

feeling expressed in the following, which is the key-note of the book:

"To the Beloved Republic I dedicate this Book, with an intensity of Gratitude and Admiration which the native-born citizen can neither feel nor understand."

It is to be feared that Mr. Matthew Arnold would regard the author as an unmitigated Philistine. He is an undisguised worshipper of material success, and delights in big figures. He loves to tell how small things were fifty years ago, and into what splendor they have since blazed out. For his flights of imagination take this as a sample: "Last year she (Chicago) received nearly two million cattle, a million sheep, and five million hogs—more than twenty-five thousand animals per day. So that there marches into Chicago every day in the year—Sundays and Saturdays included—a procession of victims two miles and a-half long, ten animals abreast." "Spread-eagleism" used to be considered as a specialty of the native American, but here is a foreigner who out-Herods Herod. And yet, so far as the material side is concerned, there is perhaps hardly a word which passes the truth. It is only when it is placed before us in this vivid way that we realize the stupendous development. There certainly never has been anything like it in the history of the world. So far from wondering at the tide of immigration, the only wonder is that all Europe, or at least the poorer half of it, with its crowded population, its military burdens, and its caste distinctions, does not empty itself into such a land of promise. Such a book as this must read in Europe like the 'Arabian Nights.' It would probably pay well for one of the great land-grant railways, say the Northern Pacific, to have it reprinted by the million copies in a cheap form, with its own advertisements attached, and distributed broadcast throughout Great Britain.

After reading such a flourish of trumpets over material success, one becomes rather curious to know how the author will face problems much more open to question, such as art, literature, and politics. He is not a whit daunted. As to pictures, "The American is recognized now in the European markets as one of the shrewdest, as well as one of the most liberal, buyers"; while "the United States now possess more and finer examples of the modern French and German schools of painting than are to be found in Europe," and have, besides, an excellent school of their own. Under architecture, he observes that "one block in Chicago has thirteen stories, the highest hardly less elaborate in decoration or less perfect in its appointments than the lowest"; while in music he thinks there should be an international contest, the Thomas and Richter orchestras playing in competition on alternate nights, first in London and then in New York. "It is estimated that there are twenty-three thousand school libraries in America, containing forty-five million books—twelve million more than all the public libraries of Europe combined"; while it is further noted that the public schools of the United States cost in 1880 over sixteen millions sterling.

In political matters we should say that the author's zeal decidedly outruns his discretion. He approves, not only of elected officials, but of elected judges. "Who are so deeply interested in the able and pure administration of justice as the masses of the people, the poorer classes of the people, who may be trusted to elect the men least likely to lean unduly to the side of the rich, the powerful, and the strong?"—a proposition beautifully illustrated by the existing labor troubles. Speaking of British colonial wars, he says: "All this will change, however, when the Democracy rules their country. The parent land will become in Europe what the Republic is upon the

American continent—the unselfish counsellor, the guide, the true and trusted friend of its less powerful and less advanced nations"—for example, of the Indian tribes. Again: "And upon my British readers let me once more impress the truth that in all that goes to make up a strong government, a power competent to maintain justice and to defeat attacks upon the rights or property of others, the American system is infinitely beyond the monarchical." One healthy sentiment, at all events, is very well expressed: "And for all the just and good measures by which the Republic has won my love, next to that by which she has made me her own citizen, and hence the peer of any man, kaiser, pope, or king—next to that, for which I will fight for her, if need be, die for her, and must adore her forever—I thank the Republic for her position in regard to international murder, which still passes by the name of war." The thoughtful American cannot but wince a little when he reads—"An important work done by the United States army is the improvement of rivers and harbors. Upward of a hundred million dollars have been spent by the engineer corps on rivers and harbors since the beginning of the Government, and the present annual appropriation for this purpose is very large." If the United States Government "is the largest printer and publisher in the world," the reflection unavoidably presents itself whether the quality (as, for instance, in the *Congressional Record*) is equal to the quantity. It is refreshing, again, to hear—"In none of the departments named in this chapter have politics the slightest influence. No politician could be found willing to apply any test but the suitability of the man for the work to be performed." Evidently the writer was not acquainted with Mr. Flanagan of Texas. When we read the summing up, in "the record of one century's harvest of Democracy" set forth in thirteen propositions, we are tempted, in view of Mr. Carnegie's unflinching optimism, to suggest to him that in the next edition of his book (and we hope there may be a great many) he should adopt the motto which he has proposed for the city of Chicago: "The Whole Hog."

*Progressive Orthodoxy.* A Contribution to the Christian Interpretation of Christian Doctrines. By the Editors of the *Andover Review*, Professors in Andover Theological Seminary. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

WITH the exception of parts of the introductory and closing articles, these papers have already had some currency in the *Andover Review*. The authors do not affix their names to the particular articles, but jointly assume the responsibility involved in their publication. The introduction is apparently by the same hand as the first article, "The Incarnation." It is written in the same astonishing manner, as it were out of time and space, and with so much obscurity that a man of good average intelligence, unused to this way of writing, might almost as well read it backward as forward for any profit it might be to him. The various writers evidently think themselves possessed of a method and results that have considerable advantages over the orthodoxy which they consider unprogressive. There is something quite pathetic in their sense of being in "the way that some call heresy." They insist, however, that their progress is entirely within orthodox limits as defined by Holy Scripture and the Ecumenical Councils of the early Church. And certainly the claim will not be disallowed by any who are not well versed in theological disputes. It will seem to them that the positions taken here ought to be orthodox enough for any one. The rationalist and the free-thinker will find a little satisfaction in the later chapters, but in

the earlier much to convince them that their occupation is not gone.

The first four chapters deal with the Incarnation, the Atonement, the fate of the impenitent, and the work of the Holy Spirit. The real animus of the book discloses itself in the third of these chapters, which is called "Eschatology." It is certainly humane, for it is bent on the relief of orthodoxy from the doctrine that the heathen world and those of Christendom whose lives have been conspicuously noble, but without Christian profession, are destined to eternal misery. The case of Sir Moses Montefiore is made the starting-point of the discussion. Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, is as little disposed as the Andover professors to send Sir Moses to perdition, but his way of saving him is not theirs. It is that he was an unconscious Christian; that the merits of Christ's sacrifice were applied to him without his knowledge. But the Andover professors say that this is salvation by magic. What they contend for is that Sir Moses will have a post-mortem opportunity to save himself by a conscious acceptance of Christ as his personal Saviour. A like opportunity will be accorded all the ignorant heathen. But without conscious relation to Christ, no salvation. The speculative basis for these conclusions is laid in the other three of the first four chapters already named. One might go far and not find another such example of modern scholasticism as they afford. Their exaltation of the person of Christ is equal to the most exacting demands. To develop "a Christocentric theology" is their purpose, and they would make Christ not only central to humanity, but to the universe. In these discussions every trace of the concrete humanity of Jesus, as we find it in the Synoptic Gospels, disappears. We are in the same region of speculation as that which the Gnostics of the early Christian centuries found so congenial to their minds.

The chapters on "The Christian," and "Christianity and Missions" are further applications of the ideas in the preceding chapters; the first insisting on the consciousness of personal relationship with Christ as essential to Christian character and salvation, the second insisting that the heathen world will have a chance beyond the grave. A chapter on the Scriptures fights an obscure antagonist. If what is really meant had been expressed as clearly as possible, rather than as vaguely, it would probably be far from the traditional doctrine of the Bible's inspiration. The suggestion that Christ was not omniscient while upon the earth (p. 227), and therefore may have been mistaken in his estimate of the Old Testament, is perhaps the most "progressive" opinion in the book. What is everywhere noticeable is a use of the Bible that assumes its absolute authority. But in justifying this the writers assume a conception of Jesus that depends for its validity upon the authority which it is made to justify, and so the argument of the book moves in a continual circle. The closing chapter, "Christianity Universal," is a résumé of the preceding chapters that will give a busy man the gist of them in half an hour. We can conceive that the concessions of the book will be welcome to many gentle spirits in the Christian church, while they will be particularly offensive to the co-religionists of Sir Moses Montefiore and some others.

*Memoirs of General W. T. Sherman.* By himself. 2d ed. D. Appleton & Co. 2 vols. 1886. This new edition of Sherman's memoirs is enlarged by preliminary and supplementary chapters, and by an appendix made up in the main of letters from officers who served under the General, containing corroboration or criticism of the opinions expressed in the first edition of the book.

The preliminary chapter gives the pedigree and the early life and military service of the author, filling out the narrative to greater completeness as an autobiography by this account of his lineage and his youth. The supplementary chapter has an independent historical value of much importance. In it General Sherman gives the facts relating to the quarrel between President Johnson and Secretary Stanton, with some very interesting evidence touching the relations of General Grant to the President. This strongly tends to prove that Grant sympathized with Johnson in his view of the right of the Executive to insist upon having Cabinet officers in harmony with himself, and of the improper character of the Tenure-of-Office Act as applied to Stanton's case. The difference between them, it is intimated, arose when Grant had to choose between taking an aggressive part in opposing the operation of the law so as to make a test of its constitutionality, and a passive line of conduct which should avoid collision with either party. Then the General, though believing that Stanton was wrong in "sticking," and the President was right in asserting a power to remove, still naturally declined to be an active participant in the quarrel, and offended Johnson, who had reckoned upon his vigorous support. That Grant was already a candidate for the Presidency, though unavowed, counted for something in his determination of his line of conduct, as it fairly might. The statements of General Sherman on this subject are among the most conclusive and authoritative possible. His frankness and courage of opinion are indisputable, and his means of knowing the secret history of the time second to nobody's. It may fairly be said that he makes final disposition of the romance about Johnson's revolutionary purposes, and brings the whole chain of events within the ordinary purposes and motives of party intrigue or finesse; Johnson, Stanton, and Grant all being more or less openly in the field for the Presidential canvass of 1868.

Another topic of some importance, on which General Sherman's testimony is weighty, is that of the relations between the Secretary of War and the commandant of the army in ordinary administration. He gives very conclusive evidence that Grant, when General of the Army and at the beginning of his Presidency, was fully committed to the view that the military and disciplinary administration of the army should be conducted through the General in command. He carefully draws the line so as to show that this does not include or imply any diminution of the importance of the Secretary, who is the authoritative mouthpiece of the President. It is simply that, by making the General the channel through whom the business must be done, his judgment and knowledge are made available to give system and energy to the work. Sherman shows that under the influence of Rawlins, when the latter became Secretary of War, Grant reversed his own previous policy and fell into line with the custom of civilian Presidents, which has pretty uniformly resulted in making the position of the nominal commandant of the army a most uncomfortable and unsatisfactory one. The legitimate conclusion seems to be that the course originally proposed by Grant and advocated now by Sherman should be pursued, or that the office of commandant of the army should be abolished, and the affairs of the army be conducted by the Secretary of War through the generals in command of departments.

The ten years which have passed since General Sherman published these memoirs have not diminished the authority of the book or of the author. The correspondence in the appendix to the present edition is good proof that the criticisms to be fairly made upon it are neither very numerous nor important. In two or three instances

only are there matters of real moment in controversy between him and other men, and the instances are rare in which he has found it proper to revise the expressions he formerly used. In some instances he has softened the form while preserving the substance; in others he has supplied omissions; in a few he has corrected errors. It may safely be said that, for purposes of military instruction and for giving a clear and fair view of the events described, it takes, and probably will continue to take, the first rank among the personal memoirs of the war period.

*Madame Roland.* By Mathilde Blind. [Famous Women Series.] Boston: Roberts Brothers.

THE first hundred pages of this little volume are on the whole satisfactory; but it then becomes, instead of a biography of Madame Roland, a history of the Girondins, and a history written not by an historian. The somewhat rash generalizations and assumptions of the authoress could be better pardoned were they connected with absolute accuracy of historical statement; but when we find Mirabeau compared to Samson, with the assertion, "the Delilah who shore [sic] him of his strength being the Queen, by whom he was bribed," one not only remembers his own proud exculpation of himself, "Je suis payé, mais je ne suis pas vendu," but one would be glad to assure Miss Blind's readers that the opinion she entertains is not the generally received opinion of the relations between Mirabeau and Marie Antoinette. And again—though a much more unimportant point—she entirely misrepresents the character of poor Lanthenas, and mingles truth and error in this statement: "His name, having been included in the list of the proscribed, was struck out by Marat, who declared him to be a mean-spirited creature (*peuvre d'esprit*)." The fact is, Marat, his ex-confère in medicine, had some kindness for him, and declared to the Convention (to save his life): "As for Dr. Lanthenas, everybody knows *que c'est un simple d'esprit* (that he is not quite right in his head)." Why a man should be spared because he was "a mean-spirited creature," Miss Blind does not explain. "Le bon Lanthenas méritait de mieux finir," as Sainte-Beuve says.

Miss Blind is not felicitous in her translations. In an enchanting *rural* letter of Mme. Roland's, redolent of the deliciousness of the country, Miss Blind gives us this somewhat startlingly incongruous phrase: "I am growing asinine by dint of attending to the little cares of a piggish country life." The original is, "Je m'asine à force, et m'occupe de tous les petits soins de la vie cochonne de la campagne." Sainte-Beuve, quoting this same letter, explains to the reader that the word "asiner" is here employed because Mme. Roland was then drinking asses' milk; and it would have been well if Miss Blind had at least perceived that "et m'occupe" has not the force of "de m'occuper." And if she had remembered that "cochonner" means to bungle, to botch, she might perhaps have spoken of the "clumsy" rather than the "piggish" country life, and relegated to brackets containing the original humorous words the untranslatable and merely suggested ass and pig of the sentence, conveying to the English reader only Mme. Roland's sense of the welcome casting off of the weight of human customs of thinking and doing.

We have not at hand the original of the passage quoted on page 153, but we have every reason to believe that Miss Blind has there mistaken *citrouille* for *citron*—pumpkin for lemon—and translated *plaisant* (humorous), by "pleasing." "I saw . . . little Barnave, . . . cold as a lemon fricasseed in snow, to use the pleasing expression of a woman of another century." This

was Ninon de l'Enclos, who said of the young Marquis de Sévigné (as quoted by his mother): "C'est une âme de bouillie; c'est un corps de papier mouillé; c'est un cœur de citrouille fricassé dans de la neige." Lemon sherbet is not despicable; squash sherbet one conceives would be.

In calling the Duc de Saint-Simon "Henri Saint-Simon" (what would he have said to the omission of the *de*? and his name was Louis!) Miss Blind confuses him with his collateral descendant, the founder of Saint-Simonism; and also errs in placing a letter of his she quotes, "in the first quarter of the eighteenth-century," since it is addressed to Cardinal Fleury as minister, who only came into power in 1726.

These are trivial indications of a sort of blunderingness which pervades the book and colors the thought, and is not redeemed by charm of expression. But the personal narrative, as we have already said, is agreeable. Any sympathetic picturing of the staid youth of Manon Phlipon, and the cheerful domesticity of the first years of her married life, of the early bloom and later fruitage of her noble and ardent uprightness of soul, has, of necessity, a peculiar delightfulness.

*Review of the New York Musical Season, 1885-1886.* By H. E. Krehbiel. Novello, Ewer & Co. Pp. 233.

THEATRICAL and musical year-books have been issued heretofore, but seldom in so elegantly printed and conveniently arranged a volume as Mr. Krehbiel's. The carefully prepared index occupies as many as fifteen pages in small type, which gives an idea of the extraordinary activity of the past musical season. Beyond a doubt, it was the busiest ever known to musicians in this city, and we suspect that, so far at least as quantity is concerned, no foreign city has ever surpassed this record. For this reason, and also because the season marked the beginning of several new and important enterprises, the volume before us is very timely. It offers so many conveniences that it is to be hoped the sale will be sufficiently large to insure its continuance in future years; but even should this not be the case, the volume will remain a valuable historic record of the most important year in the history of music in America hitherto.

The plan of the book is strictly chronological. It begins with the production of the "Mikado" on August 19, and ends on April 18, the day after the close of the American opera season. All the important concerts and operatic performances under each date are mentioned, with the names of conductor, artists, and principal works on the programme. All the novelties and many other important works are described and critically discussed at considerable length. Two tables, given in the introduction, give a list of forty-four new orchestral and vocal compositions heard for the first time this year, and a list of ten new operas and operettas, including "Die Meistersinger," "Taming of the Shrew," "Queen of Sheba," "Lakmé," "Sylvia," "Manon Lescaut," "Trumpeter von Säckingen," "Gypsy Baron," "Amorita," and "Mikado." To these should be added "Don Caesar," given a few weeks ago. The introductory chapter also includes a brief review of the three Metropolitan Opera-house seasons, with statistics of the operas produced.

The number of operatic performances given at our two houses this winter was 127, of which 19 were sung in Italian, 52 in German, and 56 in English. Of first-class orchestral concerts there were 84. The Thomas popular concerts and the American Opera, as the two most important new enterprises, receive their full share of attention. No fewer than eleven pages are devoted to an