

historian. Rarely does his gaze reach beyond the barrier of mountains which locks in the Aztec City; and if it does, the result is apt to be unhappy. For instance, we learn that one of the two important acts of Viceroy Marquina was the suppression of the Nolan expedition into Texas!

The history of Mexico in the nineteenth century is comparatively difficult. Mr. Noll's elucidation of it reflects perfectly the situation. Chapter after chapter is but a confused chronicle of revolutions. As for inaccuracies, a few instances must suffice. We learn (p. 121, 'Short History') that Texas was colonized by Viceroy de la Laguna, who "laid down the reins of government" in 1686; but Mission San Francisco de los Tejas, the first Spanish establishment in that quarter, was not made until 1690. The story of the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution (*ibid.*, p. 149), is utterly fictitious. It reports that either Aldama or Allende alarmed Hidalgo, with the result that he gave the *grito*. As a matter of fact, it was the wife of the *corregidor* of Querétaro who informed the Cura de Dolores of the Government's knowledge of his conspiracy. Astonishing, too, it is to find (*ibid.*, p. 156) that the four great leaders—Allende, Aldama, Jimenez, and Hidalgo—were shot on the same day, July 30, 1811. In his later book, 'From Empire to Republic' (p. 49), Mr. Noll reverses his own judgment, writing that the first three were shot in June and Hidalgo in July. This is all the more inexcusable since we are assured that the 'Short History' has been thoroughly revised. It is likewise with a shock that one discovers (p. 202, 'Short History') that Texas had 10,000 American settlers prior to the granting of Austin's *empresario*!

In spite of the formal bibliography (in 'From Empire to Republic'), it is perfectly clear that the author clung to his guide-books. If he had taken the pains to go through the mass of materials collected by H. H. Bancroft; to sift 'Mexico atraves de los Siglos'; to study Bustamante and Alman for the great Revolution; and to soil his hands with the dusty folios in the Biblioteca Nacional and in the Archivo General, we might have had a different story.

*Recollections of a Royal Academician.* By J. C. Horsley. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

The late J. C. Horsley, R.A., has rather slender titles to immortality in a malicious quip contained in Whistler's 'Gentle Art' and in certain dingy frescoes adorning the houses of Parliament. Possibly he better deserves to be remembered for certain excellent anecdotes imbedded in his posthumous 'Recollections of a Royal Academician.' These happy reminiscences were mostly taken down from dictation when Mr. Horsley was in his eighty-seventh year, and were set in order by a sympathetic hand.

At thirteen John Horsley was an art student, at fifteen a probationer and prize winner at the Academy schools. At sixteen one out of two portraits by him was rejected by the hanging committee of the Academy, a chagrin which in his seventy remaining years never befell him again. There was too little struggle in his upbringing. All along, the public thought too well of his anecdotal pictures. He painted the Queen's baby, the Princess Beatrice;

and her Majesty came familiarly to the studio and compared babies with Mrs. Horsley. Her Majesty delighted in the story of Wilkie that,

"after making a sketch for composition with many figures in it, he would count the number and then the number of hands displayed; and if these did not amount to nearly a pair apiece, he would alter the sketch, feeling strongly that to omit a hand was deliberately to lose a vital point of expression."

Æsthetically speaking, all of Mr. Wilkie, of Mr. Horsley, of the Queen, and of Victorian art is suggested in the anecdote.

Indeed, Mr. Horsley was a peculiarly British compound of sociability, efficiency, culture, and provincial limitations. He met the best of his time, but remained a delightful Philistine to the end. It is perhaps this complete innocence of critical attitude that gives his recollections in old age great freshness and charm. To wield a deputy's billy in the Chartist riots, to have been a frequenter at Huxley's, though never feeling "quite at ease in discussion with him," to have ransacked England for twenty-seven years for the memorable winter exhibitions of old masters at Burlington House—all this bespeaks a very serviceable and beautiful nature.

One can forgive him a rather ridiculous crusade against painting from the nude, for his excellent anecdotes. For example, Horsley was at a Lord Mayor's dinner when his neighbor, Lord O'Hagan, was suddenly called upon:

"Up flamed the impetuous Irishman, no doubt remembering how strongly he had spoken to me about being requisitioned for impromptu speaking. He turned upon the toastmaster, and said: 'You, sir, go back to the Lord Mayor, and tell him from me that he is not justified in asking me or any of his guests to address such an assemblage as this without giving ample time for preparation.' Harker was equal to the occasion, and without a moment's hesitation replied: 'Prurperation, my lord; why, if we were to give the gentlemen the time for prurperation, they would speak all the evening!'"

Great men are seen in these pages only in passing: Felix Mendelssohn a familiar guest at Mr. Horsley's father's house; Verne clambering up to the Institut de France in his cavalry uniform; Leighton similarly caparisoned for the Crimean war—at the lunch bar of the Athenæum Club; the Duke of Wellington's astonishment that, though his "double," a certain Mr. George Jones, was frequently taken for the Victor of Waterloo; he was never taken for Mr. Jones. But we must close a cursory notice of this agreeable book with the following amusing anecdote of the painter Cornelius. The scene is a Munich garden where, after a carefully planned luncheon, a young artist is exhibiting a great paper cartoon. Naturally, the guests, refreshed by much Hochheimer, and seated in the amphitheatre of chairs before the great design, await the master's verdict.

"Of course, every one waited for the great man to open his mouth. The sun was blazing on the picture, and Cornelius rose, open umbrella in hand, and pipe in mouth, in absolute silence, staring at an artistic performance *too bad for words*. The tension was becoming painful; the artist was jumping about explaining the points of the design, the perspiration rolling down his face, what with the heat of the sun and the excitement of the moment, heightened by the melancholy fact that not a solitary word of praise or satisfaction came from the invited guests.

But every eye was upon Cornelius, then recognized as the leader of the art movement in Germany, who at last lowered his umbrella with the utmost deliberation, rolled it up, buttoned it, brought it down to his hip as if it were a musket, and, with a *pas de charge*, made for the cartoon, through which he burst and disappeared, and was seen no more that day. One after another the assembled guests rose, charged, and disappeared. The artist was left alone, or almost alone. He gazed at the awful hole, with its jagged and fluttering edges, through which his friends had vanished. He advanced, took his hat off, bowed to a few lingerers, pulled his hat over his brows, and himself went through the hole, amid the uproarious applause of all who remained near enough to the scene of action; thus, with infinite humor and good temper, putting the seal of his approval on the severe judgment of his artist friends."

*La Corée Indépendante, Russe, ou Japonaise.*

By Villetard de Laguerie. Paris: Hachette & Cie. 1904.

We are not surprised to note that this author's brisk monograph, with its fifty rather cheap woodcuts, is in its second edition, for although he lived in Korea but a few weeks, he saw beneath the surface of things. In tone and value, the text is far ahead of the average book produced by the fitting swallows of literature. The point of view is, indeed, not that of the present year, although the publishers' date on the title-page is 1904. The author was special correspondent of the *Temps* during and after the Chino-Japanese war of 1894, and his latest comment is on the murder of Queen Min, concerning which event he is very full and illuminating. Considering Korea as "one of the last virgin lands of the globe," he was interested in visiting the country, not merely to study it as a buffer state that for ages had stood between Japan and China, receiving the blows of each, but which was to be the silent partner in the still greater struggle between Japan and Russia—though this he did not foresee.

His very readable work is overloaded with allusions, and abounds in bright and amusing phrases not withheld from some of the heavier pages, which deal with statistics and comparisons. One cannot help regretting that he had not made himself familiar with Dallet's masterwork on Korea, which sets forth the real life and true currents of thought in the tiny empire. He contents himself, on the contrary, with a view of things as obtained in Seoul. He is most interesting when he is talking about what he has actually seen in the country and among the people—for example, when he goes into the schools, which first nourish the youthful mind and then make it obese and dropical with traditional Confucianism, so that at fifteen the average Korean is immensely "learned," frightfully ignorant, and hopelessly arrested in mental growth. One gets the idea of a whole nation suffering paresis. Yet the Korean mind, taken in youth, shows surprising responsiveness to science and reality.

Of the five parts of this lively monograph, one is devoted to what the author calls "the conquest of Korea by Japan" but although the chapter, "Japan Renders the War Inevitable," sounds rather thunderous, the proof that China herself did not begin the war by her violations of treaty is rather a whisper. After the Port Arthur and the Wei-hai-wei campaign of March, 1895, the author arrived at Chemulpo and began his

studies of the Land of Morning Radiance. He details the political doings of the Japanese in Korea, and gives a rather hasty view of the country before the Japanese occupation, flavored with sarcastic remarks about the high-salaried Americans in Government employ. He then shows how Count Inouye tried to reconstruct the corrupt Government, and how the envoy Miura upset, by his rude military ways, the delicate and wise work of his predecessor, "the white lily of Japanese statesmanship." The author treats fully and in the main judiciously those tumults in the Korean capital which led to the murder of the pro-Russian Queen Min, to whose abilities he pays a deservedly high tribute. He describes also the flight of the king and his refuge for a year in the Russian legation. His final chapter, in which he shows himself less felicitous as a prophet than as a narrator, concerns itself with the question of the Far East. Very evidently, he does not know or understand the Japanese, and seems to share the notion that they are compacted of only Oriental stuff, and are destined to go the way of the other Asiatic nations in being subordinated to, or made subjects for conquest by, Russia or France or both in alliance. He thinks Korea is "a Morocco or Egypt of the Mediterranean of the Pacific," whose fate is at the dictation of Europeans only. Like most Continentals who have speculated on the future of the Far East, he seems unable to take Japan seriously. Hence he imagines (1895) that the whole question lay with "the Powers," and not between the little island empire and great Russia. Indeed, in vision, he thought he foresaw "in the streets of Seoul what will be the end of the megalomaniac dream (*rêve mégalomane*) of the subjects of the Mikado."

*The Citizen: A Study of the Individual and the Government.* By Nathaniel Southgate Shaler. A. S. Barnes & Co.

To explain to young people the relations in which they stand to their rulers is a laudable undertaking, and we have nothing but praise for the spirit in which Professor Shaler carries it on, or for most of the counsels which he offers. The task, however, is harder than it looks. As Bagehot said, the invisible and unrecognized parts of government are the most important. They are like the steam which moves the engine; the machinery is conspicuous enough, and even the steam when it escapes after it has done its work. But the real work is done in secret, and its nature is not revealed to superficial observation. For these reasons many books on government are almost useless. They explain the statics of it, rather than the dynamics, and, after one has mastered all they have to tell, he may find himself, like Faust, little wiser than before.

It is possible that Professor Shaler has underestimated these difficulties. There are signs of easy, not to say careless, writing now and then. He quotes, as from the Declaration of Independence, the statement, "all men are born free and of equal rights"; and, having added an ambiguous word, he remarks that it is not clear what it means. He then asserts that the effect of the Declaration has been more marked among other peoples than our own. "Here it merely embodied in apt phrases what had long been

firmly set in the minds of the people, . . . to the French, the American Bill of Rights came as a revelation of political gospel." Probably this statement would have struck Jefferson and Mirabeau with equal astonishment. Nor is it less surprising to be assured that the civil war did not alter the Constitution except in the extinction of slavery and of the doctrine of nullification. The doctrine of the Legal Tender decisions was revolutionary, and we have only begun to see its consequences.

On the fundamental question of party allegiance, also, the author expresses views which will arouse dissent. He thinks that our system of party government is based on certain fundamental qualities in human nature. All men are divided into two classes—the believers in centralized national government exercising a paternal control over the people, and the "strict constructionists," or believers in the freedom of the individual and the maintenance of the powers of local governments. Our two parties "are the indispensable agents of a democratic government. Every citizen should foster and respect them." This notion of a natural division of mankind is no doubt a very respectable tradition; but does it correspond with the facts? At the present moment there are probably more men supporting the Republican party who are intelligently opposed to its imperialistic tendencies, who are even free-traders, than are to be found in the Democratic ranks. They do not believe that the leaders of the Democratic party have any positive convictions as to the preservation of the liberties of the people; they know that these leaders are quite ready to adopt dangerous socialistic expedients. Most of them do not care for free trade or dare to advocate it if they care. They consent to our infamous pension laws; they do not protest against the awful burdens which militarism is laying on the poor; they encourage the labor unions in their despotic tendencies. Yet Professor Shaler maintains that our Congressmen are "naturally desirous of doing faithful service—except when self-interest prompts them overmuch, or when they have become mere servants of a party." Truly this is a large exception, as recent occurrences in Congress prove. Nevertheless, we are told that "the party whip has ceased to drive men as it did a few years ago," that the independence of the voters has so much increased "that in many States there is little influence left to the would-be 'bosses.'" We should like a list of these many States.

After all, Professor Shaler complacently observes, the state remains safe in the hands of either of the parties, and it does not make much difference which the young citizen joins, provided he acts honestly in making his choice. When he has made it, however, he is not to surrender his right of private judgment. He should refuse to vote for bad candidates; and in that way, if enough others agree with him, he may teach his leaders not to misbehave. Unfortunately, to refuse to vote for a bad Republican candidate may only bring about the election of a worse Democrat, and the leaders of both parties understand the situation perfectly well. They do not fret themselves because of good men who labor for "reform within the party." What they dread and detest is the genuine "Mugwump," who understands the motives which actuate poli-

ticians; and who does not respect or propose to "foster" either organization. When, if ever, a great body of citizens shall exist, holding itself aloof from the organized parties, and demanding specific measures of legislation and proper measures of administration, the tyranny of the politicians will be broken. Till then, the multiplication of citizens governed by Professor Shaler's doctrines will leave things very much as they are.

Not altogether as they are, however, for he truly says that the man who lives uprightly and tries to benefit his neighbors exerts a salutary influence on politics. The most substantial results are attained by those who make it their task to improve the conditions of their own immediate communities. In a little democracy like a New England town, these men are constantly selected to administer public affairs, and thus acquire real political power. As towns grow in size, this becomes less and less true; but perhaps even in large communities one can manifest his patriotism no more effectively than in devoting himself to such local reforms and improvements as there is reasonable hope of accomplishing. That vaguer, but easier and more captivating, form of patriotism which consists in wishing that our national policy may be directed according to our own standards of righteousness, is also not without effect; and Professor Shaler's counsels on this subject are enlightened and generous. In deploring the craze for military glory and dominion, in insisting on the barbarism of war and the cruelty of conquest, he speaks with impressive earnestness and in the interests of true civilization. Even if we do not altogether accept his historical and political generalizations, we can say that few young men would not feel themselves strengthened and elevated by the spirit of his teaching.

*Studies in Dante.* Third Series: Miscellaneous Essays. By Edward Moore. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: H. Frowde. 1903. Pp. xvi, 388.

An event of real moment in the history of literary investigation is the publication of this third part of Dr. Moore's scholarly 'Studies,' a work which deserves a place beside D'Ovidio's 'Studi' and Flamini's 'Significati reconditi della Divina Commedia' among the foremost contributions to Dante criticism. A considerable portion of the large volume is occupied by a full and accurate exposition of mediæval astronomy and geography; although nothing new is here proposed in the way of interpretation, many difficult passages are made clearer than before, and Dante's conception of the material universe is presented in coherent fashion. More important, though shorter, is the discussion of the assumed date of the vision—an absolutely conclusive argument for the year 1300, and an equally unanswerable refutation of Angelitti and of the other advocates of 1301. The question is treated with perfect fairness in all its bearings, and it is hard to see how anything more can be said on either side.

"The Apocalyptic Vision" and "The Reproaches of Beatrice," while they contain nothing strikingly novel, exhibit the author's usual thoroughness and intelligence, and form an interesting commentary on the closing cantos of the "Purgatorio." A few