

ment for its propaganda. On the plea that it was championing the cause of the oppressed Ukrainian nationality, the Bund searched the works of honest Ukrainian scholars and took such portions as suited its purpose and published them in different parts of Europe. In some cases it assumed an editorial right to make changes and improvements, "an mehreren Stellen, insbesondere in den ersten Kapiteln umgearbeitet". It is in these *ersten Kapiteln* that the propaganda work is done. It is there that we are told that "unparteiische Philologen" recognize the Ukrainian speech as a distinct language and not a dialect. At the present time philologists are no more agreed on this question than they were a century ago or they will be a century hence. Authorities of international reputation, such as Niederle, Shafarik, and Shakhmatov insist that it is a dialect and not a language, while Schleicher, Miklosich, and Jagić take the opposite view. Equally misleading and inaccurate is the statement that "Noch in ihrer Urheimat" there existed physical and temperamental differences of importance between the Great Russians, White Russians, and Little Russians (Ukrainians), and that in the course of the centuries these differences have become more accentuated until now "Zweifellos haben wir es hier mit zwei Nationalitäten und zwei besonderen Geschichten zu tun". To be sure there were differences then and there are differences now between the Great Russians and Little Russians; but according to Ripley (*Races of Europe*) the differences between the various types of Russians are less than among the Italians, Germans, and French who live in the north and in the south. Other such misstatements could be pointed out but it is hardly necessary to do so. Enough has been said to show that the historians must either keep altogether away from, or use with great care, books that are edited and translated by the "Bund zur Befreiung der Ukraine", in whatever language published; and it has published in all the important languages and in all the important countries.

F. A. GOLDER.

Alsace-Lorraine, Past, Present, and Future. By COLEMAN PHILLIPSON. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1918. Pp. 327. \$8.00.)

It may be said at once that the sections of this volume dealing with the past of Alsace-Lorraine, though of no exceptional merit, are superior to those devoted to the present. The author shows well enough how the famous "question" arose. He gives a brief outline of the history of the provinces down to the Franco-Prussian War and then devotes about a hundred pages to the annexation of 1871, to the protests against the annexation, to the various grounds assigned by the Germans for the famous act, historical, racial, linguistic, strategic, and to the various utterances and proposals of German statesmen and writers as to what should be done with the provinces now acquired. There is a brief and superficial chapter on the German régime in Alsace-Lorraine since 1871.

The remainder of the volume, which is about half of it, is devoted to what the author considers the views and aspirations of Alsace-Lorraine, of France in regard to Alsace-Lorraine, and to the various solutions suggested of the ever-present and troublesome problem, such as reannexation to France, autonomy within the German Empire, erection into an independent state, or partition between the two states most persistently interested. This part of the book is, in the opinion of the reviewer, as inferior in quality and as unsound, in many respects, as the first part is, on the whole, respectable. It is dominated by certain conceptions poorly supported by the evidence, if supported at all, and abounds in extreme and hazardous statements which have been quickly belied by events. Indeed, although this book appeared only in the spring or early summer of 1918, it is, apart from the purely historical sections, in considerable measure already obsolete.

The author says in his preface that he has done his best to preserve throughout an attitude of judicial impartiality and declares that "it is ever the wisest policy to follow this principle, even if it involves giving the devil his due". In the opinion of the reviewer he gives the devil a great deal more than his due and considerably more than he is destined to receive.

While Mr. Phillipson condemns Germany's annexation of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, denying the validity of most of the arguments given by the Germans for that act, yet he apparently would not after all these years right the wrong then committed.

The Germans [he says, with an exaggeration of language unusual in a barrister-at-law] are just as determined to hold Alsace-Lorraine as they are to hold Berlin. To overcome this determination by force of arms will mean to break the Central Empires into fragments and to annihilate the Germanic population. To achieve such a result would necessitate such unspeakably appalling slaughter, destruction, and sacrifice on all sides as would leave Europe a shambles and without any population at all. Is the result worth the cost? Only an unreasoning fanatic would answer this question in the affirmative (p. 236).

Even if it were possible, without this assuredly excessive cost, namely the extinction of the entire population of Europe, the author would not approve.

There can be no doubt [he says] that a forcible retrocession of Alsace-Lorraine to France cannot be a true solution; for a true solution necessitates an amicable accommodation and voluntary agreement of the parties concerned. . . . If, by reason of a decisive defeat, Germany felt constrained to abandon the territory, her resulting grievance would be a far greater menace to the peace of Europe than the grievance of France proved to be after 1871; a society or partnership of nations together with disarmament agreements could not then possibly be established; the existence of a festering sore in the very heart of Europe would render impossible frank and healthful international relationships, and would perpetuate those sinister shadows, suspicions, and fears which it is the business of a salutary régime to remove and prevent.

And, again, he says that the return of the provinces to France would mean, of course, the restoration of the former boundary between France and Germany—"a defective boundary that proved such a stumbling-block to the two nations and was more than anything else responsible for the outbreak of the war of 1870"—would mean, in short, the restoration of "an untenable line of demarcation between the two countries".

These are examples of the facile and confident assertions in which this book abounds. It would be most interesting to have some proof for the statement that a defective boundary was the chief cause of the Franco-Prussian War. Moreover why is the Rhine boundary any more untenable than any other? Any boundary is untenable if you haven't the force to protect it, and any boundary is tenable if you have. The Rhine proved no more untenable in 1870 than the Vosges in our own day. There have been times when Alps and Pyrenees and even the English Channel have proved tenable boundaries, and times when they have not.

Mr. Phillipson believes that if any change is to occur in the status of Alsace-Lorraine it must be only as a result of a plebiscite. He also believes in a negotiated peace, a peace without victory:

The best way to ascertain the sense of the population is by asking, without threats or pressure, each citizen to express his true sentiments and wishes; and the best time and circumstances in which to ascertain this is not when one or other alliance of belligerents is being worsted or has been vanquished, but when neither side can properly claim an outstanding victory, and when the terms of peace can be arranged by negotiation and compromise instead of being dictated at the point of the bayonet by a victorious belligerent (pp. 212-213).

Well! the world is spinning down a different groove and many of the author's suggestions have already been cast up on the bank and shoal of time, never to be tested as hoped.

The most curious and tantalizing thing about this book is why it should cost eight dollars.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

The Epistles of Erasmus from his Earliest Letters to his Fifty-third Year. By FRANCIS MORGAN NICHOLS. Volume III. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1918. Pp. xviii, 472. \$6.50.)

AFTER an interval of fourteen years the third volume of Dr. Nichols's translations from the Erasmus correspondence makes its appearance. The first volume came out in 1901, the second in 1904, and the material for the present one was practically completed in 1908.¹ The translator was then eighty-two years of age and conscious of failing powers, but

¹ See this *Review*, VII. 548; X. 686.