

here treated." And in this consists the originality of the work.

No one was better qualified for his difficult task than was Prof. Ebert, whose profound knowledge of every period of European literature has been attested by a mass of valuable articles and books, and enables him constantly to point out influences which would have escaped another. The general mode of treatment is a compromise between the older biographical method and the modern pragmatic literary history. The authors are treated chronologically one after the other, with an account of their lives and works, and a synthesis of the period to which they belong is given in an introductory essay placed before the divisions of the work. There are inconveniences in this method, and it is to be regretted that the author did not fuse his materials into one narrative. What, however, distinguishes Ebert's history from its predecessors, besides its extraordinary thoroughness and correctness, is an absence of bibliographical baggage, although all necessary references are given, and the completeness with which the works under examination are characterized and analyzed. Too much praise cannot be bestowed upon this feature. Only those who have worked their way with aching brain through the thicket of mediæval theological literature (much of which is entirely uninteresting in itself, but of vital importance for its later influence) can appreciate the endless pains and toil this part of the work must have cost the author. To mention but one example, Augustine's *'Civitas Dei'* is analyzed in fourteen pages, in which every point of importance in the twenty-two books is clearly brought out. In other words, Ebert's analyses are sometimes genuine compends of the original, and hence an immense saving to the student.

The reader must not expect to find in Ebert a perfect substitute for the earlier works of Cave, Oudin, Fabricius, etc. It was no part of his plan to give a complete history of Christian-Latin literature in all its branches. His work embraces the practical-moral and ascetic as well as the historical literature, the dogmatic-speculative and polemical only exceptionally. Ebert's original plan was to write a general history of the mediæval literature of Europe. What he has accomplished is the history of Christian-Latin literature from its beginning to Charles the Great (vol. i); the Latin literature from Charles the Great to the death of Charles the Bald, 877 (vol. ii); and the Latin literature from the death of Charles the Bald to the commencement of the eleventh century, together with the beginnings of the national literatures, Anglo-Saxon, German, and French (vol. iii). In other words, he has given the history of that branch of Latin literature, without the classic pale, on which rest the national literatures of Europe, and he has brought his work down to the beginnings of those literatures, except in belated Italy and Spain.

The period which follows is of supreme interest, and no one can be a better guide than Ebert would have been; but it is also true that the means for the study of this period are more plentiful and easier of access, while Ebert has led us through what was a trackless waste. The author has not laid down his pen because he deemed his task accomplished, but because his failing health demanded it. Let us be thankful he was spared to do so much, and not grudge his weary hand its well-earned rest. May his declining years be cheered by a hearty recognition of his monumental work, an honor to his country and a glory to himself; and by the gratitude of the scholars of all lands

who shall say, in the affectionate words of Dante—

"Tu duca, tu signore, e tu maestro."

The Orbis Pictus of John Amos Comenius.
Syracuse, N. Y.: C. W. Bardeen. 1887.

We welcome this resurrection of the *'Orbis Sensualium Pictus,'* which has lain too long in suspended animation. This masterpiece of Comenius, the prince of European educators in the seventeenth century, was the greatest boon ever conferred on the little ones in primary schools. Its author had grasped the idea of object lessons as fully as any modern, and developed it by a picture on every page of his book. Comenius, a Moravian, born in 1592, had no certain dwelling-place, but, by war or persecution, was tossed about all Germany, Poland, Hungary, England, Sweden, and Holland. He was urged by Winthrop to become President of Harvard College. Each change showing him a new significance in words when he came to see the things they denoted, he became impressed with the value of pictorial illustrations, and most of all in our childish plastic era. Hence his book was a natural growth.

It was not, indeed, the earliest picture book. The Egyptian *'Book of the Dead'* was equally a picture book. Nor was it even "the first children's picture book," according to a phrase which the publisher, quoting from the *'Encyclopedia Britannica,'* puts on its title-page. Its first issue in 1657 was more than two centuries after the appearance of the *'Biblia Pauperum.'* *'The Bible of the Poor'* was a kind of catechism in which children learned to read, and that about things and scenes shown on the same page with the letterpress. The *'Biblia'* has 200 pictures, the *'Orbis'* only 151, and those in size and artistic merit much inferior to what we see in the *'Biblia.'* Where, then, is the merit of Comenius, which gave him a swifter and wider popularity than Webster's Spelling-book achieved for him—and that in many lands and languages? His forte lay largely in two things. His scope was not Biblical, but it ranged through all the common things that lie before every child. The house, shop, trades, sports, birds, beasts, furniture, tools, all things now of most interest in a Kindergarten, are depicted. A blackboard is seen on the school-room wall. In the next place, each change of many-colored life thus brought before the eye, which catches in an instant what the ear cannot learn in an hour, is analyzed. A dozen or more of the salient features on every page are marked each with a number, which leads to its name, as in United States ordnance manuals, and that is noted in the margin in two languages—Latin as well as the vernacular. Thus attention is fixed, interest roused and concentrated on definite points, the scholar becomes an active seeker and not a passive recipient. The result is a minimum of teaching, but a maximum of learning, and children become bilingual unawares. This method of teaching Latin rose again among us in the Hamiltonian or inter-linear method.

Mr. Bardeen has applied photography to reproducing the woodcuts of 1657 just as they greeted Comenius himself. They are archaic and refreshingly quaint. It is interesting to compare and contrast them with the plates of the first American edition, published in New York in 1810 from the twelfth London edition. These were modified as respects dress, utensils, etc., to suit the time. The same first edition contains three more chapters than the present.—one being on Botany, and another on the Deluge.

In the Cyclopædia of McClintock and Strong

six books by Comenius are described, but his greatest work is not mentioned. His death is there printed as 1631. That date may be a misprint for 1671—which is also an error—and should be 1670. Mr. Bardeen's dates, too, are divided against themselves. His cuts are said to be "copies from the first edition of 1658" (p. iv.), but then the work was "published in 1657," as we are told three times over, pp. vi., vii., ix. The latter date is correct.

Three Kingdoms: a Handbook of the Agassiz Association. By Harlan H. Ballard. New York: Writers' Publishing Co. 1888. 12mo., xii, 167 pp., illustrated.

THIS little book, which has reached its seventh thousand, was prepared to meet the necessities of that excellent organization so widely known under the name of Agassiz. It has an introduction by Prof. Alpheus Hyatt, in which he points out the benefits received and likely to inure to the community from the efforts of the Agassiz Association, and pleads for a permanent endowment to secure its future prosperity. The contents comprise an historical sketch of the Association, rules for organizing new chapters, plans for work and preservation of material, directions for the profitable study of the different branches of natural history and anthropology, instructions in regard to exchanges and as to making reports of work accomplished, and references to books, in all departments of science, which the student may find useful.

The repeated editions of this handbook called for show that it meets many of the needs of the young student of nature, and, doubtless, on the whole much better than any other existing publication. We wish the Association and its handbook continued development, progress, and improvement. There are a few typographical errors which should be corrected, and one portion, the bibliography, can be, and we hope will be, considerably improved in later editions. The assistance of a trained librarian would be most useful here, and there should be a certain amount of judicious and impartial comment on each item of the list, so as to give to those looking for handbooks in special sciences some idea of what each book contains and for what purposes it is suited. There are references to some books in the list which we cannot regard as suited to the needs of the members of such an organization. Others are objectionable as deficient in quality, or sensational rather than scientific in their contents. We do not doubt that the editor has used every endeavor to obtain titles of useful works, and the result shows, among other things, how very deficient in certain directions is our elementary scientific literature. Astronomy, botany, ornithology are well provided for. The lower invertebrates are much less fortunate.

Nothing partaking of the nature of an advertisement, except it be frankly introduced as such, should be permitted in such a handbook; and in future editions the so-called "Chapter xxi" should be headed "advertising," or in some other way more clearly display to the least suspicious and youngest reader its purely commercial character. We venture on these suggestions in the belief that they will be more helpful to the editor and to the Association than the use of the more considerable space we might have justly filled with praises of the many excellent and useful features of their little book.

Verner's Law in Italy. By R. Seymour Conway. London: Trübner & Co. 1887.

THIS book deserves mention here for several

reasons. In the first place, we may save from a possible disappointment some book-buyers who expect to find in the work a treatise on Roman or Italian law. In the second place, as the work of an English scholar who rises above the "parlor-philology" of Müller and Sayce, and shows himself familiar with the literature, results, and methods of the most recent investigations in comparative philology, it is a *rara avis in terris*. Thirdly, the book is a most important contribution to the history of the Italic dialects.

Verner is no statesman or law-giver, but a modest Danish philologist, who, in 1875, published in *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* (vol. xxiii) the results of investigations which summarily explained a great residue of so-called "exceptions" to Grimm's law by referring them to the influence of a pro-ethnic system of word-accent. Thus the hitherto inexplicable discord between the *t* of *vater* (Goth. *fadar*) and the *d* of *bruder* (Goth. *brōthar*) was referred to the ancient accentual difference of *parís* (Sansk. *pítá*) and *phárós* (Sansk. *bhrátá*). On the same principle was explained the apparently arbitrary representation of pro-ethnic *s*, sometimes by *s*, sometimes by *r*. Thus the *r* of *ear* (Lithuan. *ausis*) and the *s* of *nose* (Sansk. *násá*) both represent a pro-ethnic *s*, but the ancient accent followed in the former case and preceded in the latter. The fact that, in the original inflection of the preterite of strong verbs, the accent was upon the root in the singular, but upon the ending in the plural, explains the difference of consonant in *I was; we were*. German *er war*, like our vulgar "*he wor*," is due to the analogy of the plural.

It is this form of "Verner's law" in its application to the Germanic sibilants that Conway, by a happy inversion of ultramontanism, proclaims as a rule of order for their Italic brethren. It is a well-known phonetic law that *s* between vowels in Latin is changed to *r*; thus: *nefarius* but *nefastus*, *funeris* but *funestus*, *gero* but *gestum*, *virus*; Greek *ís*, etc. Still, a goodly number of exceptions have remained, despite all the juggling and conjuring of the grammarians, as *nasus*, *miser*, *asinus*, *quaeso*, *vasum*, *Caesar*, *casa*, *caseus*, *rosa*, etc. In all these, according to Conway, the *s* has been retained on account of the preceding accent.

In order to explain all the cases of change to *r*, he is obliged to assume that the accentuation of the period when rhotacism took place was not entirely the same as that of the classical age. Here his results lack certainty. A portion of the changes to *r* are also caused by the proximity of the vowels *i* and *u*; thus, while *quaeso*, which is used only in the first singular, preserves its *s*, *quaerit*, *quaerimus*, etc., accept *r* under the phonetic influence of *i*, and *quaerebam*, *quaeremus*, etc., through the shift of accent. The physiological reason for this influence of *i* and *u* is fully established by a course of proof that forms perhaps the most brilliant and universally serviceable feature of the essay.

The author appears to be unconscious that a suggestion of a solution similar to his own was made by Sophus Bugge in vol. xl of the *Rheinisches Museum* (1885), p. 475; and he takes no notice of an article by Wackernagel in vol. xxix of *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* (1887), pp. 127 seq., which shows a similar though less far-reaching influence of the accent upon sibilants in Greek. The book is full of fruitful suggestions upon a wide range of subjects more or less directly connected with the principal theme.

Mr. Conway is a former scholar of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Is it a mere coincidence that another recent English book,

Roberts's 'Introduction to Greek Epigraphy' (1887), which shows a like careful use of latest German sources, though not the same fertility of thought and independence of judgment, should come from a fellow and tutor of the same college?

The Seminary Method of Original Study in the Historical Sciences illustrated from Church History. By Frank Hugh Foster, Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at Oberlin. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888. Pp. xi, 129.

TEACHERS and advanced historical students will alike welcome Prof. Foster's lucid and suggestive little book. He has set out to do three things: to show that investigation is valuable to any student and practicable in any large college; to lead students into the best methods; and to show the special necessity for "seminary" training in the education of ministers. He has done all three things well. The first question which would be asked by a college president about a new method of instruction is: Does it help men on in the world? And though Prof. Foster does not discuss the bread-and-butter aspect, he does make it plain that the work of investigation pays; that it pays the world at large, through the knowledge opened up; that it pays the student, through an increase of power. The four chapters in which the author describes the seminary method are studded with suggestions; no one who is trying to learn something about history from the sources could fail to find help in them. The distinction between "guide-books," sources, and other men's work is made especially clear. The principal deficiency seems to be a failure to direct students at the beginning of their work to the primary bibliographical helps, such as Vallée's 'Bibliographie des Bibliographies,' Petzholdt, and the indexes to periodicals. In this, as in the two other parts of the volume, the constant illustration by specific examples adds to the value of the book and makes it useful to persons obliged to work without a teacher. The third part, on the application of the method in theological seminaries, has more than a pedagogic importance. The Church cannot hold educated men save by a fearless application of the principles of historical evidence to its own beginnings and doctrines. To train the clergy in investigation means not only that they will be more powerful and better equipped men, but that they will be able to meet the critic upon his own ground.

For the neatness of type and binding, and for the convenient table of contents and index, the author and publishers deserve the thanks of the reading public.

The Life of Amos A. Lawrence. With Extracts from his Diary and Correspondence. By his son, William Lawrence. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1888.

THE author of this volume has discharged his filial office well. He has told enough, and with sufficient illustrations from journals and correspondence, to give a clear idea of his father's life and character, and we never, for a moment, wish that he had been less explicit in his details or less expansive in his treatment of particular matters. The proportions and the arrangement of the book are excellent, and the photographic illustrations are an admirable addition to the text. No amount of writing could have given so full and pleasant an idea of the house at "Cottage Farm" as the picture of its smothered cosiness. Mr. Lawrence suggests

that the record of his father's work and motives may have an interest and inspiration which some may not find in the biographies of greater men. It may well be so, and we could wish that it might be very widely read by business men, especially by those having a great deal of money. But there is a class who need it even more—the labor reformers, for whom all capitalists are selfish knaves. Mr. Lawrence's methods of generosity and public spirit were not unexampled. There are many such as he in the community, and they are doing more to solve "the labor problem" than the Anti-Poverty Association and all the medicine men, more or less famous or infamous, who have each a panacea for our social ills.

Mr. Lawrence was well-born, being the second son of Amos Lawrence, one of the brothers of whose business energy the city of Lawrence, Mass., is the enduring monument, a man of great probity and simplicity and social earnestness. Young Amos was a good boy—even his Harvard rustication being a precautionary measure—but he was not so extremely virtuous that he could not write to his father: "The morality and general observations of your letters, disconnected from the other matters and printed, would make a very instructive volume." As early as his Senior year he developed for himself a scheme of life to which he was entirely true in after years, with the exception of its literary prospect. He meant to be a rich man with a literary and farming attachment. To wealth and farming he attained, but not to the literary part. He would hold his wealth in trust for others' good, as well as for his own enjoyment, and this he always did. One of his least successful business enterprises resulted from his acquaintance with the Rev. Eleazer Williams, of French Dauphin notoriety. The pretender wanted money on his Western lands, and gradually unloaded all of them on Mr. Lawrence, who, finding them very burdensome, did all he could to improve the intellectual and moral condition of the people living on them.

The chapters relating to Mr. Lawrence's political and anti-slavery action are the most interesting in the book. He was an anti-slavery Whig, much interested in Liberian emigration. The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was a great shock to the cheerful optimism he had been cherishing. He immediately became the principal coadjutor of Eli Thayer, whose Massachusetts Emigrants' Aid Association conspicuously aided in making Kansas a free State. He was the Treasurer of the Association, and he advanced all the money which its frequent stringency demanded, besides being the principal contributor to the funds. The town of Lawrence was named for him in token of his important aid. He was well acquainted with John Brown, and had great admiration for his character, while doubting the soundness of his judgment more and more as time went on. He headed the subscription which secured to Brown's family the North Elba farm. He had no knowledge of Brown's Virginia plans.

But all this experience did not make him an Abolitionist, nor even a Republican. It was his house that received Sumner after Brooks's attack, but a Fillmore flag hung over it. In 1860 he was the Union-saving Bell and Everett candidate for Governor of Massachusetts. In February, 1861, he went to Washington, with others, to urge the Crittenden Compromise. Failure awaited him, and he went home and began to drill his friends and neighbors. The war found in him a vigorous champion. He could hardly be deterred from enlistment. He recruited the battalion of cavalry which was commanded by Col. Charles R. Lowell.