

second canto of the "Purgatorio" even essays to fix the time of Statius's baptism; and, thanks to that ceremony, releases Statius from Purgatory, while Virgil himself and the

Greeks who of old their brows with laurel decked are condemned to remain in Limbo. Dante believed that Statius had been decorated at Rome with the poet's crown, although the chaplet accorded to him is not of laurel, but of the lesser myrtle. Doubtless Dante conceived of this "concealed Christian"* as the first baptized follower of the new faith to win the ancient pagan honor, and Dante's own aspiration to win the laurel wreath, curiously blended as it is of Christian piety and reverence for pagan usage, seems to associate itself in a measure with Statius's example. "For its sake" (*i. e.*, for the sake of Dante's service to the faith), St. Peter had thrice crowned the poet; and the closing lines of the twenty-fourth canto of the "Paradiso" and the opening lines of the twenty-fifth, after describing that celestial ceremony, set forth Dante's longing for the terrestrial crown. But the earthly wreath must be a recognition of his services both to heaven and to the muses. The ceremony must be in his native city, that "fair sheep-fold" whence he had been expelled, but it must not be in court or public square. "If it ever happen that the sacred poem to which heaven and earth have so set hand, that it has made me lean for many years, should overcome the cruelty which bars me out of the fair sheep-fold, where a lamb I slept, foe to the wolves that give it war; then with other voice, with other fleece, a Poet will I return, and on the font of my baptism will I take the crown; because there I entered into the Faith which makes the souls known to God; and afterward Peter, for its sake, thus encircled my brow" ("Paradiso," Can. XXV, 1-12, trans. Norton).

Dante was not destined to receive the earthly honor which he craved; but when Petrarch achieved that goal of his high ambition (not, however, without scheming for it with true Italian diplomacy), he had, like Dante, the precedent of Statius in the very forefront of his consciousness. Petrarch, it is true, was too thoroughly imbued with the new spirit to emphasize, or perhaps even to think of, the Christianity of the ancient poet who had, as Petrarch supposed, won the chaplet upon the Capitoline; but, thanks to Dante, Statius had become a peculiarly significant figure, and it is Statius and no other whom Petrarch names as the illustrious precedent. And possibly Petrarch's own mistake as to Statius's "coronation" was due to a wrong inference from Dante's phrase in introducing that poet: "So sweet was the spirit of my voice," Dante makes Statius say, "that me of Toulouse† Rome drew to herself, where I earned the right to adorn my temples with myrtle" ("Purgatorio," XXI, 88-90, trans. Norton).

The point is, after all, perhaps, but a minor one. No doubt the Italian of the Renaissance, with his minute interest, not only in the literature, but also in the customs of ancient Rome, his academies "for promoting

*See the elaborate and ingenious, if not altogether convincing, study of Dante's conception of Statius's religious belief in A. W. Verrall's "To Follow the Fisherman" and "Dante and the Baptism of Statius." ("Essays," Cambridge, 1913, pp. 152 ff.)

†Chaucer, in "The Hous of Fame," retains this error as to the birthplace of Statius:

"The Tholosan that highte Stace."

the adoption of antique customs into modern life,"* and his feeling that in so doing he was renewing the golden age, would have appropriated this fine old pagan custom without the intervention of the Statian tradition. We know, in fact, that there were instances of laureation well before Dante's day; for St. Bonaventura (*Legenda S. Francischi, Opera*, VII, 280) tells us that one of the earliest converts which St. Francis made to his order was a certain inventor of secular songs (*sæcularium cantionum curiosus inventor*) who had been crowned by the Emperor (Frederic II, in his court at Naples), and was known as the King of Verse; but such instances were rare and spasmodic. The peculiar and factitious importance which Statius had to the mediæval reader, the new lease of life which Dante's emphasis in the "Divina Commedia" gave to him, and the explicit reference made by Petrarch on the occasion of his own "coronation," all contribute to make of Statius a sort of connecting link between the pagan custom and the efflorescence of laureation at the time of the Renaissance.

John Addington Symonds has written that "the ancient and the modern eras met together at the Capitol at Petrarch's coronation," and in no respect is this more curiously illustrated than in the part played by this traditionally Christian author of pagan epics in furnishing a precedent (albeit a mistaken one) for the renewal of the pagan ceremony of laureation.

Correspondence.

THE "NATION."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As a reader of the *Nation* for more than thirty years, I congratulate you most heartily on the fine jubilee number. It is in every way worthy of the splendid traditions of the paper.

To-day, as in the days of Godkin, the *Nation's* editorials must rouse the civic consciousness of the college youth of America and stimulate them to independent thought and action in their relation to the pressing problems of these times.

May it continue for many generations to inspire and to guide those from whose ranks some of the future leaders of the country will surely come.

JULIAN W. MACK.

Chicago, July 10.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wish to extend hearty congratulations concerning your semi-centennial number recently received.

I became a subscriber to the *Nation* in 1865, when I was seventeen years of age, and have been a continuous reader and subscriber from the first number to the present time. I treasure very much the complete file which I possess of this paper. It has taught me valuable lessons, and its reading has indeed been an education.

The cogent "King's English" of Mr. Godkin has never been surpassed in strength, virility, and beauty by any American journalist. To me he was an inspiration, especially for the cause of civil-service reform. My interest in

*Symonds, "Revival of Learning," p. 361.

this cause (witnessed by an active membership in the Executive Committee of the Civil Service Reform Association of Pennsylvania for over thirty years past) was largely due to the stirring appeals and vigorous battle waged by Mr. Godkin against the spoils system.

A fine photograph of this leader of men looks down upon me from my office wall, and is a constant reminder of a great spirit supremely dedicated to the cause of civic righteousness and administrative reform. And then, too, Mr. Garrison's thorough (in the fullest sense of that full word) conduct and management of the literary work and book reviews of the paper in my judgment has never been surpassed, and it is indeed very doubtful whether it ever will be. His work as shown in the files of the paper is his greatest monument.

I need not say that I read your semi-centennial number with absorbing, almost fascinated, interest. It certainly reminded me of the old days of the *Nation* to read the contributions from some of the first pillars of its early building.

May it long continue to be (as it always has been) a great force and influence in its chosen field.

JAMES G. FRANCIS.

Philadelphia, July 12.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I offer my felicitations to the *Nation* on its jubilee, and on its jubilee number.

These are bleak days for any kind of rejoicing; but the one thing left to cheer us is the tone of our best American newspapers and periodicals. Such an editorial as that on "German-American 'Misunderstandings,'" in the jubilee number of the *Nation*, should be enough to persuade the world that we are not the facile dupes that Germany pleases to think us.

AGNES REPPLIER.

Salem, Mass., July 13.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I thank you for my perusal of your impressive semi-centennial number.

It is hard to express one's sense of the peculiar human valuation of that fifty years' record of public service which hides its still ruddy virility, with a certain reticence, behind that staid black-and-white of the long-established format. Nothing of the futuristic here, yet much of the cherishable future in the justly cherished past—a future and a past which, to one who loves the destiny and history of his country, give to the present a kind of majestic assurance of the vitality and authenticity of American idealism.

There are, and will be, numerous tenets of faith, political, literary, artistic, upon which I, as an individual, differ with the *Nation*. What individual may not do so? The iris-hues of futurism which flaunt their bloom from many a more colorful journal have for me, on occasions, their fascinating shades and values. Yet, passing from occasional choices to a sense of continuity with that great living tradition of America, which has thrilled not once but again and again to the call of "Emancipation," the vast current of those fifty years, whose stormy sky and landscapes lie so quietly mirrored in the *Nation*, bears me on, I confess, with a kind of exultance in being a bubble on so cosmic a stream.

In several articles of your anniversary number, it is pertinently observed that the character of the *Nation* has been moulded by the characters of its successive editors. Its success has been that these characters have

themselves been plastic (with whatever individual limitations) to the mysterious creative forces of their time, mightier than themselves.

The Garrison-Godkin editorial tradition has stamped its historic pages, but history itself has stamped its editors. If I may make a comparison from the traditions of my own profession, the editorial sway of the *Nation* over its public has likeness to the sway of certain eminent producers of the theatre over their public. The total reportory influence of Henry Irving and Ellen Terry, though stamped with the genius of Terry and Irving, lives on by virtue of a genius larger than theirs—the genius of their audiences, the begetters of a new age. So, too, the house of Wallack flourished by a coöperation, in which that worthy American producer was a distinctive yet only a partial influence.

It is, then, a pleasant privilege, sir, to be able to felicitate you on your fifty years' celebration without being too personal; for, in wishing you joy of your golden wedding, I beg also to felicitate your loyal (if not always accountable) copartner—the American public.

PERCY MACKAYE.

Cornish, N. H., July 8.

PROFESSOR USHER'S "PAN-AMERICANISM."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me sufficient space to point out an erroneous use of words in your recent review of my "Pan-Americanism"? The review is headed "The Vaticinations of Professor Usher." The reviewer declares that "the volume is expressly announced as a prediction"; says that "neither the author on his title page nor the publishers in their advertisements have left anything undone to produce the impression that the prophecy is both definite and sensational"—the reference is to the sub-title, *A Forecast of the Inevitable Clash Between the United States and Europe's Victor*—that the inevitable clash refers to "our future war with Europe."

It is, however, an error to suppose that the word forecast is synonymous with the words vaticination, prophecy, foretelling, or that the word clash connotes the same meaning as conflict or war. There seems, indeed, to be but one usage sanctioned by authority. "Prophecy connotes inspired or mysterious knowledge or great assurance of prediction." It will hardly be denied that the reviewer's and editor's intention was to say that I had claimed on the title page such knowledge and assurance. The mention of the tripod places this beyond doubt, and the content of the review as a whole confirms it. The authority just quoted distinguishes forecast from prophecy as "conjecture rather than inference," while others define it as discernment beforehand, foresight of consequences, estimate of future happenings. Indeed, the word was chosen in order to disown any intention of predicting or foretelling, and in the hope of avoiding the inference that any certainty was claimed for any future happenings or that one probability discussed was more likely than another.

That the book itself produces this impression, your reviewer states with clearness; indeed, he cannot conceal his surprise that a book announced as a prophecy from the tripod should not contain definite prognostications. Mr. Usher, he says, "permits his book to be advertised in the most sensational manner as containing explicit and startling predictions; he himself incorporates such predictions in

his title and chapter headings; yet, in fact, he for the most part avoids choosing between alternative possibilities, and for nearly every event that he prognosticates, prognosticates also its opposite." I attempted to make clear my intentions in the preface: "to analyze, to discuss, and to examine . . . to treat so vital and controversial a subject objectively and with detachment . . . this has been my object." This I still believe to be not at variance with the accepted usage of the word forecast, and to differ widely from the common usage of prophecy and vaticination.

Did not the reviewer's difficulty lie in his original assumption that the book was meant to be a prophecy? Do not the majority of his remarks proceed directly from this assumption and depend upon its correctness for their validity?

A similar failure to apprehend the meaning of the word clash led to equally serious results. The assumption that it connoted armed conflict caused the reviewer to misunderstand many important phrases and passages, raised up hobgoblins and spectres, which were both absurd and ridiculous, and so colored the statements in the book as to render many nonsensical and improbable. Clash is defined as an interference, a disagreement, an "opposition as between differing or conflicting interests, views, purposes, etc." It was employed precisely because no reputable authority seemed to sanction its usage in the sense of armed conflict or the use of force. The book was intended to lead the reader to the conclusion that the use of force by us or against us seemed to me improbable, though possible, but that an opposition of interests and views with the victor seemed inevitable and would raise many and difficult issues, including those of armament and disarmament.

As the *Nation* in its review of my "Pan-Germanism" scouted the existence of Pan-Germanism itself as one of the wildest of imaginative speculations, a difference of opinion between the *Nation* and myself on issues of present international politics seems literally inevitable, but I should prefer that it should be due to deeper causes than the usage of words.

ROLAND G. USHER.

Washington University, St. Louis, July 14.

[We regret that we were betrayed into attributing to Professor Usher a greater degree of inspiration than was his due.—ED. THE NATION.]

A QUESTION OF CONTEXT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: *Quousque tandem!* Another exhibition of that curious mentality with which we in this country have become tolerably familiar since early in August last and with which we are destined to become more and more conversant, no doubt, as long as Germany's defenders persist in flooding us with the bright but unbearable light of their boundless and superior knowledge. The latest torch-bearer to appear in the *Nation* (July 1) is Mr. Jacques Mayer, of Munich. The science of misquotation, the art of irrational deduction, combined with the practice of inconsequential logic, misinterpretation of attested facts, and misconstruction of the plainest texts, have seldom if ever been carried to a higher degree of perfection than they have been since the appearance of that precious brochure "The Truth About Germany." Mr.

Mayer is simply following in the wake of the great and near great of his own land, when he cites Cramb in such an unfortunate but to him eminently satisfactory manner. One ought not to be surprised then, when on turning to Cramb's work to verify the quotation, one finds the first part of Mr. Mayer's citation on page 49 (E. P. Dutton's edition, 1914), and the second part, "So long, etc.," on page 16. Whatever be the true explanation of this inversion, it is a small matter, whether intentional or inadvertent. What is much more serious is the error into which apparently Mr. Mayer permitted himself to be led by his earnestness and strong convictions. He appears to believe, or intends that his readers shall believe, that he is quoting what was Professor Cramb's own personal opinion of England and of what she really is. In his all-consuming zeal Mr. Mayer seems to have given only a cursory attention to the context of both his quotations. Or is he deliberately misstating? At any rate, from a moderately careful perusal of Cramb's text the reader cannot but become aware that Cramb, far from giving to his fellow-countrymen in these words his own personal opinion or that of any other Englishman or Englishmen, was really giving what he conceived to be the opinion in regard to England prevalent at that moment in German circles.

W. A. McLAUGHLIN.

Ann Arbor, Mich., July 3.

DR. CONYBEARE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue for July 15, Dr. Conybeare writes from Oxford on June 29 explaining that he had been "over-hasty" in charging Sir Edward Grey with responsibility for the war. But on the front page of the same number there is an advertisement of the *Open Court* for July, in which an extract is given from an article by Dr. Conybeare, still making his charges against Sir Edward Grey. The advertisement (for which, of course, Dr. Conybeare is not responsible) is headed: "How one man's personal grudge has cost one million lives." It is also said that the article was originally sent to an English publishing agency and declined.

Which is the true view of Dr. Conybeare? It is natural to assume that this is to be found in his letter from Oxford, dated June 29. If so, we may rightly ask Dr. Paul Carus not to allow his pro-German partiality to prevent him from making the necessary correction in the August number of his magazine.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

Toronto, July 15.

[Dr. Conybeare's letter naturally expresses his revised judgment. Had the advertisement been brought to the attention of the editors, it would not have appeared.—ED. THE NATION.]

"THE BREAKDOWN OF INTERNATIONALISM."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The possibility, or otherwise, of Internationalism seems to me to depend on a question of personality.

Euclid tells us that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts, but it is equally true that the whole is often quite different from the sum of its parts. We ourselves, for in-

stance, are made up of many millions of cells, each living its own life and quite unconscious of the whole of which it forms a part, yet depending largely for its welfare on the actions of that whole, over which it has, however, little or no control.

Now, if the analogy holds, and we are each of us, while living our own lives, parts of a higher individuality—a nation, the real superman—Internationalism is an impossible dream, for we cannot really influence that higher personality; still less can we destroy it. But if the analogy does not hold, if a nation is an Idea, if its character is a kind of resultant of the character of its component individualities, Internationalism is possible, for one idea can be replaced by another.

In spite of the fact that the character of the German nation seems, unhappily, very different from that of the Germans I know—they do not, however, belong to the ruling classes of that country—I believe that nations are ideal existences and that Internationalism has a future. We have simply got to think in terms of humanity rather than in terms of nationality, and the latter idea will gradually fade away. But if such a change be desirable, patriotism is not a virtue, but a vice.

RICHARD KAY.

Hartland, N. Devon, July 1.

Notes from Two Capitals

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

By SIR HENRY LUCY.

The ex-First Lord of the Admiralty is not the first of his name to break up a powerful Ministry because he could not have his own way at a particular turn of affairs. Lord Randolph Churchill's son is, like his father, as headstrong as he is capable. He found his match in "Jack" Fisher. Suave in manner, modest in estimation of his own qualities, the late First Sea Lord, once driven into an attitude of resentment, is an exceedingly tough person to deal with. Naturally gratified when amid national plaudits "the dropped pilot" was, when war broke out, picked up again, he gave himself up heart and soul to administering the affairs of the navy he had created. All went well for some months, the success of the navy in casual encounters with the enemy and in the great task of keeping sea-room open for itself and its Allies testifying to the unity of capable direction at headquarters. Unfortunately, hereditary instinct asserting itself with his chief, Lord Fisher, believing his appointed domain was being systematically encroached upon, cut the painter. The Admiralty barge got hopelessly adrift, and before he quite knew where he was the Prime Minister found added to overwhelming duties and responsibilities the task of re-forming his Ministry.

Winston Churchill entered the House of Commons handicapped by the circumstance common to several members of the present Parliament, fatal to most of them, of being the son of a father illustrious in Parliamentary record. The younger and the older Pitt form a rare, perhaps unique, example where such accidental connection proved no obstacle to the triumphant progress of the son. Winston would be the last man to claim equality

with his father, who died too early to justify expectation raised by supreme, statesmanlike qualities occasionally obscured by brilliant guerrilla tactics. We get only one Randolph Churchill in a century. To old friends the son in many ways recalls the presence of the father. He does not resemble him in facial appearance, but has many mannerisms startlingly reminiscent. Designedly or unconsciously, he addresses the House of Commons in the same attitude Lord Randolph assumed when, with open hands resting on hips, feet set well apart, and head bent forward, he worried Stafford Northcote, or with the confidence that shone on the countenance of David when he went forth to fight Goliath, he girded at Gladstone.

More important resemblances between father and son are their capacity for work, their intuitive grasp of a question, their lucidity and force of speech. While he was still a private member it was noted that when Winston rose to speak on whatsoever subject, whether it was Fiscal Reform, War Office Administration, or the Allens Bill, he had mastered all the bearings of the case, carefully thought out their ramifications. His set speeches were even at this early time admirable contributions to debate. Even better, more immediately effective, were his remarks in the give-and-take discussion of Committee, or his interjected questions addressed to the Minister in charge of the business before the House.

Inheriting the rich gift of memory with which Lord Randolph was endowed, he is accustomed to write out his set speeches, learn them off by heart, and declaim them to a listening Senate. This habit on one occasion led to disastrous consequence. Nearing the end of a luminous address, recited with an ease and fluency that obscured the secret of the manuscript, he, towards the conclusion, lost his cue. He could not remember how the ultimate sentence of his speech was framed. After struggling for some moments he gave up the attempt, abruptly resuming his seat, his speech unfinished.

That was an accident inseparable from the method. A rarer and more precious gift in House of Commons debate enables a member to express in two or three pointed sentences a weak or a strong point observed as in a flash of lightning. Winston Churchill possesses that gift and improves it with daily practice.

It was characteristic of the statesman who, by a flash of grim humor, has upon the reconstruction of the Ministry been relegated to the obscure sinecure of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, that he should first present himself in the House of Commons as critic of an important measure introduced by the Government under whose flag he had won election at Oldham. The war in South Africa being in full blast, Mr. Brodrick, called upon to save the State, formulated a scheme of army reform warranted to avert repetition of catastrophe at the moment threatening the existence of the army and the stability of the Empire. The young member for Oldham, who had the advantage over the Secretary of State for War of having smelt powder and heard bullets whizz on more than one stricken field, sharply criticised it. He did more. One of a small minority, he went into the division lobby to record his vote against it. Two years later, further consideration of the Brodrick scheme resulting in general condemnation, organized attack was made upon it. As many as nineteen Ministerialists backed their hostile opinion by a vote in the Op-

position lobby. With the young member for Oldham, fresh to the Parliamentary arena, lay the double credit of shrewd insight into the real value of the portentous plan when first introduced with the blare of trumpets and the rattle of drums, and of courage in testifying to conviction by his vote.

This was an ominous launching of a promising bark. A steady stream of circumstance finally drifted it into the sea of Liberalism. Winston's constitutional independence, his blunt honesty, unfitted him for companionship with the well-drilled Parliamentary ranks of Conservatism. Nevertheless, had Mr. Balfour thought it worth while to have given his mind to the task, he might have captured and retained one who later became the lion cub of a Liberal Cabinet. From the first he openly resented the indiscipline of the son of his early comrade of Fourth Party days. The more he was snubbed, the more intractable Winston became.

Early in the session of 1904, when the long predominant Unionist Government was staggering to a fall, a motion for the adjournment was made from the Opposition side with intent to give them a helping knock on the head. It was Lloyd George who led the irregular attack. By coincidence—strange, in view of the close relationship established between the two young Cabinet Ministers under the Premiership of Mr. Asquith—Winston Churchill, still seated on the Ministerial side, rose to second the motion. Immediately, at a concerted signal, the shocked Ministerialists jumped up and with one accord left the House. They were prepared with more or less unconcern to sit out an attack on the Government opened from the enemy's camp. It is the business of the Opposition to oppose. When the assault was joined in by one from their own ranks, they marked their resentment of what they regarded as treachery by shaking the dust of the matted floor from off their feet.

That was the beginning of an inevitable end. Two months and a day later, Winston Churchill, sauntering in from below the Bar, paused a moment, looked round the House, and, turning to the right, seated himself in the Liberal camp.

Since the removal from the scene of the commanding figure of Joseph Chamberlain, the front bench of the Unionist party in the Commons has not been so fully endowed with strength and capacity that it could afford to drive out of the camp so promising a recruit. To its subsequent exceeding sorrow it succeeded in doing so.

CHARLES JOSEPH BONAPARTE.

We must show our teeth to Germany, says Mr. Bonaparte, of Baltimore, unless we are willing to be kicked around like Champ Clark's houn'-dawg. This is in line with the advice of Col. Roosevelt. The two men have usually been in accord since the time when Mr. Bonaparte, having pretty well made up his mind that the Republican party was on the road to ruin, singled out the Colonel as the good man in it to whom the people could afford to pin their faith.

The metaphor used, including its illustrative draft upon recent history, has a unique flavor, coming from an ex-Attorney-General of the United States; but then, Charles Joseph Bonaparte has a unique personality. It might be too much to say that he would be recognized at sight as a member of the former