

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

P 00583

art, both at the peak and summit of their profession, both simple and kindly gentlemen, courteous, modest, and sincere. Booth was, and Mr. Jefferson is, accepted as the most accomplished American actor of his time—the one in tragedy and the other in comedy; having this, too, in common, that they were men of high character, with a sweet spirituality of nature which does not always—or even often, perhaps—accompany artistic achievement. Mr. Jefferson had already revealed himself to us in his 'Autobiography,' the only book about himself by an English speaking actor worthy of comparison with the incomparable 'Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber.' Now Mr. Booth's only child publishes letters which disclose to us characteristics of his known before to his intimate friends, no doubt, but not suspected by the public at large.

Mrs. Grossmann's volume opens with her own recollections of her father as he appeared to her, set down simply and unpretentiously and with a captivating charm. Then follows a selection from the many letters he wrote to her and to certain of his friends. It is disappointing not to find this larger than it is; but it may be that Booth's correspondence with the late Jervis McEntee, for example, with Mr. Aldrich, and with Mr. Hutton, is reserved for a later volume, along with (let us hope) the notes written for Mr. Furness's Variorum Edition of Shakspeare and the two illuminative papers, brief little essays full of insight and appreciation, which Booth wrote upon his father and upon Edmund Kean for Messrs. Matthews and Hutton's series on the 'Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and the United States.' The letters here given have been well selected on the whole. They serve to reveal the playfulness and the humor which were among Booth's most marked characteristics, and also the deep spirituality which was the strong core of his character. In these pages we have shown to us truthfully Edwin Booth the man.

Edwin Booth the actor had been set before us already more than once, last of all by Mr. William Winter; and Mr. Winter has now expanded to equal size with his book about Booth the book about the Jeffersons which he contributed fourteen years ago to Mr. Hutton's 'American Actor Series,' and which was then reviewed at length in these columns. Mr. Winter has revised the biography and brought it down to date; he has added special chapters on the comedian's performances of *Bob Acres* and of *Dr. Pangloss*; he has worked in also accounts of certain of Mr. Jefferson's contemporaries, e. g., William Warren, E. A. Sothern, John T. Raymond, Laura Keane, Mark Smith, George Holland; and he has included furthermore an essay on 'Stage Art,' a perusal of which may be recommended to all who wish to understand the distinction between literature and the drama, and who wish to see how it is and why it is that the drama can exist and serve its own purpose with little or no aid from literature. It is to be noted with high approval that Mr. Winter's book not only has a good index, but is also enriched with what ought to be an indispensable adjunct of every histrionic biography—a full list of all the parts the actor has sustained.

Among the institutions of the *ancien régime* in France the French Academy and the Comédie Française have together survived the Revolution. That the great theatrical organization managed to live through the turmoil of '93 is little more than a lucky accident, for the house was divided against itself, and Talma the republican led a rebellion inside the walls

of the Théâtre-Français. This exciting period of theatrical history has been treated more than once already, but by no one so fully as by M. Henri Lamière in the book before us; perhaps M. Lamière is even a little too profuse and minute. His book is enriched by many interesting letters of Talma's, hitherto unpublished; and it helps to make clearer to us one of the most important figures of the French theatre, for Talma shares with Rachel the honor of being at the head of the serious actors of France in this nineteenth century. The book is dedicated to M. Jules Claretie, member of the French Academy and administrator of the Comédie-Française, who kindly contributes a rather perfunctory letter of approval, printed as a preface.

M. Parigot is already known to students of the modern French drama as the author of a biographical sketch of the late Émile Augier. He appears now with a volume of essays which proves him to be one of the best-equipped and most acute of French dramatic critics. It is not quite fair, perhaps, to speak of 'Le Théâtre d'Hier' as though it were a collection of essays, for it is really a book having an obvious unity of purpose. M. Parigot sees that a period of the French drama is about to close, and he considers in turn, contrasting one with the other, the chief dramatists of that period: Augier and Labiche, M. Dumas fils, M. Pailleton, MM. Meilhac and Halévy, M. Sardou, and M. Henri Becque. Of these the only one unknown or little known to the American playgoing public is M. Becque, who thinks himself, and is proclaimed by his friends, the leader of a new school of dramatists. Probably he was very disagreeably surprised when M. Parigot classed him as a "back number." What is worse, M. Parigot not only makes this classification, but, in his criticism of M. Becque's work, proves its justice. It is pleasant to see that his tone towards Scribe is not as intolerant as is now customary in Paris. Scribe was one of the great masters of dramaturgy, to be studied devoutly by all who want to understand the art of the stage. His formulas are not final, of course—no formulas are; they were first mastered and then simplified by M. Alexandre Dumas fils, and these in turn took the formula of the younger Dumas and simplified it still further, while keeping its strength. To the writers here in America who have been telling us the last few weeks how very great a dramatist M. Sardou is, a reading may be recommended of M. Parigot's study of the author of the 'Filles de Mouche,' in which full justice is done to his merits, while his demerits are set down also in due proportion.

*Modern Scientific Whist.* By C. D. P. Hamilton. New York: Brentano's. 1894.

This is a volume of 600 pages, the largest and incomparably the most thorough of all treatises on its subject. Our readers need not be informed that the invention in 1883 of the 'American leads' has elevated whist to a new position and dignity. A strong light is thrown upon the mathematical (if a little dry) quality of the American mind by the great access of popularity of the game that resulted from those improvements, although they imparted to it a severer character than it had had before. Formerly good players were to be met with in only half a dozen clubs in all the land; now they swarm.

The analysis of the play of the Third Hand occupies no less than eighty of Mr. Hamilton's pages. The illustrative examples are of a very

high order of excellence. We will quote one specimen, although it must be without the diagram given in the book, and without the lucid explanation of the principles it involves. But the reader should take the cards and look at this. The players A, C, B, D sit in this order of play. A holds: Spades, K, 9, 8; Hearts, 5; Diamonds, 8. C holds: Spades 4; Hearts, K, X; Clubs (which are *trumps*), X, 6. B holds: Spades, X, 5; Hearts, 9; Clubs, J, 7. D holds: Spades, 7, 3, 2; Diamonds, 5; Clubs, 9. Two rounds of trumps (Clubs) are supposed to have been played; and it has been made apparent that C and B each hold two more, and that B probably has a tenace over C. C is known to have the best Hearts. A knows that D holds the 5 of Diamonds. A has the lead. Here is the play:

1st Trick—Spades K, 4, X, 2.

2d Trick—Diamonds 8; Hearts X; Spades 5; Diamonds 5.

3d Trick—Spades 8; Clubs X, 4; Spades 3.

4th Trick—Clubs 7, 9; Hearts 5; Clubs 6.

This is fine whist.

It could not but be that a few of Mr. Hamilton's propositions are open to dispute. He is among those who are least favorable to playing for cross-ruffs. He says it is "cheap whist." So much the better; there is nothing so elegant as economy. He says: "It is *never* right to play a false card." This refers apparently to some standard of right and wrong too lofty to consider winnings. He says further:

"The vast majority of American whist-players play whist purely for the intellectual pleasure it affords—there is no other incentive. With such players the mere making of tricks is a secondary object, and to either make or lose a trick through deception is equally unsatisfactory. If the right to play false is recognized, there is then no limit to its pernicious and disintegrating practice."

This comes perilously near to silly pedantry. Of course we play for pleasure, and trying to make tricks is secondary to that pleasure; but there would be no pleasure in it if we had to have a schoolmaster put over us to make us play exactly as *he* likes, whether his way be conducive to winning or not. People who do too virtuous to wish to succeed by the aid of *ruse*, even in a game, are (thank goodness!) not long for this world. How such people can be so truculent as to wish to conquer their opponents at all puzzles us. It may be remarked that the whole practice of modern whist is a development of the Blue Peter, which was originally a sharper's cheating device. Our national horror for everything like deception and guile is well shown in our childlike game of poker.

As whist is largely an art of expressing one's self, we should expect to find whist-players fastidiously precise in their style of writing. If it be so, it cannot be proved from this book. Too many sentences are arranged like this: "You must always recollect, when planning any finesse, that if your finesse loses, the immediate loss is nearly always modified, provided, of course, that your finesse was justifiable, or turned into a gain in after-play." Or this: "In the last stages of the hand you are sometimes put to discard, holding a winning card of two plain suits, the opponent holding a losing card in one of them, but uncertain which." Or this: "Suppose partner opens the hand with knave of trumps; you have not one; your discard is from your weakest suit, but it may happen that it is injudicious to do so, owing to the unusual character of your hand." Injudicious to suppose partner so opens the hand, or injudicious so to open it?

Notwithstanding the bulk of the volume, we find nothing in it we should be willing to

spare, except four pages of maxims written in the style of morals to German fables, a style abominable in itself and absurd as applied to whist. On the other hand, there are several omissions we should be glad to have supplied in appendices to a new edition. Firstly, we think the work would hold its ground longer if it contained a discussion from the point of view of a wicked whist-player of the questions of cross-ruffs and false cards. Mr. Hamilton's loathing of deception is so great that we fear we can hardly hope for a quite accurate statement of the case from his pen. Such strong feelings are not favorable to scientific truth. We should also like some instructions how to play with an old-fashioned partner against two modern opponents; and in these, too, we demand a real low, sordid, trick-taking spirit—the moral tone of a man who would not stickle at playing blind-man's bluff itself. We should also like chapters on dummy, single and double. Finally, an extensive collection of calculations of chances would be instructive. Hamilton's 'Modern Scientific Whist' must for a long time be the leading treatise, and consequently all whist players must desire that it should be complete.

*The Egyptian Book of the Dead: The Most Ancient and the Most Important of the Extant Religious Texts of Ancient Egypt.* Edited, with introduction, a complete translation, and various chapters on its History, Symbolism, etc., etc., by Charles H. S. Davis, M.D., Ph.D. With 99 plates, reproduced in facsimile from the Turin Papyrus and the Leuvre Papyrus. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1894. 4to, pp. 181.

THE 'Book of the Dead,' as the 'Egyptian Bible' is known, is a most important work so far as the Egyptian religion is concerned, but, as a whole, it is by no means the "most ancient" of Egyptian religious writings. The texts contained in some of the pyramids are far earlier in authentic form, and the only proof of priority in favor of some of the chapters of the 'Book of the Dead' is contained in the claims which they make specifically in their own behalf. As an organic whole, with comparatively uniform contents and a generally recognized sequence of chapters, the book is not very ancient as Egyptian history is counted, being as recent as the Saite dynasty, say 650 B. C. Certain sections are undeniably very ancient, but most are of quite uncertain date. Of the method of growth we are distressingly ignorant, and for the most part hints as to which sections are oldest come incidentally from the comments and glosses of later writers. In the collection as it appears at various times and even in what may be called its codified form in the twenty-sixth dynasty, there is an utter lack of any logical or chronological succession or progression in the chapters. A classification based upon the present sequence of the sections is palpably absurd, as even an examination of Dr. Davis's pages shows. Champollion tried it long ago with no better success. Early copies varied as to contents as well as order, and, though supposed to be of great sanctity, the text was exposed to corruption at the hands of ignorant scribes and careless copyists, as well as at those of fantastic commentators. The result is a jumble of variant readings which have deterred all but the boldest from attempting a translation. Egyptian textual criticism is in its veriest infancy, and the colossal work of Naville, under the auspices of the Berlin Academy, has only laid the foundation for work in this line.

The translation by Renouf, now appearing in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, will be undoubtedly the best since that of Sharpe in Bunsen's fifth volume, but that it will be entirely satisfactory is beyond the bounds of expectation. The work of the translator is beset not only by textual difficulties, but by those incident to a multitude of mythological references to which there are only a few scattered clues. The single words may be plain enough, but the sense is exceedingly obscure.

To the solution of any of these difficulties, textual or mythological, the present work, which is to all intents and purposes itself a compilation, offers no new aids. In fact, the author does not seem aware of the extent of the mythological difficulties, for he scarcely mentions them and does not explain their nature and compass. Nevertheless, to those persons who desire to get light on the principal figures of the Egyptian pantheon and upon some of the best known features—perhaps the commonplaces—of the Egyptian religion, this book will be welcome. Dr. Davis has read extensively, to judge by his footnotes and references, and has succeeded in getting together a large amount of matter which is generally accurate and more or less pertinent to the subject. We have failed, however, to find evidences of very rigid criticism upon his sources, and of course none upon the original sources of all authentic information in this field.

The translation of the 'Book of the Dead' contained in the present volume is a literal rendering of Pierret's French version. From it, however, Dr. Davis has omitted Pierret's annotations, and in so doing he has not particularly helped matters. There is the less reason for this omission because there was sufficient opportunity to incorporate this matter in footnotes without cumbering the pages unduly. In passing, it may be remarked that even the uninitiated can note the uncertain state of the original text as it is reflected in the divergence between this version and that of Renouf; they appear to differ more than they agree. Of course a part of this divergence is due to the translators, but the differences of the text are responsible for the more striking variations. There are also two facsimile hieratic and hieroglyphic texts added in the ninety-nine pages of plates. One was taken originally by De Rougé from a Louvre papyrus, and the other is a reproduction of the plates in Lepsius's 'Tottenbuch.' The former is so much reduced in size as to be useless except so far as the vignettes are concerned, and the latter, while perfectly legible, suffers from a difficulty incident to photographic methods of reproduction. Those familiar with Egyptian papyri know that it was customary to indicate in red all chapter-headings and the beginnings of sections which correspond in general to our paragraphs. These are of great assistance in the reading, though of course not essential. In order to photograph the pages of Lepsius's work with good result, Dr. Davis has simply inked the red characters in black and so reproduced the whole in solid color. Otherwise the text is true to the original. It is a pity, however, that some means, such as underscoring, had not been devised to atone for what is a distinct blemish. Even the fainter color which the photograph of the red portions would have shown would have been better than a total obscuration of all distinctions.

The book is necessarily large and cumbersome, but the printer's work has been well done.

*Dictionnaire de la Céramique: Faïences, Grès, Poteries.* Par Edouard Garnier, Conservateur du Musée et des Collections à la Manufacture Nationale de Sèvres. (Bibliothèque Internationale de l'Art: Guide du Collectionneur.) Paris: Librairie de l'Art. Pp. lxiii, 250; 20 plates in color of decorative details and 150 marks printed with the text.

THE newest books are the best in all these matters of investigation and comparison, provided always that the new books are not mere compilations from the writings of others. Books only ten or twelve years old may mislead one, because not containing the result of the latest discoveries, as badly in ceramics as in Greek archaeology. What becomes of you as an authority if you talk nowadays of the *faïence d'Oiron*? It is nearly as bad as if you called it the *faïence Henri II.*; and yet it seems only yesterday that M. Benjamin Fillon set forth his proofs of the existence of the private pottery at Oiron or Oyron in the Department of Deux-Sèvres. Now we know, since Mr. Bonvallet published the results of his researches, and especially since the exhaustive essay contained in the huge catalogue of the Spitzer collection, that that ware was made at the village of St.-Porchaire in the Charente-Inférieure. It is a pleasure to see that M. Garnier is quite clear as to the correctness of Fillon's discovery that there was a sixteenth-century *fabrique* at Oiron. It is only as to the famous fifty-three pieces that he was wrong.

This book is new, and, but for the vexatious custom of omitting the figures, would be dated 1893. It consists of a dictionary of names of wares, geographical and other, and names of potters when those serve as names of wares; and associated with these are a few technical terms of assumed primary importance. The introduction is an excellent encyclopedic account of processes and of the general history of the industry and of the art. The whole is limited, however, to the earthenwares of Europe, excluding porcelains and Oriental wares of all sorts and also the productions of the nineteenth century. It is excellent for reference as to Palissy and Wedgwood, Rouen and Urbino, as to the stonewares of Nuremberg and Cologne, and as to English *faïence fine*. Perhaps its greatest service to Americans will be in the excellent account of the French decorative enameled pottery of the eighteenth century, Rouen, Nevers, Monstiers, Lille, Marseilles, Montpellier, and their congeners; but the Italian majolicas are well handled also, and the description of English wares is more technically accurate and more truly descriptive than that in any of the popular handbooks which are generally in use. The colored illustrations are confined to full-sized bouquets and borders, the author rightly concluding that these may be useful for identification, whereas small-scale pictures of whole pieces are mere ornaments to a book.

Blunders are to be noted, often caused by that curious indifference to proof-reading which is common to French and German books, and which goes to make them as cheap as they are, no doubt. Some of the blunders are not the printer's fault, however. Of "Barbmans," we are told that "they call so in Germany the brown stonewares which bear on the front of the neck a mask with a long beard"; and this word *barbmans* is used in the same sense in two other places. No doubt *Bartmann*, plural *Bartmänner*, is the word meant, as this is still the German name for what is called in English a *Bellarmino* or *Graybeard*. In most instances, however, M. Garnier gets his most