set on foot? I would like to see at least one Lay Church established in every large city of the country. I doubt if anything can be done in the rural districts, at least, for a long time, but if the movement is set on foot in the centers of population, the thought will get into the air, and cannot but be beneficial to all who are interested in the betterment of the people. No higher theme than Religion can engage human thought, and I find, in my pastoral works, a great many men who never go to church, and yet are guided to some extent by religious ideas. And it is a mistake to assume that only the "cultured" members of society think profoundly on these themes. I have seen evidences of real interest in high matters among rough laboring men. The refusal of a worker in a lumbering camp to accept what is fondly called "the plan of salvation" is not always due to depravity of heart but often to a partially awakened intellect.

The foundation of lay churches will in my opinion not only serve the needs of those who are dissatisfied with religion and will quicken their interest in the deepest problems of life, but will also prove beneficial to the churches themselves.

OLIVER H. P. SMITH.

TOLSTOY'S NAME.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

I have read Mr. Aylmer Maude's admirable criticism on Frau Seuron and Mrs. Evans with interest and appreciation. He shows himself to be animated by the genuine love of Truth—fair and impartial—just as I should have expected from him.

He makes one statement, however, which is not strictly accurate. In the first paragraph he asserts that the spelling Tolstoi is wrong. "Wrong" is not the appropriate adjective. The last letter of the novelist's name in Russian is a "soft semi-vowel" forming a diphthong with the vowel which precedes it: transliterated into English it is fairly represented by *i* or *y* or *ï*. The *ï* with the diæresis most nearly corresponds with *i s kratkoï* as it is called in Russian; you find the same in *troïka*, and several other words that have been anglicised. As the public of France and England and America had become familiarised with the perfectly correct form Tolstoi, it seems to me unfortunate to have introduced the *y*, which will not be elsewhere used to represent the same Russian letter. The rules for transliteration recommended by the American Library Association are a safe guide.

NATHAN HASKELL DOLE.