

of the dramatist's life which remain a blank, and these Professor Boas seeks to fill in by tracing the course of his poetic development as inferable from his works. At best, this is fragmentary and cannot be regarded as conclusive. Thus, to infer from the evidence of his plays and translations that he was not college-bred is certainly perilous. A college course does not always make a man a perfect construer, and Kyd's mistakes in translation from Latin, French, and Italian may be paralleled without great difficulty in the works of equally brilliant men who are college graduates. Even if he does speak of Thrasymene as "so dezart," and translates "Marius, l'honneur d'Arpin" as "Marius, Arpin's friend," we should not necessarily infer with Professor Boas that he did not graduate from either of the Universities.

In any case, Kyd's learning, or lack of it, seems to have made him the butt of one bitter writer of invective, the fiery Nash, who, it is generally agreed, was striking at Kyd in his Preface to Greene's "Menaphon" and incidentally furnishing some biography. Nash, as Professor Boas says, was correct enough when he sneered at Kyd as one of those who "intermeddle with Italian translations: wherein how poorelie they have plodded . . . let all indifferent Gentlemen that have travailed in that tongue discern by their twopenie pamphlets"; but Nash gives too loose a rein to his satirical fancy when he says Kyd "could scarce lie latinize [his] necke verse if [he] should have neede." Accurate scholarship, fortunately, was not a prerequisite to dramatic excellence, though some of the University wits would have had it so; nor was every University wit a perfect Latinist.

The editor of Kyd is beset from the beginning of his work with perplexing problems. As soon as he has gathered together the fragments of his author's life, he meets various disturbing questions about his known works and about those which are to be admitted into the canon. Happily, we know that the "Spanish Tragedy" is by Kyd, but we have to determine its date by internal evidence. Over this seemingly insignificant question much ink has been spilt. Was the play written before or after the Armada? The subtleties of those who fix its date at 1589-90 must, however, vanish, as Professor Boas contends, before the argument that no play dealing with Spanish affairs and written by an Englishman would be likely to contain only trivial references to vague and semi-mythical victories of English arms in the days of John of Gaunt, when the Armada was still fresh in the memory of all England. The date 1585-7, fixed upon by Professor Boas, makes more manifest the influence of Kyd on the development of English tragedy, and it is this which gives importance to the question.

Besides the "Spanish Tragedy," only one other play is known to be Kyd's, and it is his translation of Garnier's "Cornélie." By means of these two plays, accordingly, the canon of his dramas has to be determined. There are, in all, four plays which appear for examination: "Titus Andronicus," "Jeronimo," "Soliman and Perseda," and the suppositional "Ur-Hamlet," the original of Shakspeare's play. The first two Professor Boas believes not to be Kyd's; the last two undoubtedly his. The problem is complicated in the case of "Titus" by the admission

that we probably have not the earliest form in the present version—and the former alone is attributed to Kyd; and, in the case of the "Ur-Hamlet," by the loss of this play, which is most closely represented by the 1603 Shakspeare quarto. There are striking resemblances between all these plays and the "Spanish Tragedy," and also differences. The greatest care must, accordingly, be taken in estimating the relative values of these points of similarity and difference, if from them we are to determine a common or a divided authorship.

In the case of "Jeronimo" the resemblances to the "Spanish Tragedy" are largely suggested by the latter work, to which the former was intended as a forepiece; and the play might readily be composed by a fifth-rate dramatist who wished to profit by the revived popularity of the greater work. Disregarding conventional and accidental correspondences, there are no resemblances between the two plays too subtle to be explained as imitative. The lack of conformity, on the other hand, between certain events in the forepiece and the record of them in the "Spanish Tragedy" might easily be overlooked by a careless imitator, but not by the common author of the two plays.

In his discussion of the authorship of the "Ur-Hamlet," Professor Boas should rest his main argument on the striking similarities of dramatic technique between the 1603 quarto and the "Spanish Tragedy," as supplementary, of course, to the strong evidence of Nash's "Preface." The variations of "Hamlet" from its ultimate source in Belleforest correspond so closely to leading features in the plot of the "Spanish Tragedy" as to be strongly corroborative of the common authorship of these plays. On the whole, Professor Boas presents these arguments forcibly; some of his correspondences are, however, too trivial to carry weight. But it is in the resemblances of phrase between the 1603 quarto and the known works of Kyd that our editor believes he has "practically irresistible internal tests" of Kyd's authorship of the "Ur-Hamlet." To us they do not seem convincing. They might easily be the product of imitation. Such exist in the case of "Jeronimo" and the "Spanish Tragedy," of the 1604 quarto of "Hamlet" and the "Spanish Tragedy." Indeed, Professor Boas himself, in discussing the authorship of "Titus," points out just such resemblances in phrase between this play and the "Spanish Tragedy," but is content to disregard them without explanation as evidence of common authorship. There are, too, resemblances in technique between "Titus" and the "Spanish Tragedy" which are more significant than some of those Professor Boas mentions between the 1603 quarto and the same play, and these, also, he disregards. These smaller matters should be given very little weight in determining authorship. It is the mere jugglery of criticism when they are classed as corroborative evidence in the case of probable common authorship, and as mere imitation in that of probable divided authorship. That which determines us in accepting Kyd as the author of the "Ur-Hamlet" and questioning his complicity in "Titus" is the radical difference between the two plays. "Titus" surpasses in its orgy of horrors and its ingenuity of ferociousness anything in

Kyd's accredited works or what we can conceive the "Ur-Hamlet" to have been. This, with the total absence of the comic, would seem to argue most strongly against Kyd's authorship of the play.

In the matter of the text, Professor Boas has left very little to be desired. He has given us the first complete edition of Kyd's works. Hitherto, with the exception of the "Spanish Tragedy," his plays were accessible only in the collections. Of his pamphlets, the "Householder's Philosophy" existed only in the quarto of 1588, and the "Murder of John Brewen" had been reprinted in Collier's "Illustrations of Early English Popular Literature" (1863), and was out of print. The text follows the best quarto in the case of each work, and varies only when necessary. All needless emendations (for which see Fleischer's "Bemerkungen") are rigidly excluded. The notes are neither too full nor too scanty. There are remarkably few typographical errors. The following have been noted: On p. xciv, line 12, the reference to the "Spanish Tragedy" should be III., xi, 43; on p. 31, line 60, for "ambitious" read "ambitious"; the footnote on page 69 to line 148 reads: "See Note," but there is no corresponding note; the reference in the note to "Spanish Tragedy" III., vi, 16, should read "52" for "51"; on page 322 the page-heading should be "Act II," not "Act I."

Musings by Campfire and Wayside. By William Cunningham Gray. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1902. 8vo, pp. 337. Illustrated.

This volume of *causerie* by the late editor of the *Interior* contains some chapters enlarged from an earlier output of 'Musings,' though much of the contents is now first printed. A portion of the book failed to receive the author's revision, as one may notice by a few misspelled proper names and one misplaced paragraph. These defects are, however, of slight importance. The book has what many of our young Western critics mistake for evidences of culture—a simple, unaffected flow of words, as of chat on a veranda in the twilight between old friends; evidences of good taste, native rather than acquired, of homely common sense, of a genuine love of outdoor life, of latent fires of indignation ready to blaze at the puff of injustice. Some of it is charming, nearly all is pleasant reading, and there is little of the newspaper flavor. It is the apotheosis of the literary column in the Saturday evening edition, a development in words of musings, whimsies quaint or kindly, speculations of a dandelion about the pine tops, of a log-cabin builder about the universe. As a self-revelation of an earnest, kindly nature, free from pedantry yet innocent of training, reverent yet audacious, but without the undertones of strength which are the indications of real power, the book will find a welcome, and doubtless a wide audience. But it is of those which open the door to literature rather than exemplify it, which sound the note of aspiration rather than the psalm of one who stands already on the heights. Of literary finish or the assured confidence of style it has and claims nothing.

It is elegantly printed and tastefully bound; and the illustrations, from photographs by the author, are well reproduced and of a quality akin to the text.

François de Fénelon. By Viscount St. Cyres.
E. P. Dutton & Co. 1901.

The life of a great aristocratic prelate of the seventeenth century might easily have tempted a less judicious biographer than Lord St. Cyres into long intrusive disquisition on the great fundamentals implied by Fénelon in successive declarations or acts of conduct. We should then have been presented with an elaborate treatise on questions of state and religion during the *grand siècle*, instead of with the present compact and admirably balanced life. Its explanatory paragraphs and chapters, though amply detailed, are all designed to aid in the elucidation of a character hitherto treated in altogether too partial a fashion. For, as the author says, the conventional Fénelon, as described either by admirers or by opponents, invariably obscures the real man. Thus (chap. ii.) the eighteenth-century tradition, which placed Fénelon among the great supporters of religious toleration, becomes manifestly ill-founded when one examines, with the assistance of Lord St. Cyres, the essentially clerical character of the Archbishop. Yet we cannot agree with the biographer in attributing freedom of conscience wholly "to men to whom liberty of Prophesying was as the very breath of God," and thus tacitly ruling out the slowly disintegrating effect which the skepticism of such men as Bayle handed as a heritage to the still more destructive and tolerant indifference of the age of pure reason (p. 17).

It is in connection with the hackneyed Bossuet-Fénelon quarrel that the writer's analysis is most complete, dealing out even-handed justice to both contestants with an almost sardonic imperturbability of judicial humor; the reader is at first puzzled to guess to which side his sympathies are expected to lean. In the main, however, Lord St. Cyres tends to favor Bossuet, the "dogmatist, not, indeed, in the world's most vulgar sense, but as one who saw in creeds an institution rather than an idea, a measuring-rod rather than a lever, an abstract of all human duties, not their bare beginning" (p. 152). Such a character needs no reading between the lines; it falls, consequently, into natural and immediate antagonism with the "quelquechose d'inachevé, composé de contrastes qui n'ont pu se fondre et s'amalgamer," of which the picture here presented takes the place, possibly for many years, of the conventional portrait, so often drawn in unbroken, flowing outline, of the persecuted saint at Cambrai. And the special merit of the biographer's discussion lies in its demonstration of the rigorously logical fashion in which the contrast and hostility grew out of a simple difference in the diagnosing of an elementary pathological case.

In dealing with Fénelon's theory of education, his present biographer easily exposes its leading weakness. Parallels between 'Télémaque' and 'Émile' have often been established; but comparatively few critics dwell with insistence on their common fallacy of bringing up the child in large measure with a view to the subjective gratification in the result to be enjoyed by the preceptor; and an average healthy boy should chafe under a system of scrutiny which reduces the pupil almost to the condition of the prisoners in Bentham's Panopticon scheme. This community of view in Fénelon and Rousseau, we may add, was in

the one case derived from the practice of the confessional, while in the other it was a persistent survival of the inquisitorial methods of Geneva. The Swiss theorist was the more fortunate of the two in not seeing the wreck of his endeavors through their failure in a concrete example. Lord St. Cyres goes further in tracing the dependence of Rousseau on Fénelon by representing the latter as, in some respects, a forerunner of Romanticism (pp. 200-202), which restores to Nature something of her primal rights. While joining with the critic in holding that Fénelon's conception of Nature is at bottom in harmony neither with Rousseau nor with Wordsworth, one must also note that an equally wide gulf divides the observer of urban and court life from the man to whom a mere touch of color on the hillside signified a revelation of supreme importance towards the discovery of philosophic truth. Fénelon was one of the least likely of men to become "enslaved to the optic nerve."

In the preface of this volume the general reader is forewarned against the possible aridity of certain chapters devoted to the examination of the abstract principles at stake during the crisis of Fénelon's life. It is precisely in connection with these questions that the scholar will find his chief interest, for Lord St. Cyres has evidently examined not only the great treatises, but in some cases a mass of ephemeral contemporary pamphlets, bearing on such topics as Mme. Guyon and the Mystics, Jansenism and Cartesianism. It is thus that he succeeds in deepening the impression that he seeks to make of the complexity in a nature capable of allying itself now with Mystic, now with Jesuit, and consequently, at a later time, of supplying authoritative foundation for the widely differing contention of Joseph de Maistre and Lamennais.

The style of this volume is not the least of its merits. Possibly, in dealing with the more serious questions, the glitter of sustained wit or epigram might have given way to the glow of genuine interest or fervor; the academic tone of slightly supercilious aloofness suggests comparative coldness to the issues in a country which is not the writer's own. But this also rendered it possible for Lord St. Cyres to give practical fulfillment to the recently expressed wish of another commentator: "Il semble que l'heure de l'impartialité devrait être venue pour la mémoire de Fénelon."

Life of Charles Robinson, the First State Governor of Kansas. By Frank W. Blackmar, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology and Economics in the University of Kansas. Topeka: Crane & Co.

It is an unfortunate aspect of early Kansas history that works on the subject are still being written with greater and greater amplitude of detail, and the time of contraction and condensation has not yet begun. Redpath's 'Life of John Brown' filled 408 pages, Sanborn's 645, Hinton's 752. After some delay, the special admirers of Gov. Robinson are taking their innings, and Professor Blackmar's biography of him mounts up to 438 pages. Like all his predecessors, this new author at once plunges into the petty and somewhat parochial gossip, so often reiterated, as to who is the real hero of Kansas. He says, in the very introduc-

tion (p. 17): "As to the Brown-Lane-Robinson controversy, it is not easy to get at the whole truth and cause each man to stand forth in his true light." Nevertheless, he finds it easy, three pages after, like all special advocates, to say that "the verdict of history cannot fail" to make his own hero incomparably the greatest. Having thus stated the case and pronounced the verdict in the very introduction, he proceeds for many pages to multiply details, finding Brown and Lane wrong in everything, and yet presenting them in no really new light.

The essential point of the controversy has been from the beginning the alleged fact that Gov. Robinson did at the time approve of John Brown's part in the so-called "Pottawatomie Massacre," in 1856, on which the whole course of events seemed for a time to turn, and that he held that view of it for twenty-two years, after which he turned upon John Brown and vigorously denounced him for the rest of his own life. Professor Blackmar now concedes (p. 321), that Gov. Robinson wrote to James Hanway as follows, in 1878: "I never had much doubt that Capt. Brown was the author of the blow at Pottawatomie [twenty-two years before], for the reason that he was the only man that comprehended the situation and saw the absolute necessity of some such blow and had the nerve to strike it." Professor Blackmar's vindication of this seeming inconsistency is based on the ground that certain testimony, given by a Mr. Townsley (p. 322), caused the change of Robinson's opinion. The peculiarity is that, while thus relying on Mr. Townsley's evidence for the vindication of his friend, Professor Blackmar does not tell us one word as to who the witness was, when he testified, what his statements were; and does not consider him important enough to be mentioned in his index.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Townsley was simply the wagoner who was employed to drive the party. John Brown himself had spent the winter in that region (Connelley's 'John Brown,' p. 212), and did not need any one to show him who and what his neighbors were; he plainly did not intend to "sweep the creek," because two pro-slavery men were returned unharmed as having taken no part in any outrages. Furthermore, we have it on the authority of John Brown, jr., a man of high character as to truthfulness, that Townsley "volunteered to return with the team, and offered to point out the abodes of such as he thought should be disposed of" (Sanborn, p. 264; Connelley, p. 210). Townsley himself stated at a later period: "I did not then approve the killing of those men. . . . In after-years my opinion changed as to the wisdom of the massacre. I became, and am, satisfied that it resulted in good to the Free-State cause. . . . The pro-slavery men were dreadfully terrified, and large numbers of them soon left the Territory" (Connelley, p. 224). It is to be remembered that Governor Robinson himself was one of those held as prisoner by the Slave-State men, and, immediately after the Pottawatomie affair, was released; and that even Prof. L. W. Spring, author of a 'History of Kansas,' while disapproving the massacre itself, admits that its effect was "marvellous," and that it probably saved Governor Robinson and the other prisoners from death (*Lippincott's Magazine*, January 18,