

Besides the tablets from Nippur, this volume contains also a considerable number discovered at other sites, notably Sippar and Borsippa, and purchased by the earlier explorers. There are also two or three documents discovered by the second expedition in a ruin-mound called Yokha, at two days' journey from Nippur, the ancient name of which has not yet been identified. In execution, this work maintains the high standard of handicraft and calligraphy established by its predecessors, while the introductory dissertations add considerably to our knowledge of ancient Babylonian history, domestic and religious life, and legal right.

*The Life and Times of Master John Hus.*

By the Count Lützwow. With illustrations. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$4 net.

This life of Hus by a fellow-countryman, written in English and addressed especially to English-speaking people, is an obviously partisan work. Its apologetic tendency is, in fact, put forward as an additional reason why the author should have taken especial pains to examine carefully and weigh thoroughly all hostile criticism of his hero. This rather unusual claim is well sustained by the book itself. It is written in a spirit of ardent admiration for the man who stands in the author's mind as the chief representative of their common fatherland, yet with admirable temper and evident anxiety to do justice to all reasonable opposition. Count Lützwow's thesis is that the work of Hus was, in a very complete sense of the word, independent, a truly national and personal movement. He has felt himself called upon to open the subject at this time on account of vigorous efforts that have been made to reduce the personal merit of Hus to the lowest point, by showing his dependence upon others, more particularly upon John Wycliffe. The epoch-making work of Palacky, published more than fifty years ago, brought out clearly enough, one would suppose, the essentially Bohemian character of the Hussite movement; but since then a wave of German criticism led by Johann Loserth has almost swept away this fundamentally national quality of the Bohemian struggle. In his striking little book, "Hus und Wiclif," Loserth undertook to show that all that was significant in Hus's thought was derived by an almost purely mechanical process from Wycliffe. Even the "deadly parallel column" was invoked to make it perfectly clear that Hus actually copied word for word from Wycliffe in many extended passages. All that had a very convincing sound, but it required no very great familiarity with the literary processes of the time to show that even direct copying of literary material was no proof of dependence or even deriva-

tion in thought. What was written became common property and was freely appropriated by any one who found it serviceable in supporting his own ideas. The ideas were not, on this account, any the less his own. Such criticism as Loserth's was a challenge to the admirers of the Bohemian saint, and Count Lützwow has accepted it.

It cannot be said that he has contributed any considerable amount of new material to the discussion. What he says has been said before, but he has put it in attractive form and has directed his argument straight toward the criticism designed to undermine it. We are inclined wholly to agree with him that Hus represents the culmination of a long and deep-seated discontent with the administration of the Church in Bohemia, and also with the existing doctrinal teaching of the Church in so far as that was used to support the practices then being called in question. Hus had his forerunners in Bohemia as obviously as Wycliffe had his in England. The movement in each case was complicated throughout with national considerations. It is no derogation from the merits of Hus to admit, as Count Lützwow freely does, his obligations to Wycliffe, but it is a long way from that to making him an almost servile copyist whose work could not have been done without the help of his English predecessor.

Perhaps the most vivid impression retained by the general reader will be that of the conflict of the pure Bohemian element against the apparently rapid Germanisation of their country in all that pertains to the higher life. It is easy to describe this as evidence of a narrow Chauvinism, unwilling to receive the light except through a nationalist medium, but it is a conflict bound to appeal to every reader who values the force of a true patriotism that prefers its own way of salvation to the most benevolent assimilation.

*The Hisperica Famina.* Edited with a short Introduction and Index Verborum by Francis John Henry Jenkinson. Cambridge: University Press. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.76 net.

One of the most interesting problems in the history of the early Middle Ages concerns the nature of the contribution made to civilization by Ireland. According to roseate accounts of the matter, culture, including a substantial knowledge of Greek, flourished in the isle of saints from the middle of the fifth to the seventh century, during most of which period the continent lay buried in utter darkness; from Ireland proceeded the enlightening influence that brought learning back to Europe. M. Roger, in his careful but unsympathetic work, "L'Enseignement des lettres

classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin" (1905), vigorously attacks this view. He acknowledges a familiarity with Greek on the part of Pelagius at the beginning of the period, and of John the Scot after its termination, but seeks to show that what culture Ireland possessed in the interval was insignificant, and may even have come to it from without.

The "Hisperica Famina," which Mr. Jenkinson, librarian of the University Library at Cambridge, has carefully edited, with its various texts, is one of the wildest things in literature. The strange dialect is a fusion of classical Latin, vulgar Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and perhaps some independently created elements, all cast in a mould that in general is Latin, but not what Cicero would have recognized as such. It is evidently an academic, not a popular product, and may be located on the borderland between esoteric refinement and drivelling nonsense. The subjects treated are simple enough—the praise of the scholar, a description of the daily life at the school, and what appear to be set themes, such as *De celo*, *De mari*, *De taberna*, etc. The name Hisperic, scholars recently have believed, emphasizes the fact that the *Famina*, or diction, is Roman, in contrast with the base vernacular. In the "Glossæ Collectæ" of the Echternach manuscript, *Hisperica* is the last word explained, but, tantalizingly, the explanation is not legible. Bradshaw thought he read *scotica*, but nothing can be made out now. There are approaches to the new style in several late Latin authors, particularly Martianus Capella and Virgilius Maro, but it goes far beyond anything in such authors. Various specimens of it exist, the earliest published by Cardinal Angelo Mai in 1833, and all conveniently assembled in Mr. Jenkinson's book.

His edition is a distinct improvement on that of Stowasser, for more reasons than that it includes more. It contains facsimiles and reproduces the text exactly, without the disfigurement of emendation. The text is for the first time printed as lines of poetry, the nature of which has long been recognized by Bradshaw, Zimmer, and Wilhelm Meyer. The manuscripts themselves give a continuous text, but generally mark the ends of verses by punctuation, and their beginnings by capital letters; and Mr. Jenkinson's introduction includes a more careful description of these manuscripts than had before appeared. The complete Index Verborum has also something of the nature of a glossary, including references to the Echternach glosses; this feature might well have been developed still farther.

Now the significance of these curious documents for the problem stated at the beginning of this review is just this. If Ireland, as is probable, may be accredited with the invention of Hisperic

diction, we have apparent evidence that the knowledge of Greek, which it presupposes, was not altogether at second-hand. Mr. Jenkinson shows that there is no dependence on the Græco-Latin glossaries of the early Middle Ages; he believes that "the jargon represents an isolated growth or tradition of which whatever literary product there may have been has mostly perished." Further, if Gildas, the British historian of the sixth century, was acquainted with Hisperic—and Mr. Jenkinson adds a bit of confirmatory evidence on this disputed point—the existence of the dialect is proved for the very period when, according to Roger, Ireland was destitute of Greek. Finally, may it not be, after all, that the movement had a more popular nature than we suppose? After we become accustomed to the peculiar verbiage, we find it not inconsistent with poetic feeling. Mr. Jenkinson, after quoting the verse, *multiformis solifluis: pretenui nubium vapore stemicatur arcus radiis*, remarks:

We are left to wonder how such a vocabulary came to be associated with such artistic feeling. It is not enough to suppose that behind the Latin expression may stand thoughts conceived in native Irish. That seems likely enough. But apart from that, there is a directness and freedom in the expression itself which, as far as I know, cannot be matched among other remnants of contemporary literature.

It is easy to ask questions on a subject about which we really know next to nothing. As most of the fragments have come to light in most unexpected ways, it is not too much to hope that some *felice scopritore* may add others still, to supply more evidence on this fascinating subject.

*Economic Heresies: Being an Unorthodox Attempt to Appreciate the Economic Problems Presented by "Things as They Are."* By Sir Nathaniel Nathan. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$3 net.

The sub-title indicates the purpose of this volume: it attempts to depict the industrial world from a positive, or objective, standpoint in contradistinction to the *a priori* idealization which its author imputes to the professional economist. Sir Nathaniel Nathan has some unusual qualifications for the task he has set himself. He has had a long acquaintance with public affairs. As a former Burgess of Birmingham, he knows municipal trading from the inside. As attorney-general in Trinidad, he has seen much of the practical side of international trade. He knows the "service traditions" of the Crown's civil servants to perfection. His long absence from England has emancipated him from partisan allegiance, and his weighed deliverances upon England's national policy, financial and industrial, are courageously impartial. If in fair-

ness one ought to temper this praise, it may be suggested that the author's views of foreign trade may have been unduly colored by his knowledge of the struggles of the West Indian sugar-grower; also that a busy officer of the Crown has hardly time to keep in touch with much of the best recent work in economics. In particular, Sir Nathaniel's acquaintance with American economics, so far as one can judge from this book, seems largely confined to Henry George, Upton Sinclair, and W. J. Bryan.

In a treatise so comprehensive as this, it is impossible to notice more than two or three of the important positions assumed. Perhaps its quality may best be indicated by noting, first, its somewhat novel use of the concept "means"; and then by scrutinizing its theory of tariff reform; and its verdict upon Socialism.

There is much to justify the insistence upon some such term as "means" in contradistinction to the term wealth. Wealth is employed by the author to cover what are generally known as commodities—"desirable material things susceptible of appropriation, excluding money . . . and also [excluding] . . . land" (p. 20). "Means," on the other hand, denote "the man's power to obtain commodities, . . . the whole of the accumulation of varying evidences of his title to participate in wealth" (p. 22). This distinction between two aspects of wealth has been implied, or even explicitly exploited, by several modern economists. F. A. Cleveland's "funds" are the analogue of Nathan's "means." The same is true of Davenport's "loan funds" which he contrasts to actual material "wealth used as an aid in the reproduction of wealth." T. Veblen's "loan credit," portrayed as "a pecuniary fact, not an industrial one," is also akin to Nathan's "means"; and Irving Fisher's "rights" of "obtaining some or all of the future services of one or more articles of [material] wealth" are of the same genus as "means."

The relation of "means," or claims upon wealth, to actual goods is a *locus vexatissimus* of economic casuistry. The view commonly imputed to Macleod that the creation of such claims is tantamount to the simultaneous creation of an equal amount of wealth is certainly one extreme of error. Making out the title-deeds to a farm and putting them on the market is certainly not a doubling of wealth. On the other hand, the view of Professor Irving Fisher that "existing property rights (claims) are rights to the use of existing wealth, so that existing wealth underlies all existing property rights" seems also extreme. A government bond promising interest for fifty years is, at least in part, a claim on the income to issue from the labor of the unborn. To that extent no

existing property, either material goods or human producers, underlies the bond. The truth seems to be that "means," "claims," "credits," "rights," may or may not imply the contemporaneous existence of correlative material wealth; may or may not connote well founded correlative expectation of future income.

Without attempting to index the various places where his conception of "means" betrays our author into what seems to us to be error (as, for example, pp. 251, 252), it will suffice to say that it leads him to deny the essential truth of the barter theory of trade, either domestic or international. Thus he declares that "any attempt to treat of commerce as a regulated process of 'barter' or 'exchange of commodities' *inter se*, simply facilitated by the employment of money as a sort of denotation of market values, issues in fallacy and confusion" (p. 119); and again that "neither nations nor communities conduct commercial operations by way of barter or exchange of goods at all . . ." (p. 308). It follows logically that a nation's power to obtain imports depends not on its material exports, but on its "means" available for purchasing foreign produce. Apparently then a nation can obtain goods from abroad without selling goods to the outside world. So far as an accretion of "means" arises from the income on investments abroad or from freights earned on carrying the world's commerce, no one would dispute the allegation. But it seems almost a childish proposition to insist upon, that apart from the credits arising from sources similar to the two just mentioned, the export of commodities creates the claims that suffice to defray the cost of the residue of imports. If certain commodities, instead of being imported, begin to be produced at home, and if the productive power of the nation is thus diverted from producing goods for export to supplying the domestic demand directly, the "means" for paying for residual imports is diminished *pro tanto*. So that, after all, the essential core of truth would seem to lie in the traditional statement of the theory of foreign trade—that it is essentially an organized and elaborate system of barter rather than what it seems to be in the individual instance, a purchase or sale of goods for money, or "means." If our author can propound no more plausible "economic heresy" than his doctrine of foreign trade, it should seem that he might content himself with the economic "orthodoxy" he so fiercely impugns. One is reminded of Bacon's remark that "a little philosophy inclineth man's minde to Atheisme; but depth in philosophy, bringeth men's mindes about to Religion."

Sir Nathaniel's advocacy of tariff reform, however, is infected with no blind worship of colonial preference by