

the university, struck a note which is sometimes forgotten by students of language and literature. The modern languages, he said, must, if they are to hold their place in a course of liberal culture, be treated not as mere material for linguistic study or for purely utilitarian purposes, but as a content of thought in literature. Greek, he said, is gone and Latin no longer holds its own, partly because they were treated as fields for linguistic study; there is danger lest the modern languages meet a similar fate. From the difference in structure they do not give the same linguistic training as Latin, but the modern literatures have a cultural value superior to Latin, if not to Greek, and this culture the Association and its members must make the possession of the youth of America. Somewhat the same idea was voiced by Prof. M. D. Learned of the University of Pennsylvania, who gave the president's annual address on the subject, "Linguistic Study and Literary Creation." A rapid survey of the history of literary creation shows a corresponding energy in linguistic study. The work of certain authors would have been greater had they possessed wider and deeper knowledge of other languages and literatures. To increase literary production in America, which is the inheritor of the culture of Europe, the study of the European languages should be pursued effectively in the secondary schools, so that when the student enters college he may not be hampered by ignorance and carelessness. In college he may rise to an understanding of the message of great literature, and in the world he may thus become a creator of literature.

As usual, more papers were presented in the field of English than in that of any other language; in fact, about half the total number were primarily concerned with English, and of these the majority dealt with subjects of the seventeenth and earlier centuries. Problems of Shakespeare study were discussed in four papers. One of these, on "Shakespeare's Use of Prose," by Prof. Morris W. Croll of Princeton, contended that Shakespeare was not subjective in his use of prose, as some have maintained, but merely followed contemporary fashion. The new convention was to use prose for courtly conversation, as the old convention had been to use it for vulgar speech. The foreign courtly drama and the court plays of Lyly influenced Jonson, Chapman, and Day, and Shakespeare followed along. A similar protest against certain aspects of modern Shakespearean criticism was made by Prof. E. E. Stoll of Western Reserve University. Shakespeare is still interpreted as if he were familiar with the conceptions of modern science and philosophy, and as if his art were not three centuries old. This criticism traces the influence of such forces as heredity, and, setting at naught Elizabethan technique,

discovers suggestions of subconscious thought and the subtle distinctions of racial, criminal, and morbid psychology.

Two papers, one dealing with the origin of the ballad, the other with the ballad or song in the making, were presented respectively by Prof. Arthur Beatty of the University of Wisconsin and Prof. John A. Lomax of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. The former showed that the prose tale, which the upholders of the communal origin of the ballad maintain is late, is really earlier than the ballad, and that it is just as much the product of the folk as the ballad. The second paper was the direct outcome of Professor Lomax's collecting of orally transmitted cowboy songs found for the most part in Arizona, Texas, and New Mexico, with Texas predominant. These songs have been taken down from the lips of ex-cowboys, from students, and from old Texas newspapers. In some cases, they exist in from five to twenty versions. Many of them are fragments, and one consists of an immense number of stanzas as if it were intended to last from one end of the trail to the other. These songs are a curious composite of conventional diction and a vital phrasing born of the ballad instinct of the race. In subject, they range from thoughts of home and mother to the heroism of outlaws like Jesse James, from love and religion to fighting and death. In some cases, the vernacular is remarkably poetic. The majority were written in the last sixty years and they are fast disappearing as the trail vanishes before the railway.

The unsolved problem of the teaching of rhetoric and composition always arouses discussion, and two papers, one by Professor Scott of the University of Michigan, the other by Prof. Lane Cooper of Cornell, brought up anew the vexing question. Professor Scott treated the subject of rhetoric as a science for graduate study and research. Professor Cooper inveighed against the fetich of the freshman composition, in which mere words are usually substituted for thought, and questioned whether the art of written composition could be taught at all. Matter should take priority over expression, since errors of thought are worse than errors of speech. The task is to get the student to clothe thought in expression. The general criticism expressed in the discussion was that even immature writing was worth while, if only as a preparation for newspaper work and business correspondence. The most immature student has something to say, if he can be made to say it; he has a personality to reveal.

Prof. J. E. Spingarn of Columbia University, the chairman of the committee appointed at the meeting last year to consider the form and content of the publications, presented a report recommending that the committee be contin-

ued for another year, that all dissertations for the degree of doctor of philosophy be excluded from the publications, and that a committee of not less than three or more than five publish a brief bulletin, containing among other things matters of personal interest concerning members of the association, and have power to spend, if necessary, not more than \$400 in one year. The report was accepted.

The officers for the ensuing year are: President, Prof. Brander Matthews of Columbia; vice-presidents, Profs. J. W. Cunliffe of the University of Wisconsin, J. D. M. Ford of Harvard, and A. B. Faust of Cornell. The present secretary and treasurer were continued. The next meeting will be held at the College of the City of New York.

NEWS FOR BIBLIOPHILES.

Every bibliographical task to which Alfred W. Pollard puts his hand is certain to be well done. Now we have his "Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, a Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays, 1594-1685," published by Methuen & Co., to accompany their facsimile of the Folios. Like these, it is issued in blue boards with linen back, and contains full-sized reproductions of title-pages of twenty-nine of the rarer quartos published prior to 1623. We are sorry to notice that the recently discovered "Titus Andronicus" of 1594 is not among them, though a lined transcript of the title is given.

The bibliographical information is fuller than that given by any previous writer and comprises some unusual particulars. In every case where a play was entered in the register of the Stationers' Company the entry has been quoted, and in the same way all transfers are entered in their chronological order. When a facsimile is not given, the transcript of the title is printed in types of different sizes showing approximately the variety of types on the original title-page. Head-titles (that is, the name of the play as set forth at the beginning of the text) and running titles (the form used at the top of each page or pair of pages) are added. Whether or not the play is divided into acts and scenes is indicated, and stage directions, except simple exits and entrances, are printed in full. Information as to the source of the text and its relations to earlier and later editions in quarto and to the first folio are also given. This, Mr. Pollard is particular to state, represents the conclusion of the editors of the Facsimile Quartos. The printer's name where indicated by initial letters or not given at all has been determined, so far as possible, by the typography. The same information is given for the later quarto editions, for the four folios, and for the spurious plays first collected in the third folio.

So much for the bibliography. More original and more interesting is Mr. Pollard's story of the publication of the quartos and folios. He has, in a word, come to the defence of the editors of the first folio and the printers and publishers of the days of Elizabeth and James First, against the charges made by the "bibliographical pessimists" of whom Sidney Lee is chief.

This school, Mr. Pollard says, seems "to have piracy on the brain." By them the Shakespearean printers and publishers are set down as "equally stupid and dishonest, and none escape condemnation"; and they claim that the first folio was made up with "clumsiness and an excessive and inexplicable haste" from "the prompt-copies made by the playhouse scrivener," from "even less authentic transcripts in private hands," and from the quartos "tainted with . . . carelessness, incapacity, and surreptitiousness." But, again to quote from Mr. Pollard's Preface:

Optimism thinks the part assigned to the playhouse scrivener and the importance of the private transcripts dangerously exaggerated; it has heard of a prompt-copy in an author's autograph; it remembers that Shakespeare was himself an actor and manager as well as a playwright; it believes in the human dislike to throwing property away, even when it seems to have become useless. Lastly, it . . . finds that they [the editors] exercised care and discrimination in forming their canon, in substituting good texts for bad ones and in restoring passages which had been omitted. Doubtless everything might have been much better done, but, doubtless, everything might have been much worse.

An account of publishing in Shakespeare's day, the origin of the Stationers' Company, and the rules governing licenses granted by them, and the transference of the same, with a record of several piratical books, threatened or published, with efforts for their suppression, make up the interesting first chapter. In *The Good and Bad Quartos*, Mr. Pollard examines the various quarto editions of the seventeen plays published before the first folio, and finds that of "Romeo and Juliet" and of "Hamlet," there were two widely different texts, giving, for the seventeen plays, nineteen texts, of which five are, "by universal consent, thoroughly bad." Two of these five were never entered on the Stationers' Register, two were not entered by the firm that printed them, and the other, "The Merry Wives," was entered and transferred the same day. In consequence the expression "diverse stol'n and surreptitious copies" of Heminge and Condell could only have referred to "Henry V" and "The Merry Wives," of which no authentic text was printed before 1623, and to the first editions of "Romeo and Juliet" and "Hamlet," of which corrected texts had already appeared.

Another chapter, on the quartos of 1619, tells of the nine common quartos, with various dates, supposed to have been printed by Thomas Pavier in that year. This chapter is illustrated by reduced facsimiles of the title pages. A tabulated census of existing copies of these nine quartos, compiled by George Watson Cole, is given in an appendix. But the chapter on the printing of the first folio brings out some new facts. A study of the use of the brass rules used to frame the pages satisfies Mr. Pollard that the book was, virtually, all printed at Jaggard's own office, and continuously, not in three sections at three or more shops, as has been claimed. The arrangement of the preliminary leaves of the first folio in the Grenville copy is decided upon, as probably correct.

There is less to be said, of course, of the second, third, and fourth folios. Mr. Pollard, however, seems not to have noticed that the types of the fourth folio were almost certainly set at three different shops

from a copy of the third folio, which was broken into three sections, as pointed out by this Bibliophile some two years ago. The first printer received the Comedies (pages 1-303 of the third folio); the second pages 305 (page 304 is blank) to 664; and the third pages 665 to the end. The act and scene headings are constantly printed throughout in each section in a distinct type. These headings throughout the first portion are printed in plain italics, the capitals measuring about 5-32 of an inch in height. In the second section a somewhat similar, but larger type, the capitals measuring a full 3-16 inch in height, was used. In the third section a still larger type was used, the capitals having prominent kerns: what the printers call "swash" letters. The printer of the first part had a set of large initial letters, about one and one-fourth inches high, the prominent decoration being a sunflower. One of these initials is used at the beginning of each play from "The Tempest" to "The Winter's Tale." The printer of the second part started out by using a smaller ornamental initial N for King John, much like that used in the third folio, but in the case of all the other plays he used only a plain block letter, and not always uniform in size. The printer of the third part also used only plain block letters of different sizes for his indented initials.

The Baconians are always able to give us startling news about Shakespeare's books; otherwise, it seems as if Mr. Pollard's volume were almost "the last word" on the subject.

Correspondence.

THE ASTUTENESS OF THE LORDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: After all, what is the action of the House of Lords in throwing out the Budget bill and appealing to the country but a case of that reputed panacea of all ills, so much heralded by experts in government—the Referendum? And that, too, at the hands of an "effete, obsolete, antiquated, superfluous" branch of legislature that advanced thinkers have long since desired to abolish as an anachronism and a relic of barbarism, etc.! Really, at this distance it looks as if the pampered minions of mediæval feudalism had stolen a march on the pushful sociologists of to-day. The Commons are professedly solicitous for the welfare of the common people, whom theoretically they represent. "Very well," say the Lords, "let us hear from the common people; this is a novel and revolutionary scheme of taxation, involving vast economic and social changes in this country; before we approve the scheme, let us hear from your friend, the common man, whom you profess to represent." Logically considered, the position is unassailable. If the country on appeal should favor the original Budget, the Lords could then pass it with perfect consistency on the ground of having received the information they desired from the country. But if it should happen that the country did not favor the bill, the position of the Commons would be awkward indeed; they did not correctly represent their constituents, and were forced to appeal to them—disastrously.

Thoroughgoing democrats in America will sympathize with the Commons in their efforts to tax the unearned increment of land values. Defending the Budget lately in a speech at Albert Hall, Mr. Asquith described that measure as consisting chiefly of "Taxes on the accumulations of the rich and the luxuries of the less well-to-do, and a moderate toll on monopoly values which the community itself has, either actively or passively, created." An absolutely just system of land taxation would undoubtedly be appropriate for the benefit of the community all increase in land values arising from the labors and necessities of the community at large. The House of Lords naturally opposes such a scheme as Lloyd-George's, which is frankly a move against the unearned increment, and the House of Commons naturally approves of it. The Lords probably know as well as the rest of the world that a reform in land taxation is in the air. Whenever the nation demands it, the Lords will accede to the popular will, as they have always done. If they had thrown out the bill without making an appeal to the country, the Commons would have appealed; if the Liberals had won at the polls, the cry for the abolition of the House of Lords would have been heard again with redoubled vehemence. Lord Lansdowne's amendment anticipated all that, and set the Lords in an absolutely correct position before the country; they have vindicated the wisdom of the existence of a second chamber, whatever be the result of the election. To an American student of party manœuvres the inference is irresistible that all the political astuteness of the realm is not lodged in the House of Commons.

E. L. C. MORSE.

Chicago, December 30.

ENGLISH FOOTBALL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me to comment on the letter entitled "English Football" which appeared in your issue of December 2. Those remarks are fairly applicable if they were confined to the college alone, but are not applicable to "English football," for the simple reason that the colleges, whether Eton, Harrow, Oxford, or Cambridge, are an insignificant factor. The absorbing interest of the football "fans" in Great Britain is centred not on the college, but on the great professional teams, and professional football in England arouses greater enthusiasm and attracts far more spectators than does professional baseball in America. "There is no game which occupies in England the position held by football in America," says your correspondent. Any one familiar with games in England knows that football dominates outdoor sports. During the autumn, winter, and early spring months, in fact, it is the national game. Three codes are played, namely, soccer, Rugby Union, and Northern Union, the last being a modified form of Rugby on a professional basis. The cream of British Rugby talent is to be found in the ranks of the Northern Union clubs, whose strongholds are the industrial centres of the northern counties. But the popular game is "soccer," as fully 95 per cent. of the professional clubs and fully 90 per cent. of the amateur clubs in Great Britain play