

pleading, appear as anything but exhibitions of incapacity, the results of a badly thought-out and worse-executed programme. The picturesque side of these events is well handled, but the enigmas of the situation are left unexplained.

Mr. Cheetham might have paid more attention to the recent Italian literature on the secret societies so active in Italy during the period of reaction. He should have noticed also the unfavorable references to Louis Napoleon in the memoirs of the time, more especially because Thirria, to whom Mr. Cheetham makes constant appeal, compiled his book largely from the contemporary newspapers; and Le Bey, a later writer, also frequently referred to, is notoriously under the influence of the Bonapartist legend. Mr. Cheetham speaks in a vague way of the activity of Louis Napoleon's personal friends, in France, while he was living in England. Their relations with party politics before and during the republic of 1848 deserve careful examination. It is not sufficient to say that Louis Napoleon's sudden rise represented the aspirations of the majority of Frenchmen. Such a statement explains very little, especially when one remembers that the same electors who voted for a Bonaparte, as President, sent to Paris a body of legislators who were anti-democratic and showed no real sympathy with the Napoleonic tradition.

*The Silvæ of Statius.* Translated with introduction and notes by D. A. Slater. New York: Henry Frowde. \$1.

Few moderns since the poet Pope have taken Statius seriously, and his epics which won him fame in the period that most honored him, the Middle Ages, are now accounted the least significant part of his poetry. His "*Silvæ*," related at once to the epigram and the epyllion, are more in keeping with the tendencies of his age, and to them one turns to-day, if one reads Statius at all; barring the panegyrics, which were virtually prescribed, these poems contain much that attracts. Poets who have known the Bay of Naples intimately ought to show in their work a certain companionship. Statius is linked by this delightful bond to Virgil before him, and to Pontano and Sannazaro after. His admiration of Virgil and his echoes of certain Virgilian effects are noticeable enough: he suggests also a pleasant trait of the later poets, their habit of personifying bits of the landscape that they loved, of creating mythology from hill and stream as the Greeks had once created it:

In those caves Anio himself finds rest; yes, he forsakes his source, and when in the secret night he has put off his sea-blue garments, stretches himself upon the springing moss, or into the deep pool plunges his huge bulk, and with rhythmic

stroke claps against the glassy waters. In yonder shade Tiburnus rests; there Albula is fain to wash her sulphurous tresses. A bower like this might lure from Egeria, forest, Phœbe, rob cold Taygetus of his Dryad bands; and charm Pan from the Lycean woods ("*Silvæ*," i, 3.).

Another matter that impresses the reader of the "*Silvæ*" is the poet's interest in works of art. Cicero, and even Virgil and Horace, supreme in literary art, show little feeling for painting and sculpture save where these form a part of some literary tradition; they still have something of the primitive Roman contempt of the connoisseur and dilettante. But by Statius's time, art must have been an important interest in the life of a cultured Roman; a villa stored with beautiful things demanded no apology. The philosopher Pollio, whom Statius celebrates, turns for doctrinal inspiration to Phidias and Myron no less than to Epicurus.

The English reader will not fail to detect these and other attractions of the "*Silvæ*" in the prose version of Mr. Slater, the quality of which may be seen in the above selection. Our author thinks that Pope, and Pope alone, could have translated Statius into verse. Certainly the recent sonnet quoted by Mr. Slater, which attempts to render Statius's most beautiful poem, the invocation to Sleep, is not a striking success. We have noted only a few minor infelicities in Mr. Slater's translation. One who writes *docta carmina* is not a "scholar-poet" (i, 2, 172); the phrase "Lucretius the prophet and his impassioned lore" for *docti furor ardens Lucreti* (ii, 7, 76) comes nearer the meaning. "Duty, greatest of gods," addressed in iii, 3, is not the deity whom the reader of Wordsworth might expect, but filial devotion, *Pietas*. Mr. Slater should have included a translation of the prose prefaces: the brief statement about them in his introduction is not a compensation.

In the introduction sufficient information is given about Statius and his "*Silvæ*." The author does not attempt a penetrating study of the poems, but he does well in showing that some of the severest criticisms of them have come from those who have not read them or have read with extraordinary inattentiveness. Thus Tyrrell's treatment in his "Latin Poetry" is based not on Statius, but upon the brilliant though inaccurate essay of Nisard. A matter of interest to which Mr. Slater devotes considerable discussion is Dante's account of the supposed conversion of Statius to Christianity in consequence of his reading the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil. He argues plausibly against Canon Moore that Dante did not invent the legend for a dramatic purpose, but followed much earlier tradition. He even reminds us that Statius might have met St. Paul at Naples, associating with this possible,

or later-imagined, occurrence, the well-known story of St. Paul's visit to Virgil's tomb at Pozzuoli.

## Science.

### SOME MODERN ASPECTS OF EVOLUTION.

*Fifty Years of Darwinism.* New York: Henry Holt & Co. \$2.

Of the many celebrations called forth in this country by the fiftieth anniversary of Darwin's "Origin of Species," one only has so far been sufficiently ambitious to pass into book form—the addresses delivered before the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Baltimore on the first day of the year. Darwinism stands to-day for evolution as well as for the theory of natural selection, although evolution had long been advocated before Darwin. Darwin convinced the thinking world of the truth of evolution, partly through the large body of facts that he brought forward in support of this view and partly through his special theory of natural selection which attempted to give a reasonable explanation of the evolutionary process. While the doctrine of evolution is now accepted by practically all students of animals and plants, the theory of natural selection, as proposed by Darwin, has not met with the same universal acceptance, although it has received, in one form or another, general recognition as an important factor in evolution. These conclusions are well borne out by the opinions expressed in the present volume.

At the invitation of the Association, Prof. E. B. Poulton, a leading exponent of Darwinism, came to this country to give the first address of the series. The oft-told tale of the reception of Darwin's book, "The Origin of Species," is rehearsed by him with boyish relish. The battle is fought over once more to the everlasting discomfiture of the opponents of evolution and natural selection. And the conflict is at times turned into an attack on those within the ranks who, following after Darwin, have not accepted his special theory of natural selection as an all-sufficient and self-satisfying explanation of how evolution has taken place. Fifty years of Darwinism seems in Poulton's eyes to mean just fifty years of Darwinism, and nothing besides. That our conception of organic evolution has grown vigorously since 1859 does not appear from Professor Poulton's address, although without a single exception the following nine addresses make this point of view sufficiently apparent. The greatness of Darwin's achievement is better shown, we venture to think, by those who have carried forward the work as it was left

by him than by those of his followers who turn deaf ears to what students of evolution have done since his day.

In striking contrast to this somewhat lengthy "retrospect," the second address by Prof. J. M. Coulter on the standpoint of botany offers a vigorous and independent treatment of the indebtedness of that subject to Darwin. After a graceful acknowledgment of the influence of Darwin's work, which extends even beyond his formulation of the origin of species by natural selection, Coulter adds, "whether natural selection stands or falls as an adequate explanation of the origin of species, there can never be any doubt as to the breath of life it infused" into the study of descent. Coulter points out that, while at first botanists were captivated by the explanation of adaptation in plants through natural selection and showed great ingenuity in accounting for such fitness, the old explanations began to lose hold when it was found, for example, that thorns, supposed to have arisen because of protection afforded against grazing animals, prevail chiefly among plants in regions peculiarly free from such animals. The stinging hairs of nettles had been explained as built up by natural selection. It is now known that the nettle gets along very well without stinging hairs. Natural selection, Coulter concludes, eliminates species and individuals; it has nothing to do with selecting individual plants on the basis of some small, better adapted variation.

The influence of the environment in calling forth new types as a result of directly stimulating the germ plasma is urged by Prof. D. T. Macdougall. In support of this view he cites some of the most important recent experiments showing the effects of temperature and moisture, of injections of salt solution, and of radium emanations. The subject of this address is a matter of the greatest interest to students of evolution, since it bears on the most fundamental of all evolutionary questions, the origin of new variations that are "definitely" inherited.

The study of the inheritance of variations in its most modern aspects is dealt with by Prof. W. E. Castle and by Prof. Charles B. Davenport in two brief and interesting chapters. Castle explains exactly in the light of modern research the appearance of ancestral characters (atavism) when races are crossed, or when artificial selection ceases. Races of domesticated animals and plants have been produced by losing some one of the original characters. When two such races from a common source are recombined by crossing, the original conditions are once more fulfilled and the atavistic form reappears. Thus, for example, two races of white peas when crossed give the original purple pea of Sicily. A black and a yellow rabbit produce a gray rabbit—the color of the

wild form from which the yellow and the black domestic races have sprung, each by the loss of a different character.

Definite variations are generally called mutations. Macdougall's account deals with such mutations produced by environment; Castle refers mutations to the loss or acquirement of single characters in De Vries's terminology. Davenport urges that evolution is due primarily to mutations, and not to the summation of fluctuations, and assures the reader that, were Darwin alive to-day, he would cordially accept the same point of view. The mutation theory is not, however, incompatible with the theory of natural selection, for there may be selection among discontinuous variations, as well as among quantitative variations. As though in anticipation of such an interpretation of Darwinism, Poulton points out, in the opening essay, that in 1864 the Duke of Argyle said:

Strictly speaking, therefore, Mr. Darwin's theory is not a theory of the origin of species at all, but only a theory on the causes which lead to the relative success or failure of such new forms as may be born into the world.

To which Darwin replied:

I demur . . . to the Duke's expression of "new births." That may be a very good theory, but it is not mine.

Truly, the work of the reconciler is made hard.

Under the title of Adaptation, Prof. C. H. Eigenmann deals with the central problem of evolution. He brings to bear on this question his exceptional knowledge of cave faunas and the great adaptive changes that take place within certain families of fishes. Species become adapted by migration into congenial locations. Migration obviously is the important agent in evolution, not isolation, as Jordan maintains, provided the central problem of evolution is origin of adaptation rather than the "origin of species."

Isolation is urged by President Jordan as a primary factor in evolution. The importance of this factor has often been advanced before by those systematists to whom evolution means chiefly the formation of geographical races and species. But it is not evident that natural selection can have much concern with the formation of species, since specific differences have nothing whatsoever to do with useful characters. That the process of evolution (aside from the arbitrary definition of species) is concerned with fundamental adaptations rather than with superficial differences is self-evident. Granting that animals change with their environment and that isolation prevents intermingling and the production of intermediates, it does not seem to follow that isolation need have anything whatsoever to do with evolution of adaptive

characters, for it is adaptive characters alone that natural selection pretends to account for.

In Darwin's day the relation of the egg cell to the body was by no means so clear as it has become in recent years. The vagueness with which Darwin conceived how the egg cell might be built up out of units (pangenes) received from different parts of the body of the parent, is pointed out by Prof. Edmund B. Wilson. A clear summing up of the evidence to-day is distinctly opposed to the theory of the inheritance of acquired characters advocated by Darwin as a subsidiary hypothesis to natural selection.

No chapter in the whole range of evolution has been more important than that which deals with fossils, as the strongest evidence that evolution, in some way, has taken place. Prof. H. F. Osborn brings to this topic his wide familiarity with fossil remains. He argues that the evidence is demonstrative in showing that evolution has progressed in definite lines. This view has been held by a number of able naturalists, but Osborn implies that these definite lines are often adaptive lines. Selection tries to account for the origin of such lines, but Osborn rejects selection as a sufficient explanation of the process and leaves the reader in doubt as to what the unknown cause of certain adaptive "origins" may be; for, while progression along lines that are not adaptive will be readily understood, progression along adaptive lines without selection and without the Lamarckian factor is something at present outside the scope of scientific demonstration.

In concise and strong statements President G. Stanley Hall brings the volume to a close with "Evolution and Psychology." The debt of genetic psychology to Darwin is generously recognized. Darwin is "hardly less the founder of a new departure in this field than in that of classification of form and structure."

He posits a natural history rather than a philosophy of mind. . . . Finally, as Darwin freed biology from the inveterate dominance of the ideas of fixed and divinely created species, conceptions directly inherited from Plato's ideas and Aristotle's categories, so everything in the present psychological situation cries out for a new Darwin of the mind, who shall break the present spell of theoretical problems incapable of scientific solution, the ideal of a logical and methodical exactness greater than our subject in its present stage permits of, which Aristotle well dubbed pedantry, and remand the haunting problem of the ultimate goal of the psyche to the same limbo. . . . Only by so doing can we again get up against the essential facts of life as it is lived by the toiling, struggling men, women, and children, normal and defective, of our day.

Truly a wide range of subject and opinion; a fine tribute to the memory



of a great and independent thinker, even though much of what is written may be repudiated as not Darwinism by that narrow sect that claims to hold in fee the secrets of the master.

In "The Garden Yard" (Philadelphia: David McKay) Bolton Hall continues his apostleship to those city folk who try to support themselves in the country. The book teaches intensive farming to the home gardener, and instructs the beginner in market gardening. It discusses general farming topics, the various classes of vegetables, and poultry. For its size the book is very comprehensive, and its treatment of the subject is simple and practical. In his facts and advice Mr. Hall is up-to-date; his book should help to bring about the practice of intensive gardening which is to be the salvation of Eastern farmers and of suburban dwellers generally. Mr. Hall promises no millennium, however, to those who will not think as well as work. In an introduction N. O. Nelson urges the forming of coöperative farming settlements, and offers to finance them.

To those visionary souls who still take pleasure in naming the constellations we recommend a little book by Willis I. Millham, entitled "How to Identify the Stars" (Macmillan).

Raffaele Vittorio Matteucci, director of the observatory on Mt. Vesuvius, died there on July 16, from pneumonia contracted by exposure during scientific excursions at night on the crater. He was born at Senigallia, near Ancona, in 1866. Before succeeding the late Professor Palmieri as head of the Vesuvian observatory, he was assistant professor of natural sciences in the University of Naples. He had published a number of monographs on lava; on the *fumarole* and their products; on the phenomena exhibited by this volcano during the period between 1891 and 1895, and a work entitled "Come dovrebbe essere studiato il Vesuvio."

## Drama.

### EXAMINING THE EXAMINER.

The Examiner of Plays in England, George Alexander Redford, was for two days before the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons on the censorship, and his detailed testimony is highly enlightening. Whether it is more amusing than depressing, it is hard to say. The disclosure of the complete lack of taste in the officer who regulates national dramatic taste, and of the ignorance and want of fixed intellectual principles and moral sensibility on the part of the man who for fourteen years has decided what should and what should not be produced on the stage, must certainly compel a reform in the censorship, even if the result be not to reform it altogether away. None of the attacks upon it by playwrights and theatrical managers has damaged it so seriously as the two days' examination of the Examiner.

Mr. Redford, who, for the rest, ap-

pears to be a well-meaning and contented citizen, was asked by the committee to state his qualifications for his important task. Was he an educated man, a university graduate? Well, no, but "no doubt the Lord Chamberlain satisfied himself as to my competence." Had he engaged in literary pursuits previous to his appointment? Not exactly, though he had "dabbled in such things." What had he written? "If you wish to know, I have written several plays." Were any of them ever produced? Not one! What was his actual position before becoming Examiner of Plays? "I was a bank manager." How did he come to be appointed censor? Why, he was a friend of the previous censor, and had been in the habit of "acting for him when he was on holiday"! Mr. Harcourt, for the committee, then asked the question, which even Mr. Redford must have perceived to be ironical: "So the public were permitted at such seasons to see only such plays as the censor's friend thought it desirable they should see?"

The whole inquiry brought out the incompetence and confusion and vacillating uncertainties of the censorship in the most glaring way. Mr. Redford was asked on what principles he proceeded in determining whether a given play should be or should not be licensed. His reply was that he simply applied "the official point of view." Here is official art with a vengeance! But what was the official standard? Why, it was merely "custom and precedent." One sees how simple it is! A play of the kind that never has been licensed, never can be licensed, that is the whole of it. If there is in a play anything that the censor believes any of his predecessors would have thought indecent, or too personal, or offensive to the head of a friendly nation, or—oh, yes!—irreligious, that play cannot be produced in England.

Another positive rule was that no drama or opera could be "Scriptural." Mr. Redford was very strong on that point. But had he not recently licensed "Samson et Dalila"? Yes, but he had "stretched the rule" in that case. But there was one rule which was never stretched—the rule against immoral plays. How did he decide what were immoral plays? He was "bound by precedents—the unwritten law." But that unwritten law was precisely what the committee wanted to get at, and they plied Mr. Redford with questions. All in vain, however. He made it evident that he had no fixed standards whatever. Even in the matter of indecency, he had to admit that the worst plays of Congreve or Wycherley would have nothing to fear from the censorship, because they would come under the head of old plays not under the jurisdiction of the censor. Yet it was confessed that an indecent Restoration drama could not now

be produced, simply because public opinion would not tolerate it. So there we have it—it is really the public taste, not the censor, that banishes the grosser plays from the stage. Quite apart from the question of an official license, there are standards and also laws—such as those against libel and against indecent exhibitions—which no theatrical manager could venture to disregard or violate.

In the end this whole question of licensing the production of a play seems cursoriously like the question of licensing the printing of a book. Milton's argument regarding the latter would apply almost literally to the former. Indecent or libellous books he would leave to the law; and as for the impossible duties of the licenser, the language of the "Areopagitica" seems prophetic of poor Mr. Redford, with his 7,000 plays to read in fourteen years:

It cannot be denied, wrote Milton, but that he who is made judge to sit upon the birth or death of books . . . had need to be a man above the common measure, both studious, learned, and judicious. . . . If he be of such worth as behoves him, there cannot be a more tedious and unpleasing journeywork, a greater loss of time levied upon his head, than to be made the perpetual reader of unchosen books and pamphlets. . . . Seeing, therefore, those who now possess the employment, by all evident signs wish themselves well rid of it, and that no man of worth, none that is not a plain unthrift of his own hours, is ever likely to succeed them, . . . we may easily foresee what kind of licensers we are to expect, hereafter, either ignorant, imperious, and remiss, or basely pecuniary.

It seems plain that the testimony of the censor will be the undoing of the censorship. The evidence of playwrights and dramatic critics was unnecessary, after Mr. Redford had left the stand. His office may not be abolished, but it is sure to be reformed. Probably, the first step will be to allow an appeal from his decisions, which are now as final as they are inscrutable. Mr. Redford's innocent testifying to his own inconsistencies and ignorance was most diverting. He had refused a license to "La Città Morta," but had given one to the horrible plays of the Sicilian actors, because their manager had sent him a *précis*, and that seemed harmless. German plays he felt a little weak about, since he did not know the language, but his wife did. The *ewig Weibliche* in the censorship!

In Chapter i of "William Shakespeare, Player, Playmaker, and Poet" (John Lane Co.), Canon H. C. Beeching has tried to sum up as succinctly as possible the arguments in G. G. Greenwood's bulky volume, "The Shakespeare Problem Restated." In Chapters ii and iii he reprints lectures on Shakespeare's life and character. To this book Mr. Greenwood rejoins with "In Re Shakespeare" (John Lane Co.). Mr. Greenwood, making much of the spell-