

agree with all of Mr. Copeland's conclusions with regard to the merits of individual performances, but few will deny the critical sagacity which he displays, his knowledge of the subject, his sense of proportion, or his admirable consistency. A particularly interesting feature of the book is some hitherto unpublished correspondence of the actor, which brings into strong relief some of his most charming natural traits, his courage in affliction, the vein of playful humor that lightened his habitual melancholy, his capacity for deep affection, his true patriotism, his patience, his modesty, and his entire freedom from professional jealousy—qualities which account fully for the tender and reverent esteem in which he was held by his friends and associates. In a word, this is an essay well worth the reading, for its style, which is exceedingly good, its justice, its continence, and its mastery of its subject.

—The small octavo entitled 'Modern Greece,' by Sir Richard C. Jebb (Macmillan), a reissue after some years, condenses in four essays a general view of the Greek Kingdom and the Greek question, historically, politically, and socially. The first paper is a masterly outline of the story of the Greek people from Alexander to our own time, presenting the transitions from Roman to Byzantine and Turkish rule with accuracy, vivacity, and eloquence. In spite of its brevity, it is full of color and picturesque detail. The second paper supplements this sketch with a picture of the general aspect and social conditions of the country as observed in a brief tour in 1873, containing many striking observations which the traveller will find true to his own recollections. The chapter on the progress of Greece, though written twenty years ago, contains very few pages that are now superseded. The recent war has of course, wrought some changes, particularly in Thessaly. The manufactories of which Professor Jebb speaks have been closed, in many places, on account of the high price of coal; and an active emigration has set in to the United States, which no one dreamed of in 1890. Agricultural conditions and appliances, however, have improved since the war, and agriculture must remain, as Professor Jebb concludes, the mainstay of the country. Another kind of harvest—that of Switzerland and the State of Maine—may be reaped every year, we believe, when the roads are improved and extended, if judicious Greek investors will plant and multiply convenient inns at suitable coigns of vantage. This would be no desecration of a region teeming with natural beauties and historic memories. The author's general view of the people and their institutions is penetrating, just, and hopeful, without being too optimistic. The chapter on Lord Byron at Mesolonghi completes this *aperçu* by giving a section out of the most critical period of the War of Independence. Byron had no prejudices against the Turks and no illusions with regard to the Greek people and character; yet he measured with accuracy and sobriety their political possibilities and their weight in the diplomacy of the Levant.

—Parts x., xi. of the 'Catalogo Generale della Libreria Italiana dall' anno 1847 a tutto il 1899' (Milan: Hoepli; New York: Lemcke & Buechner) conclude the first volume with the letter D, and contain the

preface, which succinctly sets forth the aim of the work, its inclusions and exclusions, its rules of entry. The fourth of these rules has especial reference to the current instalments, and reads thus: "In the case of surnames preceded by the particles *da, de, di* (simple or conjoined), *du, von, van*, etc., if Italian, these prefixes are generally prefixed as they occur; if foreign, they are postfixed—still generally." One cannot quarrel with a method adopted by a foreigner to meet the needs of his countrymen, using his book of reference, but it seems strange to find here De Magny, De Maulde la Clavière, but not De Musset (and, of course, a host besides of French writers). English names are sometimes mishandled, as we have heretofore had occasion to point out, and in Part eleven "Dudley-Field" anticipates his natural appearance among the F's (with the prompt Italian translation in 1874 of his bulky 'Outlines of an International Code'). Before leaving the subject of entries, we remark that, by the omission of the son's name, the works of the elder and the younger Dumas are run together under a single rubric. The point of cleavage is discernible only from the alphabetization. Dumas père fills three pages, or six columns, and there is no cessation of Italian editions of his works, from 1851 to 1899. Dickens, on the other hand, with his minor works thrown in, claims but a single column, though going back to 1852. 'The Cricket on the Hearth' ('Il grillo del focolare') has been quite the most popular, numbering five editions, the latest in 1883. 'David Copperfield' has had two (1859, 1869); 'Oliver Twist' (1857), 'Our Mutual Friend' (1869), 'Hard Times' ('Tempi difficili,' 1877), 'Little Dorrit' (1878), 'Bleak House' ('La Casa triste,' 1885), one each. Nor has Dickens's 'Pictures from Italy' gone beyond a first translation. On the whole, while Dumas's 'Three Musketeers' was reissued in 1899, it would appear that the English novelist has passed his climax in Italy. Among Italian authors here exhibited, De Gubernatis is as fecund as any, filling a page. Much space is demanded for *Deliberazioni, Disposizioni, Documenti, Dialoghi, Descrizione, Diario, Dizionario*. One cannot praise too highly the industry, skill in condensation, and self-effacing modesty of the anonymous editors of this Catalogue.

GREEN'S LIFE OF CHATHAM.

William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, and the Growth and Division of the British Empire, 1708-1778. By Walford Davis Green, M.P. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Pp. xiii, 391.

Mr. Green in his excellent book tells us much, but not at all too much, of William Pitt's personal characteristics; for the peculiarities of Pitt's genius, and, above all, the extraordinary combination of matchless eloquence with equally unrivalled administrative ability, are the causes of his eminence among the long roll of English statesmen. But Mr. Green does not tell us much about the special conditions which at once enabled Pitt to display the marvellous powers conferred upon him by nature, and also, in the later part of his life, made it impossible for him to spend his talents in the service of his country. To imagine, indeed, with some pedants who call them-

selves philosophers, that genius is created by the requirements of a particular time, is to fall a victim to one of the idols of the cave. But, on the other hand, to fancy with the crowd that the effect of originality is independent of the conditions necessary for its operation, is to be misled by one of the commonest idols of the market-place; and it is the more necessary to note the intimate connection between Pitt's career and the special features of public life in England during the eighteenth century, because on this subject readers may be misled by a singularity of English constitutionalism. The forms of the English Constitution are in 1902 much the same as they were towards the end of the reign of George II. At the beginning of the twentieth century, as at the middle of the eighteenth century, we find in England a King, a Parliament which meets year by year, a Cabinet, a Government party, an Opposition, Tories and Whigs, and all the well-known paraphernalia of constitutional monarchy; and we are tempted to draw the inference that the Constitution of to-day is substantially the Constitution which existed during the lifetime of William Pitt. Every student, of course, knows that this idea is a delusion, and that the real continuity of English public life masks great changes in English institutions. Few, however, realize that innovations which have been gradual have amounted in the aggregate to a revolution; and that Pitt's career, in its triumph and in its failure, was determined by political circumstances which are now things of a past age.

The Parliament of the eighteenth century was an aristocratic Parliament. This one fact alone was in itself of immense advantage to Pitt. Under an aristocratic régime his position and his genius alike favored his rise to power. He was known, indeed, as the Great Commoner; but his connection with families such as the Stanhopes, the Grenvilles, and the Lyttons sufficiently shows how closely linked he was with the nobility. The "Cobham cousinhood" might be described as an aristocratic clique. Pitt in a sense represented, but he did not in spirit belong to, the middle classes. When a commoner, no less than when an earl, he belonged to the nobility. He was able to avail himself of an advantage which is now not possessed by any Englishman. Without any special effort he could and did enter Parliament in early youth. He took his seat (one can hardly say he was "elected") for Old Sarum at the age of twenty-seven, or, to use the language of Mr. Green, there "occurred that paradoxical conjunction of the most famous representative of the people with the most notorious of rotten boroughs." There was, in truth, no paradox at all. Pitt entered Parliament as the representative, not of the people, who had not a word to say in the matter, but of the owner of the borough, in this case his brother. He became a leader of the people. But so also did many a man who sat for a rotten borough; indeed, in Pitt's case it was the possibility of entering Parliament without any real election which enabled him to become a popular leader. He began public life young—in itself an immense gain; and he began it unhampered by pledges to electors or by subscription to any party programme. If the anomalies, not to say the abuses, of the British Constitution opened for Pitt the doors of the House

of Commons, his special gifts exactly qualified him for eminence in the Parliament of his day. His eloquence, his appearance, his oratorical action, his crushing sarcasm—all the traits handed down mainly by tradition—are the characteristics of a man framed by nature to impress and lead an assembly where his audience delighted in rhetorical conflicts, where persons and personal influence told for much, and where, to speak plainly, rhetoric and personalities which were not spoilt by being reported in every morning newspaper, told for more than their real worth. A commanding presence, a grandiose imagination, combined with fiery passion and what has often been lacking to consummate orators—imperious strength of will—naturally marked out Pitt as the leader or the despot (he does not appear to have been ever the favorite) of a body such as was the House of Commons of 1757.

The parliaments, again, of the eighteenth century were far more political than legislative assemblies; they were concerned far less than the parliaments of to-day with law-making; they were much more vehemently concerned with policy. The fame of a Minister depended not upon carrying through acts of Parliament (with which, indeed, he might have very little to do), for few acts of a general character were passed, and the Government of the day was scarcely held responsible for such few as were carried. In truth, the course of events and an immense change in the current of opinion have during the nineteenth century carried the English Parliament from one extreme to another. In Chatham's time, and for more than fifty years later, English parliaments cared too little for legislation (whence arose the mass of abuses which had accumulated for generations, and in 1832 required at all costs to be removed), and cared, it may be, too much for policy. In 1902 the Parliament of the United Kingdom concerns itself, in appearance at least, very much with legislation, and, it may be argued, pays too little heed to policy. Whether this be so or not, it is certain that the preoccupation of Parliament and of England with policy, and especially with foreign policy, was most favorable to the authority of Pitt. His oratory was exactly suited for vehement party conflicts, and even more for keeping alive the high spirit of the country during a period of warfare. His resolution and his insight as an administrator then made him the creator of victory. His foes asserted—it may well have been a slander—that he purposely prolonged the conflict with France in order to keep up his own reputation. What is certainly true is, that times of warfare provided the best opportunity for the display of his genius. That he was the greatest of war ministers is certain; that he could have become, like his son, a great peace minister, is open to doubt.

The British Parliament was, further, in the age of Pitt, an emphatically English Parliament, and this in a sense in which the modern Parliament of the United Kingdom never can be a purely English assembly. For the British Parliament, though, since the union with Scotland, it had contained forty Scotch representatives, whose presence at Westminster added to the influence of the Crown, was for all essential purposes an English assembly, representing English feeling alone. The Reform Acts of the nineteenth century (accompanied, as

they have been, by the rise of Nationalism) have done much more than lessen, it may be unduly, the representation of England at Westminster. They have created a complicated state of general opinion. A modern Minister must consider not only the opinion of England, but also the opinions of Scotland, of Ireland, and of Wales. England is, it is true, the "predominant partner," but a partnership is a different thing from a business belonging to one owner alone. The agent of a firm may find his action enfeebled because he must consult the wishes of more than one master. From this source of weakness Pitt was free; his wide views of public good made him throughout life resist the popular prejudice which desired to exclude Scotchmen from office and power, and he, more than any other statesman, welded England and Scotland into one nation. But the opinion of Great Britain, in so far as it reached Parliament, was, in England and Scotland alike, in reality English opinion; or, to put the thing in different words, British opinion was one thing throughout the whole of Great Britain. Pitt, therefore, was, especially in matters of foreign policy, the representative of an undivided and unhesitating national sentiment.

Mr. Green points out, and with truth, that Pitt's oratory displayed just the kind of eloquence which in earlier ages might have swayed the citizens of Athens or of Rome. He does not insist upon an equally important point, that the body of men who took an effective share in English public life, and who, for practical purposes, constituted the nation, and to whom Pitt appealed, bore a considerable resemblance to the citizens of a classical state. They were, compared to the whole of the population, few in number. They belonged to a limited class. They were guided by a few leaders who held in their own hands a large amount of political power; and this "legal country," to use an expression borrowed from France, was far more keenly interested in politics, and especially in party conflicts, than are to-day the huge mass of modern English electors. To this it may be added that the House of Commons, which represented this English nation constituting but a portion of the people, was, in spite of the corruption and intrigue that degraded Parliamentary life, more easily affected by eloquence than are the much more respectable parliaments of the twentieth century. Partisanship was violent, but party lines were not very sharply drawn. It is almost impossible to read the account of the effect produced by Pitt's oratory and sarcasm without coming to the conclusion that votes were at times more easily turned by the force of rhetoric in Pitt's day, and even at a later date, than in our own time. This idea is confirmed by observation of the results produced alike by the diatribes of Junius and by the advocacy of Erskine. A rhetorical generation was singularly amenable to the charm of eloquence.

But, if the conditions of the time afforded a field for the exercise of Pitt's genius, they also went a great way towards rendering it useless to his country. Many, no doubt, of the calamities which in the later part of his career Pitt was doomed to witness, but was unable to avert, may be attributed to circumstances which he himself, had he remained in power, could not in the long run have controlled. The miserable breakdown

of his health, in 1766, was itself one of those terrible accidents which frustrate human foresight. It is impossible to insist too much or too often upon the ills which flowed from the dull obstinacy of George III. and the culpable pliancy of Lord North. Still, when everything is allowed for, the question remains, Why was it that, at a supreme crisis of national peril, the statesman who was still worshipped as the national hero, who had proved himself the most capable war minister England had ever seen, and who, whatever his faults, was felt by the people to be the most ardent of patriots, was not recalled to power? The answer is not hard to find. The unreformed Parliament of Great Britain had some striking merits. It more nearly represented the wishes of the nation than any one would have expected who, without a general knowledge of history, had simply examined the mode in which members of Parliament were elected; but the unreformed Parliament exhibited one fatal defect. No minister could hold or attain power unless he was supported by the influence (to use the expression of the time) either of the Crown or of a compact party who, from the possession of nomination boroughs, could appoint a large number of Members of Parliament. At the time of Pitt's triumphs, the alliance with the Duke of Newcastle, and also, in the last years of George the Second, the good will of the Court, gave him that permanent support in the House of Commons without which it was impossible to govern. In the later years of his life he was not supported by the united body of Whig nobles, and he was hated by the King, who considered him a "trumpet of sedition." George III., too, had become the greatest borough-monger in his kingdom; and, being endowed with the cunning or astuteness sometimes connected with insanity, showed exactly the kind of gifts which have occasionally made men of no breadth of view or real capacity the "bosses" of some American cities.

The system of government, then, which revealed Chatham's genius to the world, was also the system which led to the failure and the tragedy of Chatham's last years.

PATON'S SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

The Early History of Syria and Palestine.
By Lewis Bayles Paton, Ph.D. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xxxvi, 302.

This is a remarkably sane and discriminating treatment of a subject which, unfortunately, "gets on the imagination" of most of those who try to deal with it. The available material for the early history of Palestine is rather meagre, derived chiefly from Egyptian, Babylonian, and Assyrian inscriptions and from the Bible. How to use the latter, especially for the earlier periods, is in any case a difficult question, and the difficulty is greatly enhanced by theological prejudices. For Syria we have the same material as for Palestine, less the Bible; but on the other hand we have no theological prejudices to deal with. Professor Paton seems to have used to the full all available material, and it is surprising how much information he is able to piece together about times and countries whose remains are practically unexplored.

The earliest inhabitants, whose remains consist of megalithic monuments of the