model the group before it be accepted by Chicago, a reasonable suggestion enough if the criticisms upon it prove [well founded.

THE TIMES only knows M. BARTHOLDI favorably as a sculptor who has done honor to his country on more than one occasion, so that whatever personal element enters into the view taken of "Washington Receiving Lafayette" is distinctly in his favor. And as to Chicago, we have the greatest sympathy with her efforts to make of horself a beautiful as well as a great city, because New-York is engaged in the same difficult task.

Americans are not averse to foreign art,

and have no narrow prejudice against foreign artists; but they do resent it when a foreigner fails to offer them the best he can do. Here is a case in point. M. BARTHOLDI is not a young, untried sculptor; nor are we unacquainted over here with works by him which reach a far higher level than the "Washington Receiving Lafayette." Does he mean to say that we are to accept whatever he chooses to offer us, without the right to examine it and analyze its merits and shortcomings? We have sympathy with an artist under the blow of adverse criticism, but we hold that M. BAR-THOLDI has spoken hastily, if the words reported are really those he uttered, and we are confident that when he has time to look the article over again he will recognize that the criticism was meant in a far from unfriendly spirit. If it opens his eyes to the defects of his work he will be glad some day of a hint

which may prevent the erection of a monument which will do him no credit hereafter. Criticism even more severe greets the monuments designed by native sculptors. We have yet to learn that international comity prevents a straightforward talk about one designed by a famous sculptor from a Sister Republic.

nowers. It was then suggested that he re-