

drew, and wrote a history of Massachusetts in the war.

As a rule, Lincoln's faulty orthography, especially in his youth, is silently corrected by the editors. In some of the letters to his one-time flame, Miss Owens, which they derive from Herndon, "I've" is even slicked into "I have," and a colloquialism like "hypo" is quoted, as if Lincoln were conscious of its not being good style. In another letter "gal" is similarly treated. We observe numerous discrepancies in the reproduction of letters common to Herndon and to this edition, and sometimes feel that our editors have been careless: but for their own defence they might well have indicated the source from which they copied, and in the case of MSS. this would have had the additional advantage of revealing the ownership of the originals. A bibliographical note on the speech at Gettysburg, which has so many variant readings, would have been a boon. Finally, we ought to have a running date at the head of each page, in order to find our place in this medley of long and short papers.

We have perforce been critical in our remarks if we were to say anything, for it would be idle to talk about the contents of these volumes *per se*, either as to their value in American history or as to the convenience of this form of publication of them.

*The Mark in Europe and America: A Review of the Discussion of Early Land Tenure.* By Enoch A. Bryan. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1893.

THE theory of the Mark has occupied a prominent place in the discussions of historians and economists for nearly half a century, and interest in the subject has greatly increased since the rejection of the old theory by Seebohm and Fustel de Coulanges. The acceptance of the new doctrine involves a complete revolution of opinion, not merely regarding the nature of village life, but also concerning the constitution of mediæval society in general, the status of the great mass of the population of western Europe during the early Middle Ages, and the historical development of property in land. Attempts have also been made to turn the old theory to practical account: in it the advocates of state ownership of land have found an historical basis for the support of their proposed legislation.

Mr. Bryan's book presents "a sketch of the history of the theory during the past forty years, and is not intended, primarily, as a presentation of the original documentary evidence." The author is an ardent disciple of the new school, and hence denies the existence of the free-village community. He presents quite fully the extreme deductions of the early advocates of the mark theory and the arguments of Seebohm and Fustel de Coulanges, but he does not bring out clearly the modified views of such recent writers as Vinogradoff, Glasson, and Andrews. Hence some readers will carry away the impression that we are forced to adopt either the exaggerated details of the theory as presented by Kemble and Maurer or the other extreme as advocated by Seebohm and Fustel. The truth is that one may believe in the coexistence of the manor and the free-village community; one may even believe that in the free village itself there was some inequality of rank and some private property in land. In short, one may accept the essence of the mark theory without accepting Kemble's "idyllic" picture of democracy. Moderate disciples of the old school are quite willing to concede that in the time

of Tacitus indications may be found of the existence of private ownership of land, social inequality, and serfdom; but they reject the view that the manor was the typical form of village life and that the mass of the population was in serfdom. A serious defect of Mr. Bryan's book is his failure to recognize the existence of a class of historians who think that Kemble and Fustel de Coulanges advocate two extreme theories.

Mr. Bryan tries to be impartial, but he seems to take it for granted that recent writers who reject the conclusions of Seebohm and Fustel have approached the subject with ineradicable prejudices in favor of an established theory or have been misled by sympathy with modern democratic tendencies. The fact is that most well-trained historical students are quite willing to adopt revolutionary theories; they have not welcomed Fustel's arguments, simply because these are not convincing. Many eminent historians firmly believe that Fustel, though a man of great ability, was guilty of the same sort of aberrations as were Kemble and Maurer. Flach, in his recent work (*'Ancienne France,'* vol. ii.), demonstrates that Fustel's data regarding the prevalence of manors or *villae*, as distinguished from free villages or *vici*, are entirely unreliable; that, in short, Fustel's use of contemporary records is quite unscholarly. This is also the opinion of other French historians who have handled the original sources. Mr. Bryan takes it for granted, however, that Fustel's arguments are flawless, and that all of his deductions are to be accepted without hesitation. If the new school finds no stronger mainstay than Fustel, its doctrine will not prevail.

Moderate adherents of the old view will have no difficulty in accepting the main conclusions of Mr. Bryan's last two chapters, which are entitled "The Mark in America," and "The Mark in Economic Discussion." He is right in asserting that it is hardly possible to find in the New England settlements "any of the distinguishing characteristics of the Teutonic mark theory which may not be otherwise accounted for." It is difficult even for ardent advocates of that theory to believe that early New England institutions were "derived from the forests of Germany."

*Recollections of a Virginian in the Mexican, Indian, and Civil Wars.* By General Dabney Herndon Maury, ex-United States Minister to Colombia. Charles Scribner's Sons. 12mo, pp. 279.

GENERAL MAURY'S "Recollections" are even broader than his title-page indicates, for some of his pleasantest chapters, showing a natural gift for narrative, are those which tell of his boyhood and his education at West Point. The sketches of old Virginia plantation homes in the vicinity of Fredericksburg are admirably done, and make a valuable addition to our material for the social history of the South in ante bellum times.

He has drawn with delicate touch and genial spirit pen-portraits of comrades in the cadet corps who became historical characters afterwards—Grant, McClellan, Jackson, Bee, A. P. Hill, and others. The chapters on the Mexican war give greater fullness to these sketches, and bring vividly before us another score of brilliant young men who were to make their mark on their era—Lee, Johnston, Thomas, Beauregard, and Stuart among them. After peace was made with Mexico, some of these friends were united again on a tour of duty as instructors at West Point; and even later,

when a dozen years of service on the frontier followed, familiar faces are constantly meeting us, as we follow the record of a soldier's career and learn from his sympathetic pen to make his friends our own, till the final explosion comes and secession drives this coterie of comrades into hostile camps.

The book is a pleasing one if we look at it simply as a narrative of the author's varied and adventurous experience; but it has a much higher and more permanent value in helping us to a personal acquaintance with a considerable group of men who made reputations on either side in the great civil war. To know them first as boys at school, and to see them develop into brave soldiers, daring Indian fighters, adventurous hunters of "big game," and finally into commanders of armies, is to give history a real life and power which the pages of the more systematic historian must lack, and which can be supplied only by personal narratives of the kind before us. General Maury's own part in the civil war was important, though he was not in the campaigns which most attract attention. His longest service was as commandant at Mobile, where no severe fighting occurred until the combined attack of Farragut's fleet and Gordon Granger's army. The only criticism a Northern man would be disposed to make upon the "Recollections" is that the writer has been unable to speak as fairly and as kindly of the National soldiers who really hurt the Confederacy as of those who by their defeats seemed in 1863 to be preparing the way for permanent disunion. With this deduction from the judgment of men and events, there is little else to mar the pleasure and satisfaction with which we read this abundant repertory of piquant incident and lively characterization.

The closing chapters are devoted to incidents of life as minister at the capital of Colombia, and give many details of society and affairs in the South American republic, with some strong pictures of tropical scenery. The reader will find the interest of the book sustained to the end, and will be glad of the opportunity of sharing with Gen. Maury's children the memoirs which he wrote primarily for their gratification.

*New Light from the Great Pyramid.* By Albert Ross Parsons. New York: Metaphysical Publishing Co. 1893.

THE author's long, rambling preface conveying no clear promise of what this book is intended to contain, we turn to the first chapter for light. This opens with four pages of insignificant quotations from unimportant authors—unimportant, at least, in regard to the pyramid—followed by another page of texts from the Bible, such as the parable of the two houses and other passages equally far-fetched. Next comes a section headed "The Pyramid Explained by the Fall of Lucifer." Glad of something like a definite position, we ask how we are to be convinced that this is true. The author first cites Isaiah xlii. 19, 20, which, after referring to Heliopolis, prophesies that an altar to Jehovah shall be set up in Egypt. Upon this the author argues as follows: The Hebrew word for altar (*mizbecha*) comes from the root of the Sanskrit *mri*, to die, and is identical with the second syllable of the word *pyramid*. The first syllable of this word, he avers, is the "Egyptian *pur*, fire." Hence, "a pyramid is an altar signifying death by fire." Now, Mr. Parsons informs us that one Wilson, in 1856, demonstrated that the pyramid interprets an ancient theory of gravitation applied to a body

P 60572

falling from a planetary distance; wherefore he asks us to regard it as proved that the pyramid bears witness to the fall of Lucifer.

This is not convincing. The passage of Isaiah appears to have nothing to do with the pyramid. No evidence is adduced to show that the Hebrew word for altar has any connection with the Sanskrit verb to die; and all we know of the two languages renders this extremely improbable. No evidence is adduced to show that the middle syllable of "pyramid" has anything to do with either the Hebrew or the Sanskrit word. No evidence is adduced to show that the first syllable of "pyramid" means fire. It is true that it might mean fire in Greek, but of the etymology of the word we are quite ignorant.

In the next place, Mr. Parsons must not presume that the world will take his word for it that the writer Wilson proved in 1856 that the Great Pyramid interprets an ancient theory of gravitation. On the contrary, nigh thirty years having elapsed without any man of any character for learning having accepted Mr. Wilson's theory, the burden of proof is upon Mr. Parsons if he wishes to convince any judicious part of the public that that theory is true. *Prima facie*, it seems quite absurd. How could there be anything like a mathematical theory of gravitation in ancient times without its affecting ancient thought very powerfully? And what sort of reasoning can prove two propositions so strange as, first, that there was such a theory in such primitive times, and, second, that the great pyramid was built with reference to that theory?

But even if, for the sake of argument, we grant, first, that the word "pyramid" means altar of death by fire (in which case, it is not an Egyptian word at all), and also that the Great Pyramid was built to illustrate a theory of gravitation, there still yawns a chasm vast and deep between these premises and the conclusion that the Great Pyramid bears witness to the fall of Lucifer. The world will think that bad reasoning; and there is no use in bringing before the world an argument that nobody who wishes to preserve the reputation of a sane head will admit. The book contains about 400 pages, and seems to pile such arguments one upon the top of another to make such a Babel-tower as would not be secure even were every stage of it laid with the utmost caution and solidity.

*A Short Account of England's Foreign Trade in the Nineteenth Century, its Economic and Social Results.* By Arthur L. Bowley. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1893.

THIS is a small book for a great subject, but the treatment is upon the whole so able that the brevity of the book is a merit. Length is desirable only when it promotes clearness, and Mr. Bowley, although apparently a young writer, has learned to be clear and concise at the same time. His book is in the same line as the noted treatise of Mongredien, and might be taken as a continuation of it were it not for the somewhat singular fact that Mr. Bowley does not allude to his distinguished forerunner. It differs, however, in covering the later years of British trade, and especially in dealing with volume rather than value. The importance of this latter feature we shall devote our space to explaining.

During the century 1791-1891 the population of Great Britain and Ireland trebled; but the value of the exports and imports rose from £37,000,000 to £744,000,000. The great causes of

this change were inventions, and the extension of the principle of division of labor through foreign trade. For Mr. Bowley clearly demonstrates that foreign trade exists only because of this principle, and that the prosperity of England is mainly due to legislation that has permitted her people to produce what they could most advantageously, by permitting them to exchange these products for such as other peoples had an advantage in producing. The full significance of the change, however, as we have intimated, requires us to consider the phenomena of price, for an increase in the money values of goods may or may not be coincident with an increase in their quantity. It is the latter circumstance that is of permanent importance, since there can be no question that he who gets more food and clothing for a less price is better off—quality being the same—than he who gets less of them for a greater price. Accordingly, Mr. Bowley resorts to the "index numbers" of Sauerbeck: "an imaginary budget is made out of a great variety of goods, wheat, cotton, wool, manufactures, tea, sugar, and so on. A definite quantity of each is taken in proportion to its importance; this budget is then valued at the prices current for each article for each different year. One date is taken as a standard, say when the budget comes to £100"; the year 1871 being selected by Mr. Bowley.

We must premise that the gravest errors are liable to occur in framing this imaginary budget; but, having given this warning, we shall assume that the method has sufficient scientific validity for the purposes for which our author employs it. It must be observed, too, that its validity is strikingly confirmed by the shipping statistics; the results from a computation of the volume of trade by index numbers showing a close parallelism with the tonnage of vessels cleared. Applying the method, Mr. Bowley finds that the date of Peel's first reforms is the date of the beginning of the fall of prices; the index number changing from 103 in 1840 to 75 in 1851—i. e., £75 in 1851 went as far as £103 in 1840. From 1851 to about 1870 prices rose again, but since then there has been a gradual decline. Roughly speaking, from 1820 to 1851 prices fell 33 per cent., from 1851 to 1871 they rose 26 per cent., and from 1870 to 1890 they fell 30 per cent. Hence the trade of the period from 1850 to 1870 is commonly regarded as excellent, while since 1870 or thereabouts the complaints of depression have steadily grown louder. If we look at the values of exports and imports, the complaints seem justified. In 1873 these values amounted to £682,000,000. In 1888 they were again but £685,000,000, rising in 1890 to £748,000,000. But if we consider quantities, by employing the gold values of 1871, we find that the trade of 1873 would be reduced to £613,000,000, while that of 1888 would rise to £980,000,000, and that of 1890 to £1,070,000,000. Per head of population, this would mean a rise from £19 in 1873 to £28.5 in 1890. The wails of the bimetallists over the evil state of the world do not seem to require very serious consideration, in view of these facts. The more conservative of them say that we must rehabilitate silver because a tendency toward lower prices paralyzes industry. So far from being paralyzed, it appears to have increased 50 per cent. in 20 years, i. e., every Englishman on the averages gets so much more from foreign countries and returns so much more to them. The tonnage figures tell the same story. In 1873 tonnage cleared at ports of the United Kingdom was 44,000,000; in 1890 it was 74,000,000. If we take Mr. Giffen's figures, including both internal and

external trade, we find that between 1870 and 1890 incomes and wages rose nominally 40 per cent., while if reduced to the value which gold had in 1871, the rise would be 100 per cent. The average workman could obtain with his wages in 1890 four times as much of the articles of common consumption as a man in a similar position obtained in 1820. While the increase of trade has not been so rapid in recent years as from 1840 to 1870, it would seem that the improvement in the condition of laborers has gone on at an even more rapid pace.

Space does not allow us to describe Mr. Bowley's other processes and results, or even to enumerate them. Suffice it to say that he examines the trade of Great Britain from many points of view, and in no instance that we have observed without unusual suggestiveness. It would not be easy to name any book that demonstrates more conclusively the case for free trade, although there is very little in it of what by the protectionists is called "theory."

*The Ideal of Humanity, in Old Times and New.* By John Stuart Blackie, Emeritus Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. Fleming H. Revell Co.

PROF. BLACKIE has chosen an admirable title except that it does not indicate, nor even suggest, the heterogeneous contents of his book. The first chapter has for its subject "David, the King of Israel." It might have been written in the happy consulship of Plancus, before the beginning of the critics, for all the profit it has derived from them. Either Prof. Blackie has not read Prof. Cheyne's Bampton Lectures on the Psalms, or he has given them no heed. David is for him the traditional "sweet singer of Israel," and, whether or not "a man after God's own heart," one after the author's own. In that matter of Uriah he was a little crooked, to be sure; but then he may have argued thus and so. As for Renan's accusation—that he was always instigating others' wickedness and profiting by it while hypocritically condemning it and sacrificing the instruments of his perfidy—nothing is said about it. Yet it is extremely suggestive of what was actually the ideal of humanity in David's time and for some centuries after.

That Prof. Blackie's attainments are in Greek and not in Hebrew will lead the reader to expect something better in the second essay "On Christian Unity." But evidently a critical study of the New Testament has not been within his scope, seeing that he finds his ideal of Christian unity in the New Testament and the early church. Queerly enough, moreover, the Jewish Christians are treated as the heretics and schismatics, when, in fact, they were the orthodox party and Paul was the radical come-outer; his first canonical appearance being in the list of the heretical Marcion. The chapter entitled "Women" has an old-fashioned tone of patronage towards "the fair sex," also called "the weaker sex," "the dainty sex," and by other similar names. There is a laborious argument for women's speaking in church, notwithstanding the injunction of St. Paul, and they may be permitted to practise medicine and to write novels; but about woman in politics Prof. Blackie is not so sure. "It is a sphere from which the purer nature of the more moral sex may justly shrink." Still, if women wish to vote, "it is their business, not mine. If they will walk with silken shoes in dirty puddles, let them walk." In a chapter on the Epistle to the Romans this recreant Scot takes direct issue with the apostle in the mat-