

matter. Bulgaria, by clever manipulation of foreign opinion, has succeeded in creating the impression that her rights in Macedonia are sounder than they really are. Mr. Upward draws up a brief for Greece. Since he states his position frankly at the outset, there is no fault to be picked with the tone of the book. He shows an intimate acquaintance with the details of a badly-tangled problem, makes lavish use of documentary evidence, and altogether shows himself one of the best equipped writers on the subject.

In calling the book belated, we had in mind the fact that for the present the Macedonian problem has become merged into the new situation in Turkey. The civil war in Macedonia has ceased. The disappearance of the Ottoman rule seems no longer imminent. Neither Bulgaria nor Greece has, of course, given up its ambitions with regard to Macedonia, but when the conflict revives, if it does revive, it will bear a different character. Nevertheless, Mr. Upward's account of racial and economic conditions in the disputed region should be of value for a long time to come.

The Effects of War on Property. By Almá Latifi. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$1.50 net.

This is a collection of studies on the effect of a state of war upon property in its various forms. After considering the property of enemies and neutrals on land, the effect of conquest upon property, the property of enemies and neutrals at sea, and exceptions to the rule of capture at sea; the author comes to what, we suspect, is the topic of chief interest to an Englishman at this time—the inviolability claimed for private property from capture at sea. He treats briefly the history of this doctrine from the time of Mably and Vattel, and then shows that in the practice of nations the doctrine is not yet accepted. The abstract arguments in favor of the innovation he examines and finds wanting, while those against it he pronounces conclusive. The entire question, he concludes, is "one of political expediency, to be decided by each state after a consideration of its own especial circumstances." After reviewing the circumstances of England, he contends that that country, if it accepted the innovation, "would be a distinct loser as compared with the Continental nations that are so eager for a change of the law."

Mr. Latifi is good enough not to doubt the "humanitarian motives" of many advocates of the inviolability of private property at sea, but remarks that the policy of nations is based upon self-interest, not upon "abstract principles preached by professors or embodied in resolutions of peace congresses." From this and other expressions we conclude

that the volume was intended as a courteous British greeting to the International Naval Conference in London. Professor Westlake cordially seconds the greeting by contributing an appended note in which he thoroughly demolishes the "topsy-turvy" notions of the expected guests.

Science.

Little Busybodies: The Life of Crickets, Ants, Bees, Beetles, Etc. By Jeannette Marks and Julia Moody. New York: Harper & Bros. 75 cents.

The first thought of a reviewer on taking up a book of science for young people is likely to be that it requires brief consideration. However accurately this may express a common opinion, it certainly falls short of conveying a truth. For no book can be more important than one that has to do with the formation of young minds; and that books of science adapted to the young have done much to determine the career of some men who now occupy leading positions among teachers of science, the writer hereof knows. Moreover, there is no class of books whose composition requires greater skill than such as this study of "Busybodies." The authors are teachers in Mt. Holyoke College, and their profession has plainly given them a happy control of the art of lucid expression. Under the admirable direction of an experienced guide, who is also a well-informed naturalist and practical entomologist, a small miscellaneous group of children, during a summer vacation in the mountains, is brought into close relations with some of the common and most interesting insects. The old guide succeeds in telling what he knows in a way that both interests and informs. The incidents of camp-life and the play of various characters help to keep the interest from flagging. The whole assemblage of incidents and facts is well managed and falls naturally into the authors' purpose. The technical knowledge conveyed is accurately as well as pleasingly given.

There is really nothing to criticise seriously, only here and there a questionable slip. It is hardly allowable today to class spiders with their "sparkling fairy webs spun anew for us every morning," among insects; although it would have passed muster less than a century ago. Nor is it quite correct to speak of "ants carrying grains of sand as far from their doorways as possible." It is a traditional belief that the curious little neuropterous grubs, known as Myrmeleon, or ant lions, "throw up sand over their heads in order to hit a helpless little ant and knock it down into the pit." But one who has carefully observed the grub will hardly give it credit for a purposeful bombardment

of that sort. The sand is, indeed, thrown up to make a runway down which an ant may slide into its jaws; but when it occasionally hits its prey, this seems to happen purely by accident, and the hitting appears to have no effect in the way of "knocking it down." But such slight lapses from the strict facts are rare; and the book is to be commended as generally trustworthy.

The illustrations are for the most part rather crude, though generally sufficient for the purpose. However, it ought to be remarked that such a picture as that of the ant lion's pit opposite page 78 is scarcely reputable drawing.

Dr. C. W. Saleeby has apparently abandoned the pill and scalpel for a pen whose ink flows freely and a blue pencil which he uses wisely in editing an admirable series of treatises on medical topics of value to the general reader. His own publications are becoming numerous. The last, entitled "Health, Strength, and Happiness" (Mitchell Kennerley), is alleged by a subtitle to be a book of practical advice, and is declared to teach a new asceticism concerning the care of the body, with a just regard to the importance of the mind. The book concerns itself chiefly with grown-ups, children being a fascinating subject to be taken up at another time. For a similar reason, the book is almost sexless, since certain momentous questions relating to women are reserved for consideration in a separate volume. Much attention is paid to the middle-aged man who is just going down hill when he need not, and who ought to be ashamed of his decline. Fresh air, much light, loose and washable clothing, sensible shoes, much and easy sleep, are the more important agencies to help him and others. Work, free from excitement, is not harmful, and particularly not a cause of sleeplessness; insomnia being often merely a result of indigestion. As to exercise, Saleeby is a skeptic, holding muscular development to be of little importance, and the best exercise that which we enjoy, and having little respect for gymnasiums and none for bedroom apparatus for this purpose. All these and many kindred matters are discussed pleasantly and almost too diffusely, so much so that the reader, while sure of entertainment, is often uncertain just what the author really believes and advises, and why. As a whole, the book is suggestive and likely to help many to whom a more exact treatise would be unwelcome.

The publication of the complete works of Alessandro Volta is now assured by the action of the Italian government in contributing \$3,000 towards the necessary expenses. A committee appointed jointly by the Reale Istituto Lombardo delle Scienze and the Reale Accademia dei Lincei will have charge of this edition, which, it is expected, will consist of five volumes, and be finished within two years.

Houghton Mifflin Company will publish this autumn "Preventable Diseases," by Dr. Woods Hutchinson; "The Elements of Military Hygiene," by Percy M. Ashburn, and "Astronomy from a Dipper," by Elliot C. Clarke.

Eugen von Gothard, the Hungarian astronomer, has died at the age of fifty-two.

He made a number of astro-physical and astro-photographic studies in an observatory at the family seat at Herény.

Drama.

THE REPERTORY THEATRE IN ENGLAND.

The announcement, some weeks back, that two repertory theatres are shortly to be started in London, one to be directed by Herbert Trench with an influential backing, the other under the management of Mr. Frohman with the coöperation of the following authors: George Bernard Shaw, Granville Barker, J. M. Barrie, and John Galsworthy, marks the turning point in the fortunes of the movement that has been actively propagated for the last twenty years. It is about twenty years ago that the first performances of Ibsen's plays were given in London, a period when William Archer, our leading dramatic critic, was, almost single-handed, championing the work of that great European dramatist against the virulent abuse and active prejudice of most of the prominent organs of the London press. The audiences were enthusiastic, but small, and from that day to this the rare Ibsen performances we have had have only brought to the theatre doors the relatively small public of highly cultivated, artistic, and progressive people who are capable of thinking for themselves. Had William Archer's name been prefixed by Mr. Frohman to the list of his four "coöperators," we should, indeed, see the main links in the historical chain of the repertory theatre movement. For Mr. Archer's teaching begat Granville Barker's practice, and without Bernard Shaw's sustained attacks, both in his criticisms and his plays, on the conventional ideals, the sentimental falsities, and worm-eaten traditions of the British drama, we should have had no Court Theatre, and without the Court Theatre John Galsworthy's modern plays, "The Silver Box," "Joy," and "Strife," would scarcely have been staged. J. M. Barrie is the only man of the five who, while taking a line parallel with the course steered by the others, has remained independent; but that Mr. Frohman's repertory theatre would not come into being without Mr. Barrie's own inspiring example and striking dramatic successes—for this we have Mr. Frohman's own declaration in the *London Times*.

The repertory theatre movement is, in theory, and let us hope it will prove in practice also, a reversal of the commercial policy that has strangled our British drama for several generations. Long ago a French critic remarked that the drama declined from the day that

large theatres came into being, and the mediocrity of the Victorian drama certainly coincided with the system of large theatres, high rents, and long runs. The triumph of the popular commercial drama was a by-product of the economic developments that witnessed the destruction of scores of beautiful, old-world handicrafts by the competitions of the new, cheap manufacturing processes. The system, in drama, acted automatically to exclude all work of fine original quality that was not, and could not be, a "popular success." William Archer in 1896 wrote:

Suppose that a playwright of genius comparable to Mr. Meredith were to appear among us to-morrow, what would be his fate? After weary years spent in bandying to and fro a brown paper parcel shuttlecock, and in playing battledore with the actor-managers, he might possibly get one of his plays produced. It would attract very little attention; a few critics would praise it warmly and be laughed at for their pains; . . . It would be withdrawn, and the dramatic Meredith would be not only depressed, but annihilated by his failure. . . . The managers would steadfastly refuse his other works. . . . In short, his talent would be absolutely and hopelessly gagged. . . . In either case the sum-total would be a genius wasted for want of a very simple mechanism to enable him to seek his public and his public to find him. . . . This is precisely the situation of the British dramatist. . . . On the other hand there exists beyond all question a public within the public. . . . The Repertory Theatre, which must at first to some extent be an endowed theatre, is required to afford a meeting-place for the artist-playwright and the art-loving (as opposed to the mere show-loving) public.

That Mr. Archer did not overstate his case may be proved by a simple comparison. All literary critics are agreed that the Elizabethan drama was representative of Elizabethan culture, but nobody can pretend that the Victorian drama was ever representative of Victorian culture. Compare the list of our great Victorian novelists and poets with that of the contemporary dramatists. We find the dead "poetic drama" of Talfourd and his school, two or three clever, garish plays by Lord Lytton, a few pseudo-realistic "dramas with a purpose" by Charles Reade, plays of the "teacup and saucer" school of Robertson, the plays of Mr. Pinero and Henry Arthur Jones. These are the flowers of the Victorian drama blossoming amid the interminable thicket of deadwood, the sensational, sentimental, meretricious vulgarities false to life and false to art, that have filled the play-bills of the last sixty years. Clever actors, of course, can do wonders with topical plays, with plays of the "cape and sword" school, with comedies that exaggerate the humors of life, with plays that parody fashionable life. I do not wish here to cast any reflections on the great uncritical body of playgoers for

whose tastes our British actor-managers, with scarcely any exceptions, have catered, for the last two generations: I only point out that the average drama of the commercial theatre, in point of view of art, of intellect, and of permanent human interest, has been far below the corresponding standards of the average marketable novel. Even the Shakespearean drama has been falsified and cheapened by an actor-manager placing the emphasis on its spectacular instead of its great human appeal, and this through the agency of "large theatres, high rents, and long runs." I except, of course, the revivals by a few great actors, such as Macready and Henry Irving, and the special work done by the Benson Company. How fatal the actor-manager system has been to the English stage is, moreover, shown by the extraordinarily meagre list of representations of classic and Shakespearean drama. Very few of Shakespeare's plays are ever performed in London. The best performance I have seen in twenty years of "Twelfth Night," barring Henry Irving's, was given by the children of two clever families in a Surrey village. The great tragedies of "Othello," "Macbeth," "King Lear" have not been adequately acted within the memory of our generation. The chief Elizabethan dramatists—Shakespeare excepted—have never been "revived" in the commercial theatre. Congreve is acted not once in five years. And so on, and so on.

The admissions made in the rival manifestoes of the two projected repertory theatres are indeed an indictment of the commercial drama: (1.) *The Young Dramatists*: "A Repertory Theatre," says Mr. Frohman, "should be the first home of the young dramatist. I beg of him to be done with the theatrical, and write only of a life that he really knows." "It is hoped," says Mr. Trench, "that the new management will be able to give the most generous opportunities to young English dramatists." (2.) *The Drama as an Art*: "Under our new system," says Mr. Trench, "it will be possible to produce masterpieces by dramatists of the first rank which would never see the light in a long run." (3.) *The Bill of Fare*: "I want to interest the good play-goer, not once or twice a year, in what is being done at my theatres, but once or twice a month," Mr. Frohman states; and Mr. Trench informs us that "the 'play of ideas' will be varied also by selections from the best revived modern plays, and by classical plays, such as those of Shakespeare, and comedies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries." (4.) *The Public*: "In my opinion," says Mr. Frohman, "there are now in this country a number of people sufficiently large to be called the public, who wish to delight in the drama as an art." That is the all-important question. It is obvious