more for its direct teaching, than as a guide to the literature and to field study. The work is a good symptom of the recent and rapid rise of a consistent science in the room of the jumble of facts too often known as geography.

Albert Perry Brigham

Colgate University

The History of Oratory, from the age of Pericles to the present time.


Teachers who have found how quickly interest is kindled at the story of a great speech by Burke or Webster have often wished for a book that might be recommended to students as summarizing the history of oratory. Such a book Professor Lorenzo Sears, of Brown, has now supplied. Within the limits of something more than 400 pages the author takes us with alarming speed over the ages between Lamech and George William Curtis, dwelling briefly on each name that ought to be signalized in such a survey of the world's eloquence. That Curtis should be included in the list of great is due to a certain change of perspective which sets in as the historian's gaze travels over the centuries. The nearer to our own time the orator stands the more careful is the attention given him, a plan which for the purposes of American youth is not without its merits. No student, northern or southern, can fail to find Dr. Sears' story of American oratory as fascinating as it is clear and concise. But in the earlier part of the book the history of oratory seems to mean a very general summarizing of the characteristics of each orator and the principles of his composition. The stirring events which tested these principles are little regarded. The tremendous effect produced upon assemblies and courts by the masterpieces of Demosthenes, or Lycurgus, or Cicero is either ignored or set forth with none of the graphic power displayed in sketching the great moments of modern oratory.

Professor Sears begins with a short search for traces of oratory in early literature, particularly the Greek and the Hebrew. Thence he passes to forensic oratory in Sicily, and from this point to Aristotle gives us what, without disparagement to the epitomist, may be called little more than an epitome of Jebb's Attic Orators. On the natural oratory of Andocides, however, he lays rather more stress than does his distinguished authority. An unsatisfactory account is given of
Aristotle, the rhetorician; and Aristotle's is about the only rhetorical theory we are asked to know. Early Roman orators are written about with a fluency that is likely to mislead the uninitiated into thinking we have first-hand knowledge of these men. Cicero gets his meed in space; and his successors and Quintilian are put in their right historical light. The next step is to patristic oratory; the reader wonders why the later Sophistic, which in a sense prepared the way for this, and which makes a picturesque, instructive period, is omitted. The mediæval preachers, especially those of the crusades, are too little known. They are here adequately treated, though briefly. A diverting chapter on eccentric (mediæval) eloquence precedes the serious discussion of Savonarola, and the preachers of the Reformation. Modern French oratory is represented by the four great pulpit speakers of Louis the Grand, by Mirabeau and Napoleon, and by various men of the restoration. Pitt and British oratory in general get a chapter; while Mansfield, Burke, Sheridan, and Fox divide two more between themselves. The rest of the book, seven chapters out of thirty, goes to American oratory. The outline as a whole seems to have due proportion. The characterizations of individual men appeal to the reader as sound: they are the work of a trustworthy critical faculty.

Reference was made above to the unsatisfactory character of the chapter on Aristotle. This is rather superficial. The mischief begins with too much vague general praise, which at the end of the chapter becomes mere fine writing. The author says of Aristotle's language that "there is no indefiniteness about it, no mistaking the lineage of each minor and major proposition;" and this in the light of the utterly divergent interpretations reached by two of the most eminent scholars of our day, Jebb and Cope, concerning a matter so fundamental to the whole theory as is the euthymeme. Dr. Sears, by the bye, does not even mention the euthymeme. Other important matters go unexplained. Having alluded to the "topics," a term which needs elucidation if only to warn against confounding Aristotle's topics and those of Quintilian, the author remarks: "There is something in these commonplaces that reminds one of Bacon's Essays." It would have been apter to refer to Bacon's own commonplaces, the Antitheta that he wrote in imitation of Aristotle.

Professor Sears does not seem to recognize that Book II., which he dismisses with a line as being "about principles of belief, as related to the speaker and the hearer," is really a sweeping qualification of the
doctrine of Book I. That doctrine is that persuasion should be logical. But a large part of Book II. is a concession to the claims of the emotional proofs. In this elaborate if popular psychology of the emotions Aristotle recognizes more fully and more subtly than any of his successors the efficacy of the appeal to the sensibilities. It is therefore hardly exact to speak of "his neglect of whatever affects the sympathies or the aversions of an audience;" and it is tardy justice to add at the end of the chapter a half dozen lines calling attention to the chapters on anger, etc., "for the part which emotions occupy in the art of persuasion."

Nor is it exact to say that Aristotle "takes occasion to rank the art of expression side by side with the faculty of thought, logic;" for this assertion does not take into account that this "offshoot of logic," as he called it, was to Aristotle a somewhat contemptible science, trading in sophistry alone. To imply further that Aristotle elevates rhetoric "perhaps with an eye to Plato's slurs upon rhetoric" is surely less than half right; for Aristotle's rhetoric is little more than a cold scientific elaboration of that "false opposite" of logic to which Plato objected; the stamp of Plato's own sarcasm is on all the book. This looseness in the treatment of Aristotle makes it impossible for the reader to understand the theories of Hermagoras—whose cardinal doctrine of the issue our author ignores—or those of Dionysius, or Cicero, or Quintilian.

These facts necessitate a cautious use of a small part of the book. But no such criticism is possible of the swift, graphic, interesting account of mediæval and modern oratory.

E. H. LEWIS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Essentials of Arithmetic, Book II., for upper grades. By Gordon A. Southworth, Leach, Shewell and Sanborn, 1895.

This, the second part of the author's two-book course, is one of the most noteworthy elementary text-books of recent years. It is one of the very few works that have successfully broken from tradition. It is a rare event when a text-book writer attempts to be modern and does not fly off on a tangent, riding as it were a winged hobby until he is far away from this practical earth. Mr. Southworth is the hundredth man, yea, even the thousandth.