

cause they are "holy" and appeal to his superstition. He adds that the Spaniards are likewise without any desire for knowledge, and declares there is no *avenir* for the pure-blooded race: "If the Spaniard remain any longer as he is in spite of railways and increased intercourse, the commerce of the seaboard will more and more slip away into the hands of foreigners—French, German, Swede, English—and the pure race (native) will fall back on the interior and inland villages, hewers of wood and drawers of water." There are letters, too, from Lady Clarricarde (daughter of George Canning), with excellent passages on the condition of Ireland, worth reading now as evidence of the long-established, long well-known state of affairs there. "It appears to me," she says, "contrary to all I have seen or read that a great amount of discontent *continuing* in a country should not produce serious results of some sort." This concludes the list of really notable letters in the department of public affairs.

Of Mr. Hayward himself one forms a conception not very deeply marked. Mr. W. E. Forster says that the unique characteristic of his political thought and experience was "the result of a curious combination of a bard, worldly, even cynical appreciation of men and things, with strong sympathy with popular movements, and ideal aspirations." He had enemies and prejudices; but his strength of character seems to have included independence, sincerity, and perfect courage as elements, and he was undoubtedly liberalized by the variety of his associations with other minds. His career was laborious and honored, and one cannot but regret that he left no more extensive and notable memoirs, as he might well have done. This correspondence is but a meagre substitute.

CONWAY'S EARLY FLEMISH ARTISTS.

Early Flemish Artists and their Predecessors on the Lower Rhine. By Wm. Martin Conway. Macmillan & Co. 1887.

PROF. CONWAY has given us a very interesting and exhaustive book on the character and affiliation of the earliest naturalistic school of painting which has ever existed, so far as we know. If, in his bent in favor of the art in which he has in his past studies most interested himself, he has now and then lost sight of the great standard of absolute art, we need not therefore disparage his admirable summary of that art which is his speciality. When, for instance, he says, "Enter beneath the sculptured portal of Our Lady of Paris, and say, have any people (even the Greeks themselves) attained higher rank in the expression of noble thought through the language of the chisel? Has the brush of the painter been more deftly wielded than by the tender hand of a Wilhelm of Köln?" we are compelled to bring him to book on the terminology of art, because "higher rank" means higher artistic achievement in expression of the ideal, and a higher degree of refinement in that expression; and, with all admiration for the fertility of invention and decorative instinct of the Gothic church builders, we must maintain that Greek sculpture is higher art than Gothic, since it is carried nearer to the perfection of those qualities of expression which are the especial *raison d'être* of plastic art. Neither can we accept his estimate of the comparative qualities of Gothic color (p. 4), or the political dignity of a "world-emperor and a world-bishop," which are entities only possible in the dark ages whose exaltation as a world epoch Prof. Conway has undertaken. Nor can we admit the distinctions drawn between mediæval and modern relations between art and religion as he has stated them. That there was a difference is certain, for

now we have little of that form of religious feeling which hinges on belief in a priesthood or the necessity of churches to faith, nor have we any great amount of serious or really sincere art; but it is a part of a great idealizing process we too generally indulge in, in reference to the past, to say that

"the life of Christ, to the Gothic mind, was a permeating influence in the whole course of human life. The husbandman at his plough and the churchman at his prayers were alike fulfilling their heaven-appointed task, and were alike performing a religious action. For this reason you will find that the Gothic church bears always in prominent position representations of the occupations of the months of the year, these occupations being as much a part of the Christian religion as the events of the life of Christ himself."

So far as the influence of the true life and character of Christ are concerned, they had as little to do with human life in Gothic spheres as now, and as much as the life of Buddha—it was the ecclesiastical organization and the heavy mastery of the priesthood, forbidding thought to rise beyond its control, which made the life of the dark ages so full of the imagery of the Christian religion. The churchman as little thought of heaven in his prayers as the husbandman at his plough, and, in one sense, therefore, they were "alike" sincere. Heaven no more belongs to the fools than the knaves, and ignorance was the gift of the husbandman as hypocrisy and sanctimony of the priest, through the properly so-called dark ages, which were dark in spite of art, because human reason and human liberty were alike darkened by the "world-emperor and the world-bishop" of Prof. Conway's admiration.

We might object seriously to the large portico made before the history of painting by the dissertation on Gothic sculpture, but at least our author might, in giving his subject true proportions, have made more account of the share which Byzantine art in both branches had in the general result, and ask what he means by the sentence, "When the Jewish philosophers introduced the commentaries of Averroës and the Arabians to the philosophers of Christendom, and thereby gave substance to the nascent opposition of Nominalist and Realist, they sowed the seed which was in due time to produce that convulsed offspring—the Reformation." We are disposed to question all the conclusions of Prof. Conway based on hypothetical religious influences, which are a very dubious part of the true motives of any art, though they do indisputably provide subjects for its exercise. Religion, coupled with intelligence, leads to freedom and right—its form is secondary in the consideration; coupled with ignorance, it becomes superstition, and this has been the same in all epochs and countries and with all forms of belief. "The religion of the thirteenth century," says our author, "was one for free use at every moment of the day. It mingled in and tended to sanctify every act of life. Barter and sale, manufacture and war, alike presented their religious aspect at that noble time." But there is no evidence whatever that any change has taken place in human nature, or that there were more honest men in the thirteenth century than to-day, or that good work of any kind was more due to religious sincerity than now. What made art more sincere, if it was so, was the fact that the artist was regarded as a craftsman, and held to the same standard as the weaver, the blacksmith, etc., etc., and to a strictly commercial responsibility, while now art rarely ministers to anything but a poor personal vanity or a formal and insincere devotion. The history of the guilds of the various arts and trades, which the author traces in great fulness, is therefore of the highest interest, and will explain better than any other agency the qualities of the mediæval artist;

"Painting, to the mediæval mind, was a craft like any other, and was therefore organized in the usual way. A painter did not look upon himself and was not regarded [by others] as a person superior to ordinary discipline. It is only in times of decay that artists give themselves airs, and require to be considered in a Bohemian category of their own. In the great ages of art painters lived like other craftsmen, and were paid for the work they did according to a fair scale of remuneration."

The chapter on the guild system and its effect upon art may be studied with great profit. What Prof. Conway says on the character of fifteenth-century art is sometimes indicative of his incomplete technical knowledge, as, for instance, where he compares Titian with the Flemings, saying: "Painters like Titian, whose pictures from beginning to end seldom took so many days as those of a Fleming occupied months, might with little sacrifice abandon any unpromising work and start afresh." He might have learned that Titian was occupied always for months on his pictures, and that the appearance of dash and energy in the finished result was simply the foundation, which showed through repeated and most studious repainting. So far from being the facile work Prof. Conway imagines it, Titian's process was long and complicated, and required the most absolute certainty in its beginnings. But in what he says of the philosophy of art he is more correct:

"The historian of art has it continually forced upon him that with the growth of civilization the artistic power of the human species by no means continually increases. What was possible to a less developed generation is impossible to one more advanced; and indeed it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the artistic powers of the human race, far from increasing in periods of general progress, may often notably diminish. I would seem, then, that certain forms of art production, beautiful enough in themselves to excite the wonder and admiration of succeeding ages, are possible only to a semi-developed race, and demand an order of intellect inferior to that of the after-coming men who yet must bow before them in delighted awe."

The fact is well stated, but to explain it it is only necessary to remember that the growth of the rationalistic and æsthetic powers does not run in parallel lines. The latter is emotional, and emotion is checked and often deprived of its normal outcome by the domination of reason. As human progress goes on, it involves large alternations of development—reason and feeling taking by turns the guidance; and art is only possible in any of its true phases when feeling controls the intellectual activity. What we call "progress," which means to us simply progress in scientific attainment, has nothing to do with art; for, as Prof. Conway says, "Art gains very little [he might have said nothing] from the progress of science." But what he says further on, "Hence the art of any generation depends not upon its knowledge but upon its ideals of Faith and Hope," is not true, for faith is an intellectual exercise and hope one of temperament, possibly artistic and possibly not, while art is emotional and imaginative; and though, as mental influences, religion and devotion may prove quickening to any emotional tendency, it is only as any other cause of emotion, as love or the influences of nature, may be.

We have only space to say that, as is general in English illustrated art works, the present illustrations are quite unworthy of the text, and such as an American publisher should, and probably would, be ashamed of. They answer an educational purpose, but give a book a cheap and unconsidered aspect.

Dr. Channing's Note Book. Passages from the unpublished MSS. of William Ellery Channing. Selected by his granddaughter, Grace

Ellery Channing. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887.

THE origin of these 'Notes' is not made so clear by the editress in her preface as one could wish. We are told that they "are from unpublished MSS. left by him [Dr. Channing] and set apart for this purpose by his nephew and biographer, William Henry Channing, and his son." "For this purpose" means, presumably, for the purpose of this or some similar volume; but "unpublished MSS." suggests something different from the memoranda which Miss Channing's material appears to have been, judging from subsequent expressions. That "it was Dr. Channing's habit to make notes at all times" is another doubtful phrase, suggesting a more engrossing habit of note-taking than our knowledge of the man permits us to attribute to him. The editing is better than the preface, but here and there we find an obvious slip. On page 7, we should certainly read, "If I have been invigorated," and not, "If I have invigorated." On page 8 the second paragraph should have been omitted, unless the place meant by "here" could have been bracketed. As it stands, it reflects too severely upon Boston. On page 100, "sensualist" should be "sensationalist," even if Dr. Channing wrote the former, as he surely did not mean it. On page 19, "Past powers" should evidently be "Vast powers."

Dr. Channing's style was so little aphoristic or epigrammatic, its stream was so essential to its effect, that he appears to better advantage in these brief, disconnected paragraphs than we should have imagined that he would. Not that he is often aphoristic or epigrammatic here, but he is so at times, and generally the sentences in their isolation are more impressive and agreeable than isolated sentences are apt to be. Even such admirable separate sentences as those of Joubert and Amiel kill each other by juxtaposition, like many pictures together in a gallery. Of the more epigrammatic, one of the best examples is on page 14: "The suppression of the multitude by force is not order. It is rebellion kept down." "We must become our own friends" is shorter and as good. The sentences are grouped under about fifty different heads. Those under the head of "Slavery" show how swift was his deduction of anti-slavery principles from the dignity of human nature: "I would no more think of owning a man than of owning the earth or heavens." The following, which comes just before the slavery section, should have been included in it, for it evidently refers to Garrison and his coadjutors: "Is any class of men to be so honored as those who espouse the cause of the most friendless, and who can gain nothing but reproach, who make no compromise with opinion?" The section on "Self-Culture" has the ring of Emerson's "Self-Reliance": "To give ourselves up to others to be guided, controlled, and so forth, is to betray our trust." "Is not the mind to be made strong by exposure? must it be housed, nursed, kept within limits? may it not be trusted amidst all kinds of opinions? Let us associate with the wise as *friends*, but, like Jesus, dine with sinners." His individualism is of the same piece with these sentences, and is another proof of the substantial unity of his thought with Emerson's: "I may desire others' virtue, but must not interfere with their freedom." "It were better for a man to do a wrong act in obeying his own conscience, than a right one in obeying mine." This, under the head "Thought: Reason," is well put: "Doubt must have the authority of reason. How, then, can we doubt its authority?" And this also: "The very question why we trust our faculties is an appeal to them." Under the head "God: Religion" we have these unconventional opinions: "We have no forms in domestic life. Friendship has none. Is not re-

ligion more free?" "It is as incongruous to profess religion as to profess benevolence." "The adoration of goodness—this is religion": a sentence that some modern Unitarian conservatives will very much regret.

Dr. Channing, as did Parker after him, contemplated an *opus magnum*. Parker's was to be a history of religion. The exigencies of the anti-slavery conflict prevented its completion. Channing's was to be a treatise on psychology. His health was not equal to the necessary labor. The sentences included by Miss Channing under the last six or seven sections of her little book are from the notes he made for that intended work. They indicate that it would have had little formal exactness, hardly more than Emerson's Essays. They also indicate that we must class him with the transcendentalists. His idealism is only less absolute than Emerson's, after Fichte. It is that of Kant—allowing the not-me, but insisting on its plastic character: "The truth is, our sensations flow from us and furnish the universe with its varying robes." "It is the soul which aggrandizes nature."

The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities, with a Survey of Mediæval Education. By S. S. Laurie, LL.D. [International Education Series.] D. Appleton & Co. 1887.

IN three hundred pages, Prof. Laurie of Edinburgh presents an interesting study of the higher education of Europe during a period which stretches from the ninth to the fourteenth century. Two introductory chapters exhibit briefly the character of preceding Greek and Roman schools, and also the changes which came about when cloister and cathedral began to appropriate learning to themselves and to teach those who were to conduct their offices. The closing chapters repeat in topical form the results of the previous survey. They discuss the changes of meaning in the term university, and gather together the more important facts about the university studies, students, faculties, privileges, discipline, and graduation. A somewhat abstract preface by Dr. W. T. Harris opens the book, and no index ends it.

Prof. Laurie's thesis is, that until the fourteenth century there was no conscious founding of universities. A university grew, and was not made. The germ from which it started was usually some religious foundation. An ecclesiastical school began to admit lay pupils and to teach its trivium and quadrivium with some relation to secular life. With the enlargement of learning and the increase of civic liberties, came the need of specialized studies to supplement the ordinary work in arts. A great teacher—Constantine, Imerius, William of Champeaux, or Abelard—then gave so decisive an impulse to a single class of studies in his locality, that the place became known as the home of medicine, law, or theology, and attracted thither other teachers and students of similar tastes. An epoch was thus created in the development of the school. A university began—that is, a community of the learned—which soon assumed privileges of organization, self-government, and exemption from public burdens such as at that time were commonly accorded to trade guilds. The towns found the presence of large companies of scholars commercially valuable, and readily conceded moderate claims for privilege. In case of conflict with the towns, an appeal to pope or sovereign for protection generally brought a recognition as authoritative as any modern charter could give. These modes of semi-conscious growth the author illustrates at length by the examples of Salerno, Bologna, and Paris; the more intentional foundations, by the case of Prague.

For English readers this book probably offers the best brief account of the important subject with which it deals. Most teachers who read it will gain something. Yet it cannot be called a good piece of work. For treating coherently so long and complex a period in so brief a space, elaborate preliminary studies of original authorities are essential; and no less essential is the artistic planning of a scheme by which the mass of matter may be brought economically and in neat sequence before the reader's attention. There are no signs of such studies here, or of any such painstaking purpose to ease the student. Most of the authorities, when cited at all, are given at second-hand; and though each sentence is clear, there is no even development of the argument from cover to cover. Hundreds of valuable facts are shovelled together, with many repetitions, omissions, and allusions. Do we praise or condemn when we call the book "suggestive"?

The Military Annals of Tennessee: Confederate.

First Series: Embracing a review of military operations, with regimental histories and memorial rolls, compiled from original and official sources, and edited by John Berrien Lindsley, M.D., D.D. Printed for subscribers. Nashville: J. M. Lindsley & Co. 1886.

THIS is certainly a remarkable book. It is one of those publications of which Macaulay said they might have been light reading before the Deluge, when one who died at six hundred was regarded as having been cut off in his prime. Dr. Lindsley's book contains 910 closely printed pages, the steel engravings, of which there are about two score, not being included. And yet this is but the beginning. We are soon to have "The Index of Officers and the Index of Men," containing the names of 8,000 officers and 60,000 men. This in turn will be followed by a third series, giving biographical notes of the prominent Confederates. This last will complete the Confederate Annals. Dr. Lindsley will then undertake, on a commensurate scale, the general history of Tennessee, and will "edit and publish a series of volumes covering the whole field." It is possible that even the antediluvians might have rebelled at this point. Tennessee, Kentucky, and Louisiana are the only Southern States, not of the Continental Confederation, which have received extended historical treatment. But, with the exception of the "Commonwealth Series," almost exclusive attention has been paid to the early settlers. 'The Military Annals of Tennessee' is, in this respect, a pleasant exception.

We cannot but think Dr. Lindsley has made a mistake in the plan he has adopted. With all due respect for the brave men who fought for the Confederate cause, the monument can be justly considered out of proportion to the subject. In its present form, the book will hardly meet with any popular acceptance even in Tennessee, beyond those whom patriotic motives actuate. Outside of the State, its circulation will be confined to public libraries and compilers of encyclopædias. With the rest of the series, we have now nothing to do. But granting the plan of the present book, we are compelled to rate very high the execution of its details. It might be called simply a collection of regimental histories and memorial rolls. Each regiment of infantry and each regiment of cavalry receives separate treatment, the rolls being preceded in most cases by short sketches written by some one actively engaged in its campaigns. Most of the memorial rolls are official, having been copied from the archives in the War Department, by permission of Secretary Lincoln. The opening article is by J. M. Keating, on "Tennessee for Four Years the Theatre of War, 1861 to 1865," a concise and