

not because the new was better than the old, but because it was different; not because the English felt the need of being philosophical, but because Shaw felt the need of being Shakespeare. His love of intellectual adventure and his sheer lust to be first ally him less with the great dramatists and thinkers than with recent geographical explorers. In these days, the only undiscovered land lies in the uninhabitable regions around the poles. You may still figure in the headlines by reaching the South Pole. But you cannot plant colonies or found a new world there, because no one can live there. Mr. Shaw has been essentially a polar explorer. Having dashed through No Man's Land to the intellectual poles, he has cried to the rest of the world, "How funny you look down there!" And now the rest of the world, ably encouraged by Mr. Chesterton, is beginning to cry, "How funny you look up there!"

Mr. Chesterton's biography is not a joke. It is as serious as his life of Browning or his life of Dickens. Indeed, it is more serious: it is as serious as the "Life of Jean Jacques Rousseau" by Samuel Johnson, which, by the way, was never written, or as the "Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley" by T. B. Macaulay, which was never written, either. That is to say, it presents in sharpest conflict two totally different ideals; it is the Shavian Superman against the Chestertonian Englishman. Mr. Shaw trusts in himself and his foreign allies, and appeals to the future. Mr. Chesterton relies upon the bulk of the English race, and appeals to the past. Mr. Shaw wishes to be as unlike everyone else as possible, and to bring literature around to himself. Mr. Chesterton wishes to be more like every one else than any one in his generation, and to restore English literature to its central traditions. He is thinking of Dickens and Johnson and Fielding and Dryden and Ben Jonson and Shakespeare. He is very weary of the Pre-Raphaelites, the Paterites, the followers of Wilde, the Nietzscheans, the Ibsenites, and all manner of æsthetic dandies, neoterics, and exotics—of whom he is obliged to regard Mr. Shaw as one. If he praises beer with an exaggerated emphasis, it is because they have praised absinthe, and beer is English; if he extols beef, it is because they have extolled caviare or vegetables, and beef is English; if he glorifies marriage,

it is because they have attacked marriage, and marriage is English. If he has declared for romance, it is because Shaw has declared against it, and romance is English; if he has spoken for patriotism, it is because Shaw has spoken for cosmopolitanism, and patriotism is English; if he accepts God, it is because Shaw rejects God, and God is English. Shaw has drawn out the strength of Chesterton as the arch enemy drew out the strength of the angel Gabriel. Putting the case in American terms, it is fun to spend the Fourth of July with Shaw, but it is pleasanter to keep Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year's with Chesterton.

NEWS FOR BIBLIOPHILES.

According to the published extracts of the will, the late Robert Hoe has instructed his executors to sell his library and art collections at auction, leaving it to their option whether the material be offered in New York, London, or Paris. While the French books, and possibly the manuscripts, might bring better prices abroad, it is generally believed that the early printed books, as well as the English and American books, would sell as well or better here. It is hardly probable that the collection will be offered in one continuous sale. That was the old way. For example, the catalogue of the great Roxburghe library said that the books would be sold "on Monday, 18th May, 1812, and the forty-one following days, Sundays excepted." Nowadays, with values so much enhanced, the catalogues are divided into different portions and sales are held several months apart.

No copy of that very rare Thackeray item "Flore et Zephyr" (1836), a small folio pamphlet consisting of eight plates slightly tinted enclosed in a cover, has been offered at auction in this country since the Augustin Daly sale in 1900, when two copies were disposed of—one, with the original drawing of one plate inserted, fetching \$850, the other, with the plates cut around and mounted, bringing \$420. This latter copy will be again offered as one of the attractive items in the library of the late Wilhelmus Mynderse, to be dispersed by the Anderson Auction Co. on October 28 and 29. The Thackeray collection comprises seventy-six lots, and is one of the most extensive ever offered here. The two college periodicals, the *Snob* (lacking four numbers) and the *Gownsmen* (lacking Nos. 1 and 2), also from the Daly library (where they brought \$115), are included, as well as "Vanity Fair" (1848) in parts, a fine set; "The Second Funeral of Napoleon" (1841); "Comic Tales and Sketches" (1841); and "An Interesting Event" (1849). The Dickens collection is also extensive, including three copies of the first edition of the "Pickwick Papers" (1837), one being in parts; "Sketches by 'Boz,'" both series (1836-37); the Christmas Stories, 5 vols., first editions, in original cloth; and other items. Poe's "Tales of the Grotesque and Arabesque," 2 vols. (1840); a set of Cruikshank's "Comic Almanacs," 19 vols. (1835-53); Fielding's "Tom Jones,"

first issue, 6 vols. (1749); Irving's "Sketch Book" (1819-20); Edward FitzGerald's copy of Goldsmith's "Life of Richard Nash" (1762); and first editions of Smollett, Scott, Lowell, Longfellow, Holmes, and Hawthorne, are other noteworthy lots.

Earlier in the week, on October 26 and 27, the same firm will sell the second part of the library of Collin Armstrong. In this portion are included some of the publications of the Kelmscott, Merrymount, and Roycroft Presses; collections of the first editions of Andrew Lang, William Morris, Stephen Phillips, Swinburne, and Charles Godfrey Leland; first editions of "The English Dance of Death" and "The Dance of Life," with other books illustrated by Rowlandson, etc.

On five days, October 25 to 29, the Merwin-Clayton Sales Co. will sell the second part of the library of Charles M. Wallace of Richmond, Va. Catesby's "Natural History of Carolina" (1754), with colored plates; Shelton's translation of "Don Quixote" (1620), the first edition in English; Humboldt's "Vues des Cordilleres" (1810), with colored plates; the first edition of the "Letters of Junius" (1772), and a collection of "Junius" literature, are notable items included in this part.

On October 27 and 28, C. F. Libbie & Co. of Boston will sell the libraries of Dr. James R. Nichols of Haverhill, Mass., and C. E. Tuttle, of Rockland, Maine. The Halliwell-Phillips Shakespeare, 16 vols., folio (1853-65); Roberts's "Holy Land" and "Egypt and Nubia" (1842-46); Jardine's "Naturalists' Library," 40 vols. (1834-38), with 1,242 colored plates; Sowerby's "English Botany" (1853-72), with upwards of 1,800 colored plates; Meyrick's "Inquiry into Ancient Armour," 5 vols. (1842-54); Surtees's Sporting Novels, 5 vols.; first editions of American and English Authors, and a series of Maine town histories and genealogies, are included.

Correspondence.

SCIENCE AND INAUGURATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In an editorial on "Science and Culture," in your issue of June 17, you conclude as follows: "If those masters (of scientific technique) themselves see this (that the heart of education is still the knowledge of men and not of things) our humanist need not shudder over Dartmouth choosing a physicist for president." I felt moved at the time to remark that in other countries this tendency to shudder is not experienced. Among the physicists who are, or have recently been, at the head of British Universities there occur to me Lord Kelvin, chancellor of the University of Glasgow; Lord Rayleigh, chancellor of the University of Cambridge; Sir Oliver Lodge, principal of the University of Birmingham; R. T. Glazebrook, successor to Lodge as principal of University College, Liverpool, and now head of the National Physical Laboratory; the late J. Viriamu Jones, principal of the University of Cardiff, and his successor, E. H. Griffiths, noted for their determinations of electrical and thermal constants, respectively; and Principal Loudon of the University of Toronto. But Dr. Nichols has now been inaugurated

president of Dartmouth, with due pomp and dignity, and, apparently without a shudder. Dartmouth men, from the venerable ex-president to the youngest undergraduate, seem to be profoundly pleased and confident of the future. We may then leave this question for the present. I have lately attended three interesting inaugurations, which have given rise to some thoughts that are concealed in the following lines.

The inauguration of President Nichols, like that of President Lowell the week before, was a spectacle of great picturesqueness and imposing academic ceremony, worth going far to see, and never to be forgotten by the participants. Among the delegates from other colleges were upwards of a score of fellow physicists, who had come to show their loyalty and affection for their colleague. In the afternoon they were hospitably entertained in the laboratory, where those beautiful experiments on the pressure of light were made that had carried the names of Nichols and Hull to many a corner of Europe, where the name of Daniel Webster was unfamiliar. That the names of these delegates should have been, with singular unanimity, omitted from the press reports, is not to be laid to any snobbishness on the part of the press, which had room only for the names of presidents of universities, but is merely a symptom of the attitude of the public to the president and the professor respectively. In the eyes of the public, the professor, on becoming a president, is endowed with marvellous learning, and is an authority on all possible disputed subjects, from the spelling of a word to the settlement of labor disputes. He is an "educator"—the terms *savant* or *Gelehrter* not being needed in the English (or American) language, for these indicate a producer of learning, a notion which is still somewhat foreign, and under suspicion. To the public the president is the outward and visible sign of the university, he is the coal, the gasoline, the steam, the boiler, the engine, the dynamo, the light, the power. He setteth up and he putteth down. He furnishes policies, and he puts them through. He is the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Is he—and, if so, why? European observers of our university conditions with one accord ask this question. Prof. Angelo Mosso, in his book, "La Democrazia nella Religione e nella Scienza," says:

In Italy we are true republicans in the matter of instruction, for the professors vote for the choice of the rector, and the liberty of teaching is so great that the state pays republican and socialistic professors, who openly carry on propaganda against the institutions and the form of government wished by the majority. In America no one understands that this might be possible. The universities are under the despotic power of a president who has unlimited powers, appointing and deposing at will professors, who do not constitute, as with us, a corporation of learned men jealously protected by law. At first sight it seems a paradox to say that where liberty is greatest there tyranny is greatest, but really it is so.

The papers have commented on the fact that President Nichols, in his inaugural, did not announce a new policy. Why should he? Dartmouth seems to be getting on very well as she is. Dartmouth men seem to be enthusiastic and united, and to possess the traditions of democracy. I saw no automobiles in Hanover belonging to students. It is proverbial that "honesty is the best

policy," and this we have had in the inaugurations of Presidents Nichols, Lowell, and Maclaurin. All have admitted that student conditions are not at present ideal, and all have expressed optimism as to their becoming so. All favor general culture, which Maclaurin at least says cannot exist to-day without some acquaintance with science, while the others go nearly as far. What steps seem necessary to be taken is pointed out clearly by Dr. Lowell, and the theory so long prevalent at Cambridge, that equal volumes have equal weights, or that everything is as good as everything else, seems to have received a severe blow.

As I began with science, so let me end. What the colleges think of the claims of science may perhaps be inferred from a study of their honorary degrees. At Harvard, if my memory serves me, out of about thirty honorary degrees five were given to American scientists and seven to foreigners. Of college presidents degrees were given to about six. I am told that an effort is to be made to raise the value of the degrees of Doctor of Science and Doctor of Letters, and that the degree of Doctor of Laws is to be kept for distinguished public servants, and for college presidents. At any rate, this seems to be the plan at Dartmouth. Sixteen purple hoods were bestowed with this most honorable degree *ex-officio* on presidents of colleges, while one doctorate of science was conferred on a president who was also a scientist. An Englishman present called my attention to the different character of the degrees from those conferred at a Cambridge or Oxford convocation, where the *ex-officio* degree is usually absent. It may be questioned how much good these degrees do which presidents pass around to each other. I was told that one of them had upwards of one hundred, and used a card catalogue to keep track of his hoods. Into this purple curia or academy let no geometer enter. The scientists must be satisfied with the more modest yellow.

Is there any way to encourage men to go into science, or is there any place in this country for pure science? Science is, like virtue, its own reward. The scientist can obtain neither money, headlines, nor velvet hoods. Unless, indeed, he take out patents enough, when he can obtain all three. In France they do these things differently. At President Lowell's dinner, when Prof. Joseph Bédier was called upon he immediately launched into a panegyric of the Collège de France, recalling the names of the great men who were among its founders. Of these I recall those of Ampère, Regnault, Foucault, and Champollion. Perhaps we should have more such names if we earnestly desired them. I remember seeing upon the walls of the lecture room in the École Polytechnique the motto "Pour la patrie, la science, et la gloire." Surely an inspiring phrase for the young Frenchman, not as good, perhaps, as the motto "Veritas," but more concrete. We are told now at every breath that the watchword of the educated man must be "service." True enough. Did not Newton serve England when he invented fluxions and discovered the law of gravitation? And yet I suspect he was not thinking of that, but did it because he could not help it. A student once told me that he thought it was foolish to be always talking about culti-

vating science for the good of the world. "The reason we do it," said he, "is for the fun we get." I suspect he was right. On the title page of the works of one of the greatest living physicists are the words: "The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein." That we may have this pleasure, and that we may share it with generous youth, is the chief desire of the scientist.

ARTHUR GORDON WEBSTER.

Worcester, Mass., October 17.

A NEW ARCHÆOLOGICAL LECTURESHIP.

[To-day Mr. James Loeb, formerly of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, New York, endows the Charles Eliot Norton Memorial lectureship in the Archæological Institute of America. Previous gifts by Mr. Loeb have made it possible to secure several foreign scholars of note as lecturers for the institute; the new foundation will provide an income which will be expended in accordance with the terms of the letter to the president of the institution accompanying the gift. This letter, which outlines a type of endowment likely to be productive of lasting benefit, and expresses at the same time an appreciation of Professor Norton's services to art, we are permitted to print in full. —ED. THE NATION.]

Professor Francis W. Kelsey,

President of the Archæological Institute of America, Ann Arbor,

My dear Sir: I take pleasure in informing you that I have instructed my secretary to pay over to the treasurer of the Archæological Institute of America on October 21 \$20,000 of the 5 per cent. bonds of the United States Steel Company for the endowment of the "Charles Eliot Norton Memorial Lecture Fund."

The annual income of \$1,000 is to be paid as an honorarium to one or more distinguished archæologists for a course of lectures to be delivered before the affiliated societies of the institute. In choosing the lecturers preference is to be given to European scholars, but in the discretion of the council invitations may also be extended to American scholars.

The experience of past years has amply demonstrated that a constantly growing public eagerly avails itself of the opportunity which these lectures afford to keep abreast of the latest researches of a science which is constantly increasing our respect for the achievements of antiquity. I deem it a privilege to endow the institute with a fund that will enable it, for all time, to help, not only its members, but also the general public, to enjoy the fruits of future archæological discovery.

October 21 marks the first anniversary of the universally regretted death of Prof. Charles Eliot Norton of Harvard University, and this day seems peculiarly appropriate for the creation of the endowment. He was the real father of the Archæological Institute of America. Thirty years ago he had the satisfaction of seeing the idea which he had long and enthusiastically fostered in the minds of a small company of scholars, take concrete form in the estab-

lishment of the institute, whose services to learning have amply justified his eager hopes. It is fair to say that one of the most far-reaching of these services lies in the opportunity given to a selected body of young students to inspire themselves at the actual sources of ancient culture. Our universities lose no time in appointing these young men, and their teaching is giving new life and vitality to an important branch of learning.

Two generations of Harvard students were privileged to hear from Professor Norton's inspiring lips what "man's sacrifice to beauty," as Mr. Henry James has well called man's artistic effort, has done for the uplifting of the race. To them the establishment of the Charles Eliot Norton Memorial Lecture Fund will, I hope, be a welcome event. To that larger circle who knew and valued Mr. Norton for his fearless devotion to his country, for the delightful essays and scholarly public addresses which marked the stages of a long and singularly distinguished life to the pursuit of *res humaniores*, it may serve as a token of the devotion and admiration of one of his pupils.

Yours faithfully, JAMES LOEB.

Villa Waldfried, Murnau a./Staffelsee. September 8, 1909.

ENGLISH AND CLASSIC VERBS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The September *Harper's* contains an interesting article by Mr. J. C. Fernald on "The Simplicity of English," in the course of which occur the following words:

The Greek verb has 1,138 parts, which the simpler Latin was able to reduce to no less than 444. Here the English language has broken all precedent. The most complicated English verb, the verb *be*, has but eight different forms, *be, am, is, are, was, were, being, been*. The verb *be* is alone in this proud distinction. No other irregular verb has more than five changes of form; as, *give, gave, gives, giving, given*. A regular verb has but four changes of form; as, *love, loved, loves, loving*; and out of at least 8,000 verbs in the English language, all except a little list of 200 are regular.

There are several remarkable things in this statement. First, we rub our eyes to see whether we have read aright. Only eight different forms? Where are the forms *art, wast, wert*? And why are *givest, giveth, gavest* omitted? And *lovest, loveth, lovedst*?

Again, it would be interesting to know how Mr. Fernald obtained his number 1,138 for the parts of the Greek verb. By assuming that some one theoretical verb could at the same time be in both the conjugations and exhibit all possible variations of pure, mute, and liquid verbs in all possible tenses, and by counting all duplicate forms, that number might be arrived at—possibly might be exceeded. But 507 is the number given by Curtius, "Das griechische Verbum," edition of 1877, page 5. This makes forms enough, in all conscience; Curtius calls this "Fülle" "eine erstaunlich grosse" (p. 3), and carefully gives his method of computation. He omits what he considers to be real duplicates, but he counts *λύω* twice, *λύσω* twice, and *ἐλυον* twice. In his enumeration of the forms of the Latin verb he gives 443, only one less than Mr. Fernald's number. I do not know the method of counting in this instance. *E. g.*, the series *es, et, emus, etis,*

ent meets the learner of the Latin verb in three conjugations, in two different tenses and two different moods. Are these counted as 5 or as 15? A good illustration of the wide variation between truthful answers to the same question would be afforded in answering this: "How many forms does a boy have to learn in order to inflect a Latin adjective of the first and second declensions?" One person thinks (taking *bonus* as his model): "three genders, six cases, two numbers; $3 \times 6 \times 2 = 36$." Another one reflects that *bona* and *bonis* each occur six times; that *bonum, boni, bonæ, and bono* are each found four times, and *bonorum* twice; so he replies "thirteen different forms," deducting nearly 64 per cent. of the other answer.

But when it comes to the method of expressing one's meaning by inflections, have not most of us felt that while we were about it we had rather learn more forms instead of fewer, in order to be sure of what we were saying? When the *Nation* itself was a boy, I dare say it (or "he") would rather have learned a separate set of forms for each of the three series *es, et, etc.*, mentioned above, than to be obliged to determine whether it was dealing with a present or future indicative, or with a present subjunctive.

Nor is the English verb itself as easy as one might think, judging merely by the paucity of simple forms. The foreigner has to learn a double set of tenses for many verbs, and if the sentence is negative or interrogative, there is still a third mode of expression, which may have to be used. "Jack writes home once a week." "Jack is writing; don't bother him." "Jack is not writing." "Jack does not write often enough." "Is Jack writing now?" "Does Jack write home often?" In Latin and Greek *scribit* and *γράφει* serve for all of the variations. The foreigner may say: "I am believing both Cook and Peary," and then wonder why "am believing" will not work as well as "am receiving."

To go back to the Greek verb for a moment, its mass of forms may easily be made much less formidable than would appear at first sight. Thus Curtius counts 70 forms for the future, active and middle. Does a boy have to learn 70 new forms? Not a bit of it. He learns that an inserted sigma was the future sign; this one fact gives him all of the 70 forms instantly, the present tense, of course, being already known. And if we insert before the sigma of the future middle the syllable *θη* we have the future passive without more ado, which disposes of 35 more of Curtius's forms so that the learning of two facts gives a knowledge of 105 forms. I have often seen beginners look with dismay at the columns of contracted verbs, as if it were all entirely new material. But tell them that three "rules" (or statements) will show them how to get all the shortened forms of *φιλῶ*, and three (it would be two except for the omission of iota in *τιμάει*) will serve for *τιμάω*, and the feeling of dismay is apt to vanish.

To close with a sigh: Just suppose our simple English had a phonetic system of pronunciation!

ADDISON HOGUE.

Lexington, Va., October 12.

CHAUCER SPEAKS.

SIR: I have recently noticed what seems to be another of the rare cases in the "Canterbury Tales" in which Chaucer apparently forgets for the moment the supposed narrator of the story and speaks in his own person. It is in "The Squire's Tale" (F. 278-82), in the description of the dancing which follows the banquet of Cambrinskan. The lines are:

Heer is the revel and the jolitee
That is nat able a dul man to devyse,
He moste han knowen love and his servyse,
And been a festlich man as fresh as May,
That sholde yow devyssen swich array.

It may be urged that the modesty of the squire leads him to speak thus, but, however this explanation might account for the "dull," it would scarcely do so for the third and fourth lines. In the "Prologue" we read of the squire:

Singinge he was, or floytinge al the day;
He was as fresh as is the month of May . . .
So hote he lovede, that by nightertale
He sleep namore than dooth a nightingale.

It seems singular that Chaucer should make the squire excuse himself because of his ignorance of the very things about which he obviously knew the most. On the other hand, Chaucer, "hore and rounde of shape," who often pleads his dulness, might very naturally speak in this way of himself.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

University of Rochester, October 4.

A CORRECTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I notice among the entirely merited corrections of Miss Frank's translation of Sudermann's "Rosen" one slip of your reviewer. The translation (*Nation*, No. 2311, p. 364) of "unverwandt" should be "steadily" not "unawares." W. A. COLWELL.

Spartanburg, S. C., October 15.

Literature.

A NATION MAKER.

Sir George Grey, Governor and High Commissioner. By James Collier. (Makers of Australia Series). Christchurch, Wellington, and Dunedin, New Zealand: Whitcombe and Tombs, Limited.

Seventeen years since, September 8, 1892, we reviewed Rees's "Life of Sir George Grey," virtually an autobiography, touched up here and there by the hand of an ardent admirer and co-worker. Since then other lives of Grey have appeared, notably this one by Mr. Collier, who, though an admirer is at the same time often sharply critical. Grey has passed to his account: the Boer war, the federation of Australia, and at this moment of South Africa, have taken place, events with which his career stands in close relation. America, moreover, has taken on the character of suzerain and patron of "backward races" in the South Pacific. For the