

The faithful Parsee receives his reward on this earth by becoming a rich merchant, for the eleven hundred Parsees in India, mostly in Bombay, are a shrewd and successful set of business men, wiling many a rupee from the pockets of the dreamy Hindus.

But are not we Americans adopting this fine Parsee ideal of "two blades of corn" this year?

Says the head of a sanitarium: "We are going to start a farm this season." Says a New Yorker: "We are going early into the country this spring to start a garden." Says a small property owner: "I must offer my three empty lots for the town to use for vegetables." Says every farmer: "I must raise just the largest crops I can to feed our soldiers."

The ideal has been placed before us by the government, and we are showing ourselves true Parsees and patriots in attempting to produce enough corn "so that others can buy it cheaply and readily."

DR. BERNHARD PICK.

It is with deep regret that we chronicle the fact that Dr. Bernhard Pick died in the early spring. Readers of *The Open Court* are familiar with the painstaking character of his scholarship and research. Beside numerous magazine articles on critical subjects relating to the history of Judaism and the early Christian church the Open Court Publishing Company has published his *Paralipomena* (Remains of Uncanonical Gospels and Sayings of Christ); *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter, Paul, John, Andrew and Thomas*; *The Cabala*; *Jesus in the Talmud* and a collection in German and English of *The Devotional Songs of Novalis*.

Dr. Pick's most recent publication was a pamphlet *Luther's Battle Song* in commemoration of the quadricentennial of the beginning of the Reformation in 1517. It is a historical investigation as to the year and occasion on which Luther wrote the song, and Dr. Pick came to the conclusion that it is most probable that he wrote it in Oppenheim in 1521 on his way to the diet at Worms. The original script of the hymn set to music is signed by Luther in facsimile.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

DER TEUFEL IN DEN DEUTSCHEN GEISTLICHEN SPIELEN DES MITTELALTERS UND DER REFORMATIONENZEIT. Ein Beitrag zur Literatur-, Kultur- und Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands von Dr. phil. Maximilian Josef Rudwin. *Hesperia: Schriften zur germanischen Philologie*, herausgegeben von Hermann Collitz, No. 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. Pp. xii+194. Price \$1.75.

Dr. Rudwin, the author of this *Dissertatio de rebus diabolicis*, who is instructor of Germanic languages and literatures in the University of Illinois, is not a stranger to the readers of *The Open Court*. Nor is he an amateur in the study of the religious drama, as he is already the author of studies on the prophet-scenes of the medieval religious drama (*Die Prophetensprüche und -zitate im religiösen Drama des deutschen Mittelalters*, Leipsic and Dresden, 1913); on the relation of the medieval religious drama to the liturgy of the church, and to the theology and mythology of the Middle Ages ("Zum Verhältnis des religiösen Dramas zur Liturgie der Kirche," *Modern Language Notes*,

XXIX, 108-109; "The Religious Drama of the German Middle Ages," *Ibid.*, XXX, 151-155; "The Origin of the Legend of *Bos et Asinus*," *The Open Court*, XXIX, 57, 191-192; and on modern passion plays ("Modern Passion Plays," *The Open Court*, XXX, 278-300, May, 1916); and of a bibliography of present-day German passion plays ("Passion Play Literature," *Bulletin of Bibliography*, IX, 66-67, 90-93, July and October, 1916). In this monograph, which is composed of two almost equal parts, Dr. Rudwin has given a study, on very broad lines, of the role the devil played in the medieval religious drama, which continued to flourish in some Catholic parts of Germany to the end of the sixteenth century, and of the creator of this role, the German people of the Middle Ages. This book concerns itself with the devil only in so far as he is portrayed in the German medieval mystery and miracle plays. Within these limits, however, the book is a mine of exact and exhaustive information. A very large amount of the dramatic literature of these epochs has been carefully read, and every allusion to the devil excerpted and the mass of material thus gained classified.

Dr. Rudwin correctly points out that the devil in the religious plays is a character borrowed from the Bible and the Apocrypha, and rests mainly on Christian tradition. He is not, however, the scriptural Satan. Commingled with this Oriental personage is the ancient Germanic Loki and a swarm of spirits, goblins, elves and fairies. In other words, the medieval devil is a complex being, a creature of a hybrid nature.

The devil first appeared on the stage in the scene of the Descent into Hell in the Easter play. With the growth of the Easter play into the passion play is analogous the growth of the devil's role, developing from a passive secondary character into an active character of the first rank. The development of the role is traced in this book as the different scenes are added to the cycle of the passion play until, with the inclusion of the episodes of the Fall of Man and of the Last Judgment, the devil appears as the Alpha and Omega of the Christian world system.

A careful study is made in the first part of the book, which bears the title "Die Teufelsszenen im mittelalterlich-religiösen Drama," of the role of the devil in all of the scenes in the medieval German religious plays in which he appears. In each case, the theological or biblical foundations for the part are given; the source of the role is indicated and its development is traced; the contents of the scene are fully described, in which process the different, at times contradictory, versions of the same scene are harmonized, the number of verses in each scene in which the devil plays a part, and the different names applied to the devil in different plays are tabulated; the professions and social status of the damned souls and the punishments meted out to them are given in the Hell scenes. The fifth and last chapter of the first part deals with the *mise en scène* of the devil-scenes.

The second part of the book, which has as title "Der deutsche Teufel in Mittelalter" is devoted to a study of the medieval German devil and of all his activities as reflected by the religious plays. This is the most original and valuable part of this interesting book. The Hebrew Satan, who is largely derived from Parseeism, develops, subdivides, and, one is tempted to say, propagates himself in the Christian Middle Ages until there is a whole infernal hierarchy of evil spirits with Lucifer, the Fallen God, in command, Satan as Lucifer's lieutenant and viceroy of Hell, and a host of lesser devils in attend-

ance. Nor are these devils all of one kind. A keen analysis shows the difference in character between Lucifer, Satan, and the lesser demons. The author also traces the relations of the fiends with each other (not forgetting those of the devil and his mother), their dwelling-places in Hell and on earth, their implements and weapons, their food and drink (not forgetting the hellish beer), their songs and dances, their qualities and their relations with heavenly and earthly powers, God and man and woman and priest, their triumphs and their final fate.

The chapter on the devil as *simia Dei*, the direct antitype of God, will be of great value to the student of folklore. Much of the character of the devil, the author shows, can be explained by the fact that the role of Lucifer develops as contrast to and as the reverse side of the role of the Christian Deity, that the devil is conceived to be the ape of God.

The bibliography is very extensive. It contains not only a great number of references to the literature on the medieval German religious drama and on demonology, but also an alphabetical list of medieval German mystery and miracle plays with their text-editions, or synopses, or historical references.

Nδρ.

THE BASIS OF DURABLE PEACE. Written at the invitation of the New York *Times* by *Cosmos*. New York: Scribner, 1917. Pp. 144.

This book is an impossible solution of the problems of the war based upon the most abominable distortion of facts. The author takes the pro-British standpoint and would not allow an inkling of justice to Germany. "A durable peace," we are told in the last chapter, "depends upon the victory of the Allies." France must receive back the territory now invaded and Alsace-Lorraine; Russia, Constantinople and the Dardanelles, and German militarism must be crushed. In Germany the wise magistrates of Nuremberg once decided that they would not hang a thief before he was caught, and that principle is in force still: so long as Germany remains undefeated there is absolutely no use of talking peace or of a "basis of durable peace" on the basis of crushing Germany, even if she were as wrong as the author assumes her to be.

For instance, to make of Alsace a French country with French sympathies is simply an error. I lived for two years in Strassburg as a student and know the city thoroughly and also the Alsacian country, but with the exception of Mühlhausen, there is not a French spot in Alsace. In Lorraine people speak French, but I have not found a French sympathizer among them. The only French sympathizers I know in Alsace-Lorraine were M. Schneegans and the painter Hansi.

Our author "Cosmos" grants that Alsace was German in the Middle Ages. But he adds: "When at the close of the Thirty Years' War Alsace sought protection from a more powerful state than the Holy Roman Empire had shown itself to be, it came under the protection of France at the request of its own people." The Strassburg people are assumed to have invited Louis XIV to take possession of the city! Is that the author's ignorance or is it intentional distortion?

Nothing German is left in Alsace, and Erwin von Steinbach, a native of the duchy of Baden, is unknown to *Cosmos*. He says: "It is probably the case that the Gothic artists who built the cathedral of Strassburg either came from the Ile-de-France or had gained their inspiration there."

The author writes under the pseudonym "Cosmos" and the unsigned Introduction blows the trumpet for him and calls him "a source the competence and authority of which would be recognized in both hemispheres."

The articles appeared in the *New York Times*, and the same anonymous writer of the Introduction declares that "the public perceived the candor, the impartial fairness, the breadth of view, and the profound understanding of political principles."

If "Cosmos" had been fair, he would have shown that the present submarine campaign is provoked by Great Britain and Great Britain alone is to blame for it. Prussia-Germany and the United States have always advocated the principle of the inviolability of private property on the high seas, but it was Great Britain, in the assured belief in the superiority of her navy, that was firmly opposed to it. If private property had been respected by Great Britain and if goods on neutral ships had been free Germany could have received canned milk for her babies from America, and the U-boat warfare would not have developed. Shall we blame the Germans if they retaliate and sink boats that carry food or ammunition or contraband to Great Britain? The *Lusitania* carried a heavy cargo of ammunition, but she also carried passengers, and we learn that to sink a passenger boat is murder. Therefore the Germans ought to be blamed. Now, it is against United States laws to put passengers and explosives on the same boat or train, but any mention of the gross neglect of duty of our own officers and inspectors is ruled out of order. Nor is it sufficiently known that while American passengers, among them women and children, were encouraged to take passage on the endangered boat, English people were secretly warned to keep off by the agent who sold the tickets. Further it is not sufficiently known that all the passengers of the *Lusitania* could have been saved, because a great number of English torpedo-boat destroyers were close by in Queenstown harbor and had received the wireless S. O. S. call for help, but they were held back and not sent out to the rescue of the passengers. Even so, more passengers could have been saved if the internal explosion of the forbidden cargo of picric acid and stannic chloride had not overcome many with the odor of poisonous gases—intended by the American manufacturers for the German soldiers in the trenches and now prematurely set off on the passengers of an English boat.

The condemnation of the Germans for the destruction of the *Lusitania* reminds me of the condemnation of a Russian Jew who was accused of having caused the breaking of a great show window and was condemned to pay for the window and the costs of the court. The fact was that some person had thrown a stone at the Jew, but the Jew evaded the stone and the stone crashed into the window. When the offender was taken to court by the owner of the store he claimed absolute innocence of having smashed the window, because he had intended to hit the Jew and not the window; so the Jew was considered guilty because he dodged the stone and caused the smashing of the expensive pane, and the court in the truly Russian spirit which condemns a Jew under all circumstances made the poor Jew pay.

The explosives were not intended for the passengers on the boat but for the German soldiers in the trenches, so our manufacturers are innocent of the catastrophe, but the Germans are the guilty ones that should be blamed and hated as Huns the world over.

Now is Germany truly to be blamed for the catastrophe, or is not Great

Britain first of all responsible for having insisted on refusing to protect private property on the high seas, and secondly Americans who first did not insist on their right to trade with Germany and then did not obey their own laws but loaded the dangerous cargo on a passenger liner? Our Chicago cartoonist is right when he declares that England has always favored "the freedom of the seize"; and an anonymous American poet who has written trenchant verse makes the following epigram:

"Who sank the Lusitania? Three—
Great Britain, Germany and we."

There is a systematic misrepresentation of Germany in the American press and the present *Basis of Durable Peace* is only one characteristic instance of it.

κ

Dr. Ernst Schultze of Hamburg-Grossborstel has published a book entitled *England als Seerüberstaat*, the purpose of which is to prove that international law which, with the advance of civilization, has made great advances in recent times in its consideration for human welfare on land, has made scanty progress in maritime matters, and that this is due entirely to the attitude of England, which has been the bitter adversary of all movements for the recognition of international rights and private property at sea. Having in recent times been almost the sole owner of the seas, Great Britain saw it to her advantage to make use of her power. While on land the representatives of civilized states easily agreed on having private property protected and warfare confined to the armies, involving only the property of belligerent states, the same rule could not be extended to naval warfare in spite of repeated proposals which came mainly from Prussia and the United States. The general acceptance of humane principles was again and again frustrated, solely because England always refused to sanction such international agreements.

The contents of the book are indicated by the following chapter headings: Piracy and English History; England and International Law at Sea; The Right of Piracy; The Right of Taking Prizes; The Paris Declaration of 1856; Auxiliary Cruisers; The Right of Blockade; The Question of Contraband; The Question of Mines; The London Declaration and the War Against Germany; England's Disregard for Neutrals; England's Opposition to the Freedom of the Seas; Germany's Position Regarding International Law at Sea; International Conferences; England's Misuse of Other Flags; The Attempt to Starve Germany; and The Taming of the Shrew.

In the last chapter the shrew that is to be tamed is, of course, Great Britain. England complains about the brutality of German submarine methods, and according to Dr. Schultze this indicates that England is losing fast, or has even already lost, her supremacy on the seas; and as soon as she belongs to the powers who suffer by a continuation of the right of piracy as much as others she will join those who clamor for the recognition of international rights on the seas. Accordingly there is a prospect now that in the future the barbaric method of piracy will be abolished, and that naval warfare will become as civilized as warfare on land. It stands to reason that in wars to come private property will be respected on sea as much as it is now on land. κ