

too high. Mr. Rowntree accepts, after due comparison, the results obtained by Prof. Atwater in this country. The "standard of life" is higher here than in Europe. "Considering the body as a machine," Prof. Atwater says, "the American working man has a more strongly built machine and more fuel to run it than has his European brother." Hence he is capable of and performs more muscular labor. Conversely, the foreign laborer does not require quite so much food in order to do his work. If he is smaller, and does not work so hard, he can exist on less food. A horse doing moderate work may exist, and even thrive, on hay. If he is to do more work, he must be fed with grain; and a large horse needs more food than a small one. But the possible reduction from Mr. Rowntree's standard is very small; and we cannot escape the conclusion that if the poorer class of laborers in England were better fed, they would presently increase in physical size and in physical efficiency. Their condition has greatly improved within a century, and had it not been for the deplorable mania for "empire" which has lately affected the English people, it would have continued to improve. But when a nation spends a thousand million dollars for glory, the poor cannot escape paying their share; and increased taxation for such an end means increased poverty.

The Brothers Dalziel. 1840-1890. With selected pictures by and autograph letters from Lord Leighton, etc., etc., etc. London: Methuen & Co.; New York: Dutton. 1901. Small 4to, pp. 359.

Any one whose notice and recollection of wood-engraving antedate the rise and culmination of the American school, needs no introduction to the genial George and Edward Dalziel, who here modestly celebrate themselves. Their narrative is loosely chronological, and is copiously illustrated by specimens of their woodcuts in connection with each artist as brought upon the scene. Edward, himself a designer, is occasionally thus represented, as is Thomas, who began with copperplate, and E. G. Dalziel (eldest son of Edward). Another brother, John, associated with the firm, died in 1869. From 1851, Margaret, one of four sisters (there were eight brothers, all artistically minded), also assisted with the blocks. Portraits of this generation and of the parents heighten the interest of the retrospect.

The Brothers are discursive, and diversify their story with character sketches, anecdotes, letters (often in facsimile), in a way to offset the catalogue nature of their book. They were natives of Northumberland, and the youngest was born in Newcastle-on-Tyne, the seat of the revival of wood-engraving under Thomas Bewick. Bewick had been seven years in his grave when George Dalziel came up to London to learn the art under John Gray, a pupil of Nicholson, who had been Bewick's pupil. George's brother Alexander was also taught by Nicholson. In the early forties the new firm had much to do with the eccentric Ebenezer Landells, one of the projectors and original proprietors of *Punch*, who, having begun with Bewick, had finished under Nicholson. The Brothers Dalziel were, further, on the most cordial terms with William Harvey, Bewick's favorite pupil. The Tyneside tradition, therefore, came down very straight

through our authors, but it is something of a disappointment that they have forborne to review the progress of the technique of wood-engraving, or the decline and fall of the craft. In a chapter regarding their own pupils—among them, Harry Fenn, who came to America to make his reputation—we read of Hal Ludlow (p. 350):

"His work had become so popular that Mason Jackson came to us on behalf of the *Illustrated London News*, to know if we would allow Ludlow to make drawings on wood for that journal, saying, 'it was a pity that such clever drawings should all be reproduced by process,' which he regarded as an inferior manner of rendering them. What a change has come since that period! How completely has the then thought 'superior' manner had to stand aside for the inferior! [The Dalziels closed their engravers' office in 1893.] We may here state that, in the long past, we always thought some automatic process would be perfected for the proper reproduction of point work, or what was always known as 'facsimile' drawing."

William Harvey died at seventy in 1866, but, remark our authors, "even in his own time what changes took place! He said that in his early days if merely a frontispiece were wanted for a book, John Murray would invite him and John Thomson, the engraver, to dinner at Albermarle Street, that they might discuss the subject fully before beginning the work" (p. 15). As to the designers' preparation, we are informed (p. 41):

"In Kenny Meadows's days, the artist in black and white had not thought of the advantages of drawing from the living model; neither William Harvey nor Sir John Gilbert ever drew from nature, and George Thomas was one of the first, if not indeed the very first, to draw on wood direct from life. This was about the early part of the Crimean war. . . . No doubt Mulready had life models for his 'Vicar of Wakefield' drawings, and, later on, Millais never drew without the life, nor did any of the pre-Raphaelite school; but this was the gradual and natural development of a new method, and innumerable drawings by the younger artists which passed through our hands were all drawn direct on wood from the life."

These drawings were so beautiful in themselves that the Dalziels sought to preserve them by "getting fairly good photographs for the engraver's purpose on other pieces of wood. . . . Then followed, as a matter of course, the constant practice of making drawings upon paper which were photographed on wood." It was the invariable custom of the gifted and amiable Birket Foster "to make small water-color sketches for his more important black-and-white work; sometimes they were partly pencil, or pen and ink tinted." Foster, by the way, had essayed wood-cutting under Landells, but made no progress.

"Among the early drawings by John Leech that passed through our hands, were those he made for Thackeray's 'Irish Sketch-Book,' which were probably copied from Thackeray's own pencil work, for he was not above having help on his drawings, the result not always being such as he expected." Dicky Doyle

"had a facile pencil when once fairly at work, but he was singularly deficient as to the value of time. . . . On one occasion, when illustrating a story by Thackeray, the number had to be issued short of certain pictures that had been arranged for. Thackeray was a good deal annoyed, and asked Doyle if he could give any reason why he had not done the drawings. He replied, in his cool, deliberate manner: 'Eh—er, the fact is, I had not got any pencils.'"

"Half a dozen of the *hardest*" was his requirement, as appears from an undated letter here given. It was Doyle who introduced the Dalziels to Millais, and one of the most interesting facsimiles is of a letter (p. 84) in which Millais gives minute directions for retouching a woodcut after his design, and sketches the parts in question.

When Fred Walker came out of school with an ambition to be an illustrator, he took counsel of the Dalziels, who "advised him to begin by copying, in pen and ink, pictures from the *Illustrated London News* and other illustrated periodicals, specially recommending the works of John Gilbert and Birket Foster as the best models for style and manner." One wonders what old Bewick would have said to this.

Had we picked out the plums of personal anecdote we could have made a more entertaining notice of this handsome volume, but our aim has been to show its relation to the history not of book illustration but of wood-engraving. The latter relation, we feel, might have been much more valuable. Still, no one can peruse this record of a talented family without being greatly attracted to the chroniclers as thoroughly lovable men, strongest as wood-engravers, not remarkable as designers or as poets; generous patrons of art, undertakers of great art publications, and founders of the Camden Press, still flourishing in the hands of their posterity, as this product testifies.

The Amherst Papyri. Part II. Edited by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt. H. Frowde. 1901.

This work, published by the Oxford University Press, contains certain classical fragments, and many documents of the Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine periods, besides some theological fragments, chiefly from the 'Shepherd' of Hermas, which have been identified since the issue of Part I. Such a collection is always a lottery, and this particular lottery offers nothing so striking as the "Words of Jesus," the poem of Sappho, the list of Olympian Victors, and the long petition of Dionysia, which made the Oxyrhynchus papyrus so rich in agreeable surprises and in legal information. On the other hand, the present volume must be consulted by every student of the original sources for the social and legal conditions in Ptolemaic and later Egypt. The student of palaeography will also find in it an almost unique series of specimens, ranging from the third century B. C. to the seventh century A. D. Many of these can be dated with absolute precision and others with close approximation. They supplement, therefore, and modify in some interesting particulars the history of this science and the statements in Mr. Kenyon's treatise on the subject.

The fragments belonging to the classical period include fifteen broken lines of an unknown tragedy, pieced out in part by Blass, and possibly, as he surmises, from the "Νηρηίδες" of Aeschylus, and a slight trace of the "Sciron" of Euripides. A brief commentary by Aristarchus on the first book of Herodotus rescues for us a short quotation from the "Ποικίλος" of Sophocles, and confirms the special meaning of the word *αἰκνιστος*. Another papyrus of the early fourth century A. D., containing three fables of Babrius, is very curious as pre-

senting a bad Latin translation, dictated, apparently, to a scribe who knew less Latin than the translator. In it occur the unheard-of and problematic Latin forms *frestitiatur*, *babbandam*, and *sorsus* as a translation of *πάρος*. The Greek text, though inferior to the Athous manuscript of the British Museum, yet has its value in showing that the form of the eleventh fable and a suspected reading (*βαλόντος*) go back to the fourth century, and that an alphabetical arrangement of the fables dates back to the same period.

The miscellaneous documents supplement our information about the administration of Egypt, and also with regard to many technical and legal details. Though they furnish many coincidences of months in the Egyptian and Macedonian calendars, yet they do not afford sufficient data to settle the perplexing question of the Macedonian calendar and its relations to the Egyptian. They do, however, determine the date of certain Egyptian prætors, and incidentally extinguish one imaginary official (Dioscurus, A. D. 105). They show that the Government monopoly in oil, as practised by the Ptolemies, was much relaxed under the Roman period, though certain other administrative methods persisted even into the Byzantine period. They give frequent hints of conflicts between the Egyptians and the Greek settlers under the later Ptolemies; the Egyptians complain that they are overreached by the Greeks in the apportionment of certain lands, while the revolting Egyptians (B. C. 165) burn and destroy title-deeds, a proceeding aimed against the Greeks. Still, under the Ptolemies, the prevailing impression we receive is of a reign of law and of the tax-gatherer. It was the excess of these civilizing agencies rather than their deficiency that the inhabitants might complain of.

This is well shown by a detailed instance of the administrative processes, preserved with unusual completeness in Papyrus 31. The document dates from B. C. 112, in the reign of Soter II, Senpoëris, daughter of Onnophris, surreptitiously enclosed a piece of desert land (about 55 square metres) with a view to planting date-palms. An overseer of the revenue, while collecting taxes in the neighborhood, gets wind of this encroachment, visits the spot, probably applies torture (*πειθαρχία*), and extracts a fine together with twice the ordinary taxes. This fine is paid over to a banker, and the transaction requires the signature of the overseer of the revenue and of the royal scribe, fortified by the certificates of two minor officials that the land measurements are correct. Senpoëris survives to pay two years later a Government tax of 10 per cent. on the purchase price of a house and land. The collection of revenue was naturally carried out with great rigor. Granaries were sealed by Government agents, and were not released (*ἀφέντες*) till they were assessed and the taxes paid—a procedure similar to that of the Turkish Government in the sixteenth century. Moreover, parties suspected of defrauding the revenue were expressly deprived of the assistance of advocates. Advocates who dared render assistance in such cases were themselves subjected to heavy penalties and disabilities by a decree of Philadelphus, cited in an interesting petition of certain landholders (No. 33), wherein they accuse a Komarch not only of peculation, but of the

further misdemeanor of bringing advocates to plead for him in the royal court.

A notable feature of the present collection of documents—quite familiar, however, in Egyptian jurisprudence—is that in all business and legal transactions the women are rather more in evidence than the men. They make loans and purchases, inherit property, and execute contracts of every description with remarkable freedom and apparent equality before the law. The custom of intermarriage between brother and sister is strikingly illustrated in several of these fragments. A census return by a certain priest, Panephremmis, reports himself as forty years old and married to his full sister, aged seventeen. A petition by a certain Demetria in behalf of her son, claiming exemption from poll-tax for him on the ground that he is descended on both sides from a gymnasiarch, gives the family tree for five generations, which offers three successive instances, on the mother's side, of marriage between own brothers and sisters. The names, too, in this genealogy are all Greek, with a single exception. A family correspondence of the second century A. D., between Sarapion and his son, and a sister who was probably his wife, is occupied with questions of crops and laborers and clothing and money; the son, however, shows genuine anxiety about his father's health. But expressions of affection come high when papyrus costs three obols a sheet, and when, in a memorandum of expenses, we find the single item of papyrus set down for 80 drachmæ, against 100 drachmæ for traveling expenses. The Greek of these excerpts, corrupt and misspelled as they often are—in fact, by reason of their misspelling and corruption—constitutes in itself an interesting study, ranging as it does far into the Byzantine period. The fragments from the 'Shepherd' of Hermas, belonging to the sixth century A. D., add a little to the portions already discovered by Tischendorf and Professor Lambros; but the few lines of the lost ending are especially valuable because they coincide pretty closely with the Latin version, and furnish a clear proof of the forgery of Simonides.

It is superfluous to praise the work of the editors. Nothing has been omitted in the indexes and annotations to make the contents of the sumptuous book accessible and available.

Commonwealth or Empire. By Goldwin Smith. Macmillan Co. 1902.

No one can deny that Goldwin Smith is a true friend of this country; and his wounds are faithful. Up to the close of the last century, he tells us, the United States, if not the United States alone, represented the ideals of freedom. They were imperfectly realized, like all ideals, but they were recognized and respected. "The American Republic was the home of democracy and the hope of labor. It promised to do something more than the Old World towards correcting the injustice of nature, equalizing the human lot, and making the community a community indeed." Hence it was an object of alarm to the enemies of popular government, who hailed the secession of the Southern States with shouts of exultation. They hoped to see the end of a government founded on the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

Shall their hopes now be realized? Against the 'commonwealth' are now arrayed Plutocracy, Militarism, and Imperialism, three forces which instinctively conspire. The plutocrat is by constitution an Imperialist, and by necessity a believer in a standing army. We need not dwell on the present great power of aggregated wealth, for it is illustrated every day. Nor need we argue that its spirit is anti-democratic.

"Its ostentatious prodigality and luxury are a defiance of democratic sentiment and subversive of democratic manners. At heart it sighs for a court and aristocracy. It worships anything royal or aristocratic. It barters the hands of its daughters and its millions for European titles. It imitates, and even outvies, in some things, the gilding of European nobility. Its social centre is gradually shifting from America, where its inclinations are still in some measure controlled, to England, where it can get more homage and subservency for its wealth, and take hold of the mantle of high society.

The political colors of American plutocracy were plainly shown on the occasion of the South African war. The drawing-rooms of New York at once declared themselves on the side of the drawing-rooms of London."

The relation of Militarism to humanity and to political liberty has been the same ever since the military power enslaved Rome. England owes her freedom to her immunity from standing armies. In this country we have had no standing army, for the armies of the civil war were citizen armies, and dissolved when peace came. Yet the army of the North gave birth to a great military interest, and its prodigious exactions in the shape of pensions show that our rulers do not dare to refuse its demands. Few of them dare even to criticise the conduct of the army in the Philippines; many of them go so far, in their anxiety to propitiate the military element, as to declare that our soldiers are justified in torturing the wretched people whom they are attacking, and that those who protest against cruelty are unpatriotic.

That this is a normal development of Imperialism is shown by the British rule in India. The Sepoys committed atrocities on the English at Cawnpore, and the English retorted with similar cruelties. The commandant at Cawnpore proposed impaling and burning alive as punishments. Lord Elgin said:

"It is a terrible business, however, this living among inferior races. I have seldom, from man or woman, since I came to the East, heard a sentence which was reconcilable with the hypothesis that Christianity had ever come into the world. Detestation, contempt, ferocity, vengeance, whether Chinamen or Indians be the object. . . . When the passions of fear and hatred are engrafted on this indifference, the result is frightful—an absolute callousness as to the sufferings of the objects of those passions, which must be witnessed to be understood and believed."

We need only read the current newspapers and the debates in Congress to recognize the spirit which Lord Elgin describes, and it is encouraged by the attitude of many of the clergy: "We hear them dwell on the advantage of warfare, and an eminent English ecclesiastic even quotes approvingly the lines—

"That God's most perfect instrument
Is working out a pure intent
Is man arrayed for mutual slaughter:
Yea, Carnage is His daughter."

Although this is a book of but eighty pages, it contains a whole arsenal of arguments against the abandonment of the prin-