original. The volume ends with the wish that "the well of German talent not give out."

R.H. KEYSERLINGK,
University of Ottawa.

* * *

ARNOLD TOYNBEE. — *Mankind and Mother Earth. A Narrative History of the World.* New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1976.

The historian puts on the prophet's mantle, and it nearly engulfs him. Readers seeking an outline history of the ancient world will do better to read Chester Starr's *A History of the Ancient World,* by the same publisher. Those more interested in modern times will also look elsewhere: by page 415, out of 596 pages of text, we have only reached A.D. 780.

Toynbee in his Preface, however, declares his intention of giving "a comprehensive bird's-eye view of mankind's history in narrational form". He rightly scorns the late nineteenth-century view of "history" as comprising only "those particular past events that had led up to the West's present ascendancy", although he perhaps rather overstates his case. If it is true that western historians at that period, writing of the late fifth century A.D., would typically ignore what Toynbee calls "the whole of the civilized world of that date, from Greece to China and from China to Meso-America and Peru", it is surely an excessive reaction for Toynbee himself to dismiss so contemptuously "the barbarian successor-states of the Roman Empire in the Empire's derelict western provinces". The writings of Boethius and the mosaics of Ravenna are not negligible by anybody's standards.

Toynbee's great preoccupation is with Teilhard de Chardin's "biosphere", characterised by "the relative smallness of its size and the exiguousness of the resources that it offers". He argues that man not only has the power to make the biosphere uninhabitable, but "will, in fact, produce this suicidal result within a foreseeable period of time if the human population of the globe does not now take prompt and vigorous concerted action to check the pollution and the spoliation that are being inflicted on the biosphere by short-sighted human greed". Would this matter? "Has the progression of life in the biosphere been worth its price in anguish?" Perhaps not: "Mankind is the most potent species that has arisen so far, but mankind alone is evil". On the other hand, Man alone has a conscience, and since mankind is "one of the products of life's progression", therefore we may conclude that "Man's ethical standards and judgments are inherent in the biosphere and therefore in the total reality of which the biosphere is a part". This is the higher pantheism with a vengeance, dressed up for the 1970s.

"Man's acquisition of consciousness", however, has its drawbacks: it "has enabled him... to carry out plans that can prevent Nature from liquidating him as she has liquidated other species that have become a nuisance and a menace to the biosphere as a whole". He has "been the first of Mother Earth's children to subdue life's mother and to wrest out of the hands of life's father, the Sun, the fearful force of solar power", which he has "let... loose in the biosphere, raked and untempered". Man, by his use of atomic energy, "has embarked on the adventure that ended fatally for the mythical demigod Phaeton". Can he, will he "avoid bringing Phaeton's fate on himself and on his fellow living beings"? Toynbee is clearly somewhat pessimistic.

These quotations demonstrate Toynbee's ecological and philosophical preoccupations. Equally prominent is his syncretistic approach to religion. There are many "alternative possible roads by which human minds can approach... the ultimate reality behind the phenomena and the question of the relation between this ultimate reality and man". One might from this expect at least sympathy for those who choose an alternative road to Toynbee's. Not so: St. Ambrose, for instance, following his own lights, is nonetheless condemned for acting "evilly" in opposing the restoration of the altar of Victory in the Senate House at Rome. But is it reasonable to expect Toynbee's own twentieth-century standards of toleration from an embattled fourth-century bishop? Is it good history?

There are some splendid passages in the chapter on "Religions and Philosophies, 334 B.C. — c. A.D. 220": "Yahweh, like Zeus, had started as a Weather-god, and, since Zeus was out of the running, Yahweh's only competitor for this role was Jupiter Dolichenus, a Romanization of the Weather-god of the strategically-sited town Doliché (Dulukh) in northern Syria". This comes in fact at a point where Zeus is so far out of the running that he has not been mentioned for a page and a half, since we heard that "the spiritual vacuum left by the effacement of Zeus (he had suffered the same fate as *T'ien*) left room for Sarapis to gain an entry into the Hellenic pantheon; but... Sarapis was a superfluous replica of Asclepius... and... had no chance of replacing Zeus as the Hellenic World's Father figure. This role was seized by Yahweh, the masterful national god of the Jews." How would this sort of thing read in an examination paper? "Was the spiritual vacuum left by the effacement of *T'ien* greater or lesser than that left by the effacement of Zeus?" Or, "Show how Yahweh replaced Zeus as the Hellenic World's father figure, with particular reference to the competition *either* of Sarapis *or* of Jupiter Dolichenus". The flavour of *1066 and All That* is slight but inescapable: Toynbee combines the didacticism of the old-fashioned school textbook with an assurance derived from the Whigs, Macaulay without the style, and on a cosmic scale.

Political and military history is presented in a traditonal manner, heavy with names and dates. How much will the non-specialist derive, for instance, from the eight pages on the Ch'in and Western Han regimes? This is one of several points where Starr's account, though shorter, makes better sense. Much of Toynbee's narrative could be replaced by a mere time-chart. There are no footnotes, understandably; less excusable is the absence of even the most rudimentary bibliography. What sort of reader did Toynbee have in mind? It is hard to escape the impression that much of the narrative is perfunctory, a vehicle for the spiritual and ecological message. Nor is the style easy to read, although it occasionally provides, perhaps unwittingly, some arresting images: "Constantinople was a bed of thorns for the French emperors who squatted there from 1204 to 1261".

Spiritual preoccupations apart, intellectual and cultural history gets little space. Han China is discussed with no mention whatsœver of art. The chapter on "The Hellenic civilization's cultural achievements, 478-338 B.C." deals with the visual arts primarily in terms of their political and economic significance, says something about the philosophers' ideas but little about other writers, and mentions Herodotus not at all and Thucydides only as an "exiled naval officer" who makes Pericles call Athens "the education of Hellas". Roman culture is not even allowed its own existence ("Latin was the medium in which the Hellenic culture was disseminated in territories under Roman rule round the perimeter of the western Mediterranean... and in Transappennine continental Europe up to the line of the Danube and the Rhine"). "Cave paintings" appear in the index. So does "canon law". "Cathedrals" do not. There is however a better-balanced account of the Italian Renaissance.

In so compressed a narrative, it is clearly impossible to include everything, or for that matter to do justice to conflicting scholarly interpretations. Thus, for instance, not all scholars would agree with Toynbee on the Thera eruption and the Mycenaean takeover of Crete. Similarly, his views on the consequences of Hannibal's devastations have been rightly challenged by P.A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower,* and others. The statement that "From 108 B.C. onwards, Rome was virtually governed by war-lords" is highly debatable. There seems no evidence for the existence of the so-called "Silk Road" in the traditional form accepted by Toynbee. The Mesoamerican civilisations are summarily treated and, oddly enough, possible ecological factors in their decline are ignored. "Western civilization 1563-1763" rates ten pages, from which one derives the impression that the major political figure of the period is Leopold I; Elisabeth of England is not mentioned, nor any French king except Henri IV, and he only for changing his religion.

Toynbee's treatment of the past hundred years is particularly idiosyncratic. Of individuals, J.J. Thomson, Mahmud II, Atatürk and Gandhi rate a mention, but not Hitler, Stalin or Mao Tse-Tung. North America barely exists. No single event in U.S. history in this period is even mentioned, and the U.S.A. itself appears only as one of the eight "great powers" before 1914, after which it apparently ceases to be of world importance. On the other hand, we do learn that "the teaching profession's bargaining power is weak", although "their social value is at least as great as that of workers in any other profession." The wars of the twentieth century are a "spectacle of human wickedness and folly", a judgement with which few will cavil; exempt from this condemnation, however, are the British in 1940-41 and the Turks in 1919-22. Considering how hard it is to gain Toynbee's approval (Pericles, Sophocles and Socrates are all condemned for excessive and unenlightened patriotism), the Turks may feel highly honoured.

The conclusion? "Some form of global government is now needed". There are too many "local sovereign states", just as there are too many "academic 'disciplines'". "Mankind is in a crisis... and the outlook is perplexing". To quote A.E. Housman's famous parody of a Greek tragic chorus: "In speculation/I would not willingly acquire a name / For ill-digested thought; / But after pondering much / To this conclusion I at last have come: / *Life is uncertain.*" Would the Oxford University Press publish such lucubrations from a writer of lesser eminence? They do not enhance Toynbee's posthumous reputation.

The book has no illustrations. The index is unreliable, although 45 pages long, and the principle on which even proper names are included or excluded is obscure. Only five of the maps have even rudimentary indications of physical relief. The price is $19.50.

Colin M. WELLS,
University of Ottawa.

* * *

EDWARD SHORTER. — *The Making of the Modern Family.* New York: Basic Books, 1975.

"I got the idea for this book," writes Edward Shorter in the chatty style that pervades much of this volume, "when sitting with Chuck Tilly and Ann Finlayson around the breakfast table one morning. Chuck had said that, in order to really pin down how social change transforms people's lives, what we needed was a general history of the family..."