

teresting features of life in "a trans-Missouri State" have been omitted. The heroine has more character than is usually allowed her in the novel of commerce. She is a graduate of Smith; but, the author having made this concession to the modern young woman, hastens to assure us that she hardly had a bowing acquaintance with her studies and was on bad terms with the faculty; in short, her four years in the East merely modified her accent to suit the taste of the hero from Boston. Evelyn does, in fact, display an ineptitude for the simplest matters of business, which convinces one that she had great feminine charm. The book is written in forty-seven short and stirring chapters; the characters are well drawn, and the style is vigorous; but it will not "take tired people to the Islands of the Blest," which are unknown to the geography of the novel of commerce.

The French, as a rule, are saved from sentimentality by the keen and clear intelligence which is their most conspicuous endowment; but when a Frenchman writes "pour les jeunes filles," it is quite another story. In 'La Fille du Braconnier' a prolific writer, M. Mélandri, contributes another volume to the library of fiction that may be read by a French girl in the interval between her convent-school and her wedding-day. An English or American girl of any age would be profoundly bored by the tears and agitation, the touching coincidences, the wholly unconvincing incidents which in the end land the poacher's daughter in affluence in the very château whose demesne her father used to poach. The tale is redeemed from absolute mawkishness by a spirited account of the battle of Waterloo. "Le respect dû à nos lectrices," to quote the writer's phrase, ought naturally to bar out the ordinary tone and setting of the modern French novel. But the intelligence too has its claims, and one can only pity the "jeune fille" who in her teens is nourished on the "Girl's Own Paper" style of fiction while her English-speaking contemporary is reading Meredith and Hardy and Stevenson. It is rare, indeed, to find the latter after this liberal allowance declining, like her French cousin in later years, on the novels of Bourget and Prévost.

Across Coveted Lands. By A. Henry Savage Landor. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903. 2 vols. 175 illustrations, diagrams, plans, and maps. Pp. viii., 462, viii., 460.

Voyages au Maroc (1899-1901). Par. Mis de Segonzac. Avec 178 photographes . . . une carte . . . et des appendices, politique, astronomique, météorologique, botanique, entomologique, numismatique, géographique. Paris: Armand Colin, 1903. Pp. xii., 410.

Mr. Landor's would be an extremely interesting record of Persian travel—Persia being the coveted land in question—if it could excite any trust in its accuracy. As the case stands, the numerous excellent photographs are its only confidence-arousing element. For the rest, Mr. Landor, by his attitude towards other travellers and authorities, and by his own vagueness on essential points, produces an unfortunately amateurish and unsatisfactory impression. Neither his attacks on Major Sykes nor his

more general fulminations against official maps and geographical societies will go to help his own geographical standing. Independence of attitude and freedom from conventional opinions are excellent things in a traveller, but persistent captiousness and a parading of such different views can only remind of Sir Richard Burton on his weakest side. Yet Burton, however wrongheaded and bullheaded he might seem, could always base his dicta on a sound knowledge of the people he dealt with. Whatever his theories, they rested on carefully observed facts. Mr. Landor leaves a very different impression. For example, we are not told from first to last what his knowledge of Persian, if he had any, was. His travels seem to involve personal intercourse with the people. But indirect references make it plain that the case was not so, that he had need of an interpreter throughout. With that vanishes at once the first-hand value of his book. The labors of the Oriental as interpreter have to be taken, not with a grain, but with bushels of salt.

The residuum, then, which we have here is the record of the journey of an intelligent and observant but very opinionated man from Enzeli on the Caspian by Teheran, Ispahan, Yazd, Kermand, Nafband, Birjand, Nasratabad in Sistan and Nushki to Quetta. All this, of course, is ground of the most beaten, following the Oriental equivalent of a post-route throughout, and we cannot but wonder that it should have had attractions for a traveller of exploring instincts like Mr. Landor. The solution probably lies in the political prominence of Persia at present. This book is Mr. Landor's contribution to the Persian conundrum now before the English mind, Is Germany my friend, or Russia? His solution is emphatically pro-Russian: the keynote is struck at the very first in an encomium of Russian railway methods, and especially of the through train from Warsaw to Baku. Thereafter follows a very readable and lively account of observations and ideas on the route outlined above, giving special attention to manufactures and trade, actual and possible. All is evidently in thorough good faith, and probably Mr. Landor's studies in consular reports and the like are factually correct, but the general result does not inspire confidence either in his narratives or in his conclusions.

Very different is the impression produced by the Marquis de Segonzac's record of travel. The country through which he went has its questions, too, perhaps more presently burning than that even of Persia. Within, it is full of civil strife, more or less latent; and without, it is watched by jealous and longing eyes. Yet up and down through it, in three great journeys, went this officer of Spahis, in disguise, with native companions speaking the language, though, as he confesses, having no knowledge of literary Arabic, everywhere observing, mapping, photographing, collecting. How he, a wandering beggar for the most part, managed to escape observation and suspicion, to take these careful photographs—not so beautiful, it is true, as those of Mr. Landor, but much more to the point—to watch his chronometers and his compass, his barometer and hypsometer, to keep mapping his route, to fix so many points by careful astronomical observation,—that all must remain a mystery. For M. de Segonzac does not talk much about him-

self. He gives the barest diary of his movements from day to day, of weather and events—a narrative dry enough, but enlivened from time to time by touches of detail which show the trained observation of a man knowing the people among whom he was. Yet there are passages, too, in which the artist rises above the topographer, and the atmospheric mystery of a landscape is rendered in delicate French. And to it all, as he says himself, the conclusion is lacking. He will not touch "la question marocaine." He recognizes that it lies outside of the frame of his book. One protest only he will make. Exploring simply from lust of wandering or of extending science would be a poor pastime. "Avant tout il [l'explorateur] aspire à servir son pays, et, dans ses rêves de nomade, il voit l'ombre de son drapeau s'étendre partout où il est passé." That is frank at least. His prefacer, M. Eug. Étienne, Vice-President of the Chambre des Députés, is much more detailed on Algeria's need of Morocco. But they must, he holds, come into one another's arms through natural evolution, fostered by the spread of French influence.

Three great journeys are recorded here. One led our author, as a beggar, living by alms, from mosque to mosque, through the mountains of the Rif, untouched by explorers, the only unmapped part of the littoral of the Mediterranean, from Fez to Melilla and back to Wazzan. The second journey was made under very different conditions, in the company and under the escort of a venerated Sharif (name naturally suppressed), who was willing to give the shelter of his sanctity to this disguised French explorer. Throughout, he it remembered, it is evident that the French are on remarkably close terms with these Sharifs of Wazzan—rivals to the present Sultan, and of an older line—who are at present making trouble in Morocco. On this journey the "Moyen-Atlas"—a term unknown to our maps, but found on German ones—was three times traversed, new ground throughout except for a single crossing by Caillié in 1824-28 and Rohlf's in 1862. Finally, with a single companion, M. de Segonzac made a pious pilgrimage as merchant in a small way through the holy land of Sus, journeying from Dar al-Baida as far south as Tisnit and back to Mogador. Thus three parts of Morocco, two, absolutely unknown before and one only touched, have been here unveiled with tolerable completeness. And all is stated with scientific brevity and certitude.

The appendices take up 114 pages, and are careful investigations and descriptions, by specialists called in to the task, of the results of these journeys. A greater contrast, negatively and positively, than this book presents to Mr. Landor's could hardly be imagined.

The Loyalists in the American Revolution.

By Claude Halstead Van Tyne, Senior Fellow in the University of Pennsylvania. The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. 1-ix., 1-360.

In considering a work based upon the sources, it is important to know what sources have been used. Mr. Van Tyne, nevertheless, gives no bibliography, because, as he says, the bibliography in Flick and in Winsor make it unnecessary to do so. We would suggest that in a work of this kind a bibliography, of the sources at

least, is indispensable. In the present case it does not appear that the author has made much use of the sources mentioned by Flick, except at second hand, having cited only once (p. 260) the valuable Transcript of the Manuscript Books and Papers of the Committee of Enquiry, etc. From the foot-notes we gather that the sources principally used are the colonial laws and records, the American Archives, Stevens's Facsimiles, Rivington's Gazetteer, and the letters of Murray and of Curwen. Aside from the colonial laws, which have been carefully analyzed (Appendix B, Appendix C), it does not appear that the author's acquaintance with the sources of his subject is exhaustive or intimate. Citations are not made uniformly, and Rivington's Gazetteer has been cited throughout as "Rivington's Gazette."

The work itself is concerned broadly with two problems, quite different in their nature—the formation of the Loyalist party, and the fortunes of the party after it was once formed. The first five chapters, with the possible exception of chapter iii., have to do with the former, the last eight have to do with the latter. Obviously it is more difficult to trace the origin of a party than it is to relate the fortunes of the party after it is once formed. Mr. Van Tyne has, at any rate, apparently found it so, for he has succeeded in giving us a useful and fairly satisfactory summary of the organization of the Loyalists, of what they did, of how they were treated, and of what became of them; but he has failed to give us a useful or satisfactory account of the transformation of the old colonial parties into the Loyalist and Revolutionary parties. Indeed, from the author's point of view, this transformation was necessary only in respect to the patriot party. "Loyalty was the normal condition, the state that *had* existed, and *did* exist, and it was the Whigs . . . who must do the converting," etc. (p. 2). Consequently the author's task is limited for the most part to an enumeration of the classes which remained loyal.

This, it strikes us, is to miss the core of the whole matter. It is, of course, true that loyalty was the normal condition, but loyalty as a general condition, and loyalty as a specific party policy, are quite different things. In the only sense in which the terms have any significance, there were neither Loyalists nor Revolutionists in 1765; in 1776 there were both. Between these dates the progress of events in England and America was steadily in the direction of defining the issue more and more precisely in terms of revolution vs. loyalty; the problem of the historian is to show how the different factions and parties were gradually disintegrated, and forced to accept the one alternative or the other. The central fact was the existence, as late as 1774, of a large conservative party which favored neither absolute revolution nor submissive loyalty. This party was composed of two elements: those who preferred to resort to forcible resistance rather than to accept absolute submission, and those who preferred absolute submission to forcible resistance. In 1774 and 1775 the conservative party split in two on these lines: those who were facing toward revolution became revolutionists, those who were facing toward loyalty became loyalists. Both elements acted from essentially the same motive—the necessity of supporting the

lesser against the greater evil. This central fact Mr. Van Tyne has apparently missed.

The number of errors of detail suggests a hasty gathering and sifting of material. The proposal which led the Boston leaders to await the action of a Continental Congress (p. 34) was not made by the Sons of Liberty in New York, but by the Committee of Fifty-one. "New York Convention" (p. 64) should be "New York Congress"; "Provincial Congress" (p. 88) should be "Provincial Convention"; while "Provincial Convention" (p. 161) should be "Provincial Congress." It is misleading to say that, in spite of majorities on Long Island "against the measure" (of the Provincial Convention in New York, 1775), delegates were sent by "small bodies of patriots who relied on outside support" (p. 89). This was true only in the case of two towns in Queens County, Jamaica and Oyster Bay, and the delegates from Queens County were refused a vote by the Convention. Four counties, instead of three (p. 116), authorized the New York city delegates to act for them in the first Continental Congress; and this authorization was hardly "careless" (see 4 American Archives, i., 1188). It is hardly correct to say that the Provincial Convention in New York assumed legislative powers (p. 119). Aside from a formal approval of the first Continental Congress, its sole work was the election of delegates to the second Continental Congress.

On the whole, Mr. Van Tyne's book, especially the last part of it, will serve a useful purpose, but we feel that the subject is one which might well justify more careful work and profounder thought than has as yet been given to it. The style is somewhat above the level of "dissertation English." The index is good.

Personal Idealism: Philosophical Essays by Eight Members of the University of Oxford. Edited by Henry Cecil Sturt. Macmillan. 1902. 8vo; pp. 393.

The writer of the opening essay of this volume is one of Oxford's importations of four or five years ago, George Frederick Stout, of St. John's, Cambridge, called to Oxford when his eminence in psychology had become unquestionable. He here undertakes to resolve some of the sophisms of Ward and Bradley, mingling logic and psychology in the manner peculiar to him, until the reader doubts whether Mr. Stout could answer correctly which of these subjects it is that he is dealing with. The second essay is by Ferdinand C. S. Schiller, author of "The Riddles of the Sphinx," and it is the liveliest, and, as one would say, the most brilliant, in the book. William Ralph Boyce Gibson discusses the problem of freedom in its relation to psychology. Without astonishing originality or clearness of thought, he presents considerations substantially sound, and so commonly overlooked as to be well worth urging. There is, he says, besides the study of the modern psychologists, another science dealing with Mind as conscious of final causation. This naturally suggests a swarm of questions, some of which Mr. Gibson passes without notice, while some he answers or half-answers. George Edward Underhill's paper on "The Limits of Evolution," which argues that the evolutionist cannot deal with origins and unavoidably assumes the existence

of laws not subject to development, may be reckoned as padding. Robert Ranulph Marett treats of "Origin and Validity in Ethics," preaching the clear truth that Validity is the primary principle in this field.

One would expect that students who are moved by the conviction that enough has not been made of personality in philosophy, would anchor their bark on the rock of ethics. Yet of these eight essays, two only are ethical, since Mr. Gibson, though he treats of the problem of freedom, does so in the sole interest of psychology. The succulent paper of the editor, on "Art and Personality," sandwiched for no obvious reason between two dry slices of ethics; will prove, we think, the most useful to philosophy of the whole eight. We shall not insist that the writer shows signal skill in hitting his nail squarely on the head, but he manages, after a fashion, to get a sufficient part of it driven home. At any rate, he certainly brings together a considerable number of items of thought bearing upon the question of aesthetics which it will be highly convenient to have thus collected. We hope to hear more from this new philosopher, Messrs. Boyce Gibson, Marett, and Sturt belong to a class of thinkers whose work we shall value more and more as the day of heroes in philosophy fades away *al ponente*. Dr. Frederick William Bussell considers "The Future of Ethics: Effort or Abstention?" Finally, Rev. Hastings Rashdall, best known for his book on the mediæval universities, attempts to analyze personality, and gives in his adhesion to the limitation of God, as against the absolutism of Bradley and other metaphysicians in vogue.

The tendency vaguely described on the title-page is probably destined to play a prominent rôle in the thought of the twentieth century; but even those who believe that some such view will ultimately be found to approve itself after the oscillations of opinion shall have subsided, can hardly expect this publication to shake opinion as it must some time be shaken if metaphysicians are ever to come to any agreement. Mr. Schiller thinks they never will do so; and, furthermore, that they never ought to. Philosophy, he thinks, ought to be regarded as a matter of personal fancy. "The whole history of philosophy shows that the fit of a man's philosophy is and ought to be as individual as the fit of his clothes, and forms a crushing commentary on the intolerant craving for uniformity. . . . For this reason any philosophy is better than none." That is, one must not go metaphysically naked, like Truth in her well, but whatever opinion one takes a fancy to, will answer every essential purpose. Lutoslawski's master, of unpronounceable name, can hardly more magnify the element of human wilfulness. Nevertheless, the assortment and confrontation of opinions, if carefully studied, may have a fine effect. There is eventually to be a "harmony" of metaphysical systems, though no "uniformity," differences of philosophical belief being "too deeply rooted in human idiosyncrasy to be eradicated." Mr. Schiller does not believe there are any hard facts which remain true independently of what we may think about them. He admits it requires a hard struggle to make *all* facts suit our fancy, but he holds that facts change with every phase of experience, and that there are none which have been "all