P 61093

burgh, resulting in his Gilbey lectures, delivered at Cambridge last year, and now published under the title of 'The History of the English Corn Laws' (London: Swan Sonnenschein; New York: Scribners). This volume, though avowedly prepared to meet the present discontents, is entirely free from partisanship. It emphasizes particularly the connection of the Corn Laws with British social legislation in general, and warns against the danger of appealing to historical precedents without taking into account all the circumstances of the case. Professor Nicholson thus corrects certain misapprehensions common among free-trade advocates; he shows, for instance, that the effect of these laws in raising prices has been exaggerated, and that the struggle for their repeal is incorrectly described as a conflict of class interests. But his removal of popular errors in nowise weakens the case against protection. Thus, he makes it clear that, though the Corn Laws did not produce constant high prices, the fluctuations in price which they did produce were an evil both to the farmer and to the consumer. The writer's careful investigation of this phase of protective legislation leads up to the conclusion that, while its intention was good, its results were disastrous. His comment on the present situation is suggestive rather than dogmatic, but Mr. Chamberlain's party will gather cold comfort from such an expression of expert opinion as this: "It is said that conditions have changed, and that a change of economic policy is required. To such a general statement it may suffice to reply that the conditions have certainly become more complex, and it is improbable that methods which failed under simpler conditions will succeed under more complex." That their failure was complete, Professor Nicholson entertains no doubt: "They did not steady prices or benefit the farmer; they did not prevent the flow of labor from the country to the towns, and they did not make the nation independent of foreign food supplies."

—As a piece of historical composition, Mr. H. S. Wheatly Crowe's 'In Defence of a King' (Liverpool: Edward Howell) is decidedly amateurish. But we doubt whether it should be tried by ordinary canons since it seems to be designed altogether as a work of edification. The King in question is Charles I., who, to Mr. Crowe, is the one type for all ages of the righteous man and the great ruler. Of his own book, the author says in a brief introduction: "Founded on history and on such private assistance as I could collect, I have stated nothing in these pages which has not been generally accepted as true, nor have I stated anything without having good reason and good authority for so doing." After this prefatory declaration, the whole apparatus of footnotes and references usually employed in controversial literature would seem to be unnecessary, and in fact it is not supplied. After the exordium already quoted, Mr. Crowe opens his first chapter with the following sentence: "It has never been doubted by anyone that when Charles the First came to the throne, if not yet outwardly, but inwardly, the English nation was in an uncontrollable state of boiling disorder; for the arbitrary and bigoted ideas of Elizabeth, especially at the latter end of her reign, had done very little for the country's good." The book closes as follows: "As the king's body was being carried to the chapel, a heavy snowstorm came on, and the black pall which covered the coffin soon became completely covered by a sheet of pure white snow. Thus a sign! proclaiming his innocence, and an intimation that he had been received into the hands of the Great Keeper of all things. God rest his soul." We furnish our readers with some means of judging the character of this volume by quoting its alpha and omega. What lies between may be styled one of the curiosities of literature. Lest this statement seem unwarranted, we will give one further excerpt: "When the dreadful deed was over, which denounced all those who were concerned in it as murderers, one could only say, that there had been foully done to death the best Christian, the best master, the best father, the most worthy gentleman, and the greatest man that ever lived."

—The third edition of George Kamensky's translation of Mendeléeff's 'Principles of Chemistry' (Longmans, Green & Co.), probably from the definitive edition of the original, incorporates a laborious revision by Mendeléeff, for the years intervening since the last edition have been wonderful years for chemistry. Our readers need not, perhaps, be reminded that the book, as an account of the distinctive properties of all the chemical elements, which is its character, is one of the most, if not the very most, marvellous achievement in making a subject of infinite details untiringly interesting, and investing it with a power of taking root in the reader's memory. It is also valuable as expressing with unusual openness all the processes of thought of one of the greatest scientific reasoners that ever lived. It cannot, however, be called a model of judicious and calm logic. Whatever proposition Mendeléeff inclines to, which must be something illuminating his most famous discovery, will be for him "a logical development"; while anything else will be a "hypothesis," regardless of its logical genesis. The phase rule is admitted to the rank of "a theory," which he hopes may in time develop into "the true theory." On many points he is skeptical about the doctrines of the new chemistry, and sometimes his objections have no little force, but they are always exaggerated. Perhaps the most valuable addition to this edition, because the substance of it will not be found elsewhere, is an admirable account of all the metals of the rare earths, contributed to this edition from the pen of B. Brauner, than whom no authority could be higher and probably no other as competent in every way for this task. It shows the "periodic law," as it is called—though it never was anything more than a rule of waviness—suffering under the serious defection of over a dozen elements; and a whole horizontal line (or two, as commonly drawn up) is erased from Mendeléeff's table. Brauner compares the series of elements from cerium to ytterbium to the triads in the eighth column, iron, nickel, cobalt, etc., where the atomic weights progress while the general chemical character remains constant. This is a matter of deep interest for scientific logic on account of the extraordinary success of almost all the predictions that have been based on Mendeléeff's scheme, which have by no means been confined to the existence of scandium, gallium, and germanium. It cannot, of course, break the probative force of successful prediction, but it must cause men to scrutinize instances of it, and see to what circumstances it may have been due. We must add that the "periodic law" retains all the value it ever had for other parts of the table. The three English editions of the book, which have represented three successive Russian editions, have all had different English editors. The first of them was a fairly competent person as translators go, and the others have been careful about getting the numbers right; the last corrects the form of some names, and Wyruboff, for example, no longer occasionally figures as Wernhoff. But otherwise, the new editor leaves much to be desired, and in several instances renders statements false which in the previous editions had been rightly given.

—Dr. O. E. Lessing, of the University of Wisconsin, has published in his "Grillparzer und das Neue Drama" (Munich: R. Piper & Co.) an interesting contribution to the rapidly growing list of works dealing with Grillparzer. The day is long past when not only critics of the stamp of Wolfgang Menzel, but literary historians of considerable acumen, like Gervinus and Julian Schmidt, could afford to belittle the significance of the Austrian dramatist; though, among the living, Rudolf Gottschall could still coin the ludicrous phrase that "Grillparzer was incapable of development." There has grown up in Germany, within recent years, a Grillparzer literature inferior in volume and minuteness of research only to that which gathers steadily around the names of Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, and Heine. No critical biography of the poet that has hitherto appeared in either Austria or Germany equals in scholarly comprehensiveness and charm of style the Frenchman Auguste Ehrhard's 'Franz Grillparzer: Le Théâtre en Autriche'; but many other notable monographs, such as those of Volkelt, Scherer, and Emil Reich, show that posterity has begun to ratify the judgment of Byron, who, in 1821, wrote: "Read the Italian translation by Guido Sorelli of the German Grillparzer—a devil of a name, to be sure, for posterity, but they *must* learn to pronounce it. With all the allowance for translation . . . the tragedy of 'Sappho' is superb and sublime! And who is he? I know him not, but ages will." . . .

—Dr. Lessing has, in his critical estimate, not unwisely ignored the crude and dismal (for all its poetic diction) "Ahnfrau," Grillparzer's first and long his most popular work, which allied him throughout his life, in the opinion of the unthinking, with the "fate tragedians" of the school of Müllner and Werner. "Die Ahnfrau" bears the same relation to Grillparzer's "König Ottokars Glück und Ende" or "Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn" that Schiller's "Robbers" does to his "Wallenstein" or "Wilhelm Tell"; but the choice of the subject in Grillparzer's case was purely accidental, as it was not in Schiller's. Dr. Lessing's main thesis—the influence of Hegel on Grillparzer's philosophic and æsthetic theories and on his political attitude—is somewhat forced. The poet's caustic wit spared Hegel, as many of his epi-