

of the court. She played cards and gave her winnings to the poor; but once when she lost she made up her mind not to play any more. The resolution—she was in the habit of writing down her resolves, confessing herself to her diary, and so on—is characteristic:

"I will never play this halfe year butt att 3 penny-ombre, and then with one att halves. I will not I doe not vow, but I will not doe it—what, loose money att Cards, yett not give [to] the poore! 'Tis robbing God, misspending my tyme, and missimplying my Talent: three great Sinns. Three pounds would have kept three people from starveing a month: well, I will not play."

She was very good to the poor, visiting them, feeding and clothing them. She was also somewhat inclined to ascetic habits, eating but one or two dishes at meals, fasting, and in general mortifying herself in gentle ways, but much to her injury, Evelyn thought; and he was not satisfied with her replying to him, "I could get fat in three days." She went once to Paris in the train of the Ambassador, but successfully avoided the gayety of the place so far as was at all possible, even to the point of not permitting the French King, who had heard of her wit and beauty, to see her. It was on setting out on this journey that she deceived Evelyn. She had been married privately, and on his commiserating her for having to leave her lover, she said: "Mr. E., if ever I returne againe and do not marry, I will still retire"—meaning into a private and religious life. This, says Evelyn, "was the only tyme that in her Life she ever prevaricated with me, and cover'd it with that address, and was, I am most assured, in deepest sorrow; as all my former suspicions of her being marryed vanish't." On her return the marriage was announced, and she lived happily with her husband some two years, and then died in childbed at the age of twenty-five. The eulogy which Evelyn then pronounces over her is very great, but evidently wholly sincere. The instances he gives of her ways and deeds and temperament are delightful illustrations of humble piety; and certainly if she seems at times like a Catholic gone astray into another fold, her life may well be reckoned in the calendar of Protestant saints. The biography is a lasting part of religious literature.

*Tertium Quid*: Chapters on Various Disputed Questions. By Edmund Gurney. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1887.

MR. GURNEY is already well known as the author of two more substantial works, the 'Power of Sound,' a treatise on musical æsthetics, and 'Phantasms of the Living,' a laborious piece of "psychical research." He has also written important papers on hypnotism. The essays contained in these volumes are revised reprints of articles which have appeared in reviews; and the title 'Tertium Quid' hints at the fact that many of them seek to mediate, by new points of view, in certain old disputes.

The essays in the first volume are philosophic, those in the second are æsthetic—and the style goes with the subject. Mr. Gurney's philosophic style is too complex to be easy reading. His style when he writes on music is direct, and often enchanting. These musical essays remind us of some of the most admirable pages of the 'Power of Sound'—on the whole, if we mistake not, the best work on æsthetics ever published, but of which the misfortune is that it is too psychological for the musicians, too musical for the psychologists, and too bulky for the generality of mankind.

But to begin with the philosophic essays. The first three of them, under cover of reviewing

Messrs. Harrison's, Seeley's, and Mallock's respective deliverances, treat of the possibility of a religious conception of life. The next two handle the Vivisection controversy; the sixth is on "Evidence in Matters Extraordinary"; the seventh is an attempt to show that utilitarian principles furnish rational ground for altruistic obligation; and the last (entitled "Monism") sets forth very completely the perplexities to which the theory of "mind-stuff" atoms leads. It is no easy matter to give an account of these essays in brief, their manner is so much more tentative than dogmatic, and their thought so subtle and thorough, so observant of possible objection, so full of saving clauses, and careful to avoid excess. The fact is, Mr. Gurney loves truth almost too much—too much, that is, to be a popular writer on topics where the truth lies buried deep. Not the cutting, but the untying of knots, is his aim. But where the knot is intricate, the operations of the faithful untyer often outlast the patience of the looker-on; and such, we fear, may be the effect of Mr. Gurney's philosophizing upon the common reader, who wants nothing so much as to get quickly to some serviceable final phrase.

To all who care for truth, however, more than for any stop-gap phrase, we can heartily recommend the first of these volumes. Rarely does one meet a writer whose intellect is played on from so many sides, or who so continuously takes the wider view. Refusing to ignore the religious problem, the quest of a conception of life which shall give inward peace, he equally refuses to find peace in any such *abstractions* as Professor Seeley's worship of Natural Law, or the Comtist "religion of Humanity," for these only banish perplexity by taking so distant a view that discordant individual destinies disappear from sight. The individual destinies lie heavy on Mr. Gurney's soul, and positive peace he finds none within the lines in which the bookkeeping of "Science" with Nature has hitherto been carried on. That these lines are prematurely drawn, and that the account is probably not yet closed, is a truth on which Mr. Gurney well insists; and his final conclusion would seem to be, that *if there be* an invisible order continuous with the present order of Nature and enveloping it, our attempts at solving the religious problem rationally may be postponed till the facts of the invisible order are known. Empty as is such an hypothetical supernaturalism (if such it can be called) of positive content, skeptical as is its intellectual form, our author is careful to point out its enormous importance from the practical point of view. Whereas the keynote of dogmatic Naturalism can only be Resignation, the keynote of any possible supernaturalism may be Hope:

"I simply state as a psychological fact, that the sense of possibilities that can never be disproved is capable of exercising a pervading effect on the human mind which is absolutely irrelevant to any numerical estimate of odds. . . . To the majority, the amount of solace which the idea of a chance will give is out of all proportion to the greatness of the chance. Suppose that, after condemnation to a long term of captivity, a prisoner is told that there is one chance in ten of his release at the end of a year; the large majority of men, in such a case, would find the burden of the year immensely lightened. Nor, I believe, would the effect be diminished, but rather enhanced, if the chance were indefinite and not susceptible of a numerical statement."

This is interestingly applied to the question of immortality on pages 143-150 of volume I. If it seem to the reader nothing short of a wholesale licensing of credulity and granting of passports to the paradise of fools, let him read the book. He will see that Mr. Gurney's intellectual fibre is at the furthest imaginable

extreme from credulity. Balanced states of mind like his are growing commoner; but between the coarse self-assertion of the upper and the lower dogmatisms, their fate is still, as a rule, to be pushed to the wall.

Of the æsthetic essays we have left ourselves no room to speak. They are altogether admirable. Most writers on the philosophy of the arts seem to have been specially bereft by nature of artistic perception—probably to enable them the more fluently to write. But Mr. Gurney can perceive and describe as well as reflect. His vindication of the non-reasonable, magical, or purely physiological character of the charm of poetry is as fresh and profound a piece of criticism as we have read in many a long day. Altogether, these volumes can rank among the subtlest and sincerest pieces of critical work of our time.

*On Conducting*: A Treatise on Style in the Execution of Classical Music. By Richard Wagner. Translated by Edward Dannreuther. London: William Reeves. 1887.

It is not often that a reviewer can say of a translation that it is as good as the original, but this is true of Mr. Dannreuther's version of Wagner's essay on conducting; indeed, some passages are easier to read than in the original. Wagner's literary style is often as clear and as direct as Heine's, but at other times it is as involved as Jean Paul's. Mr. Dannreuther has taken pains to simplify the more difficult sentences, and his knowledge of German and English is so thorough that he has always been able to find a happy equivalent even for the unusual or new words which Wagner never hesitates to use if they give a sort of onomatopoeic realism and vigor to his speech. The essay itself should have been translated into English long ago, for it is one of the most valuable contributions ever made to musical literature—an essay which every musician, whether a conductor, a player, a singer, or merely an amateur, should carefully read and reread. It throws a flood of light on the questions of interpretation and expression.

Pedants who cannot read between the lines of a composition are constantly clamoring for "correct" readings of classical compositions, and insisting that we have no right to play them in accordance with modern notions of expression. Now, Wagner's notions as to what is "correct" in the interpretation of classical works differ widely from those universally current twenty years ago. He not only protests against the misinterpretations of his own works ("I am sorry to say I know of no one to whom I would confidently intrust a single tempo in one of my operas; certainly, to no member of the staff of our army of time-beaters"), but goes so far in his indictment of these conductors as to assert that whatever popularity Beethoven's "Eroica," for instance, had, was really due to the fact "that Beethoven's music is studied apart from the concert-rooms—particularly at the piano—and its irresistible power is thus fully felt, though in rather a roundabout way."

Conductors chiefly fail in their imperfect sense of tempo. "The whole duty of a conductor is comprised in his ability always to indicate the right tempo." Now, "the right comprehension of the *melos* is the sole guide to the right tempo," and "our conductors so frequently fail to find the true tempo because they are ignorant of singing," and do not sufficiently fix the attention of the orchestra on the melody of the work. They take a certain time for a movement, and play it through with metronomic regularity, regardless of the fact

that there may occur some bars of pathetic melody which have the character of a slower movement, and, therefore, ought to be played slower. The fact that such modifications are not marked in the scores is no proof that they were not made by the composers when they conducted. It was not customary to mark them formerly; but all testimony points to the fact that the great composers (especially Beethoven) used a varied tempo, or rubato, in conducting. "It is essential . . . that the tempo shall be imbued with life as delicate as the life of the thematic tissue. We may consider it established that in classical music written in the later style, *modification of tempo is a sine qua non.*"

Many interesting cases are given, illustrating this principle in detail, and the proof of their correctness lies in the magic effect which they always produce. The greatest Beethoven conductors in Europe are Von Bülow and Hans Richter, both of whom apply Wagner's principles. And as for Wagner himself, he relates that eighteen years after Weber's death he conducted "Der Freischütz" at Dresden, when he

"ventured to set aside the slovenly manner of execution which had prevailed under Reissiger, my senior colleague. I simply took the tempo of the introduction to the overture as I felt it; whereupon a veteran member of the orchestra, the old violoncellist Dotzauer, turned towards me and said seriously: 'Yes, this is the way Weber himself took it; I now hear it again correctly for the first time.' Weber's widow, who still resided at Dresden, became touchingly solicitous for my welfare in the position of Capellmeister. She trusted that my sympathy with her deceased husband's music would bring about correct performances of his works, for which she had no longer dared to hope. The recollection of this flattering testimony has often cheered and encouraged me."

Wagner needed something to encourage him, in view of the treatment to which his own works were subjected by these conductors. He relates how at one theatre *Tannhäuser* was obliged to relate his tragic recollections of Rome in waltz time; how "Rheingold," which should last two and a half hours, was dragged out to three, and the "Tannhäuser" overture took up twenty minutes instead of twelve, etc. When Wagner conducted the "Meistersinger" overture for the first time at Leipzig, the audience insisted on a repetition. Subsequently it was played by the same orchestra, but conducted by Reinecke, and was hissed! When the conductors added malice to their ignorance, the result was still more disastrous. Mr. Otto Floersheim relates how Ferdinand Hiller, after much pressure had been brought to bear upon him, conducted the "Meistersinger" overture at a concert in Cologne. But not only did he have no conception of the changes of tempo; he deferred the rehearsal of the overture to the last moment, and had only time to play it through *once* before the concert. Now, this overture is one of the most difficult pieces in existence, and the best orchestra in the world could not do justice to it without three or four rehearsals. The inevitable result at Cologne was that the orchestra got "all mixed up," and produced such a wild chaos of polyphonic cacophony that the critics next day naturally wondered "what in the world could have induced Dr. Hiller to put such a piece on his programme!" Dr. Hiller did not even like the "Tannhäuser" overture until he heard it as conducted by Herr Seidl, when he was honest enough to admit: "Ja, so gefällt sie mir auch."

*Universal History*: Ancient History, by George Rawlinson, M. A., Oxford.—Mediæval History, by George Thomas Stokes, D. D.,

University of Dublin.—Modern History, by Arthur St. George Patton, B. A., University of Dublin.—Geological History, by Edward Hull, M. A., LL. D., F. R. S., Director of the Geological Survey of Ireland. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1887.

THOSE who are acquainted with Professor Rawlinson's 'Manual of Ancient History' will get a good notion of this 'Universal History,' of which he is one of the editors, by being told that it is upon the same general plan as that useful book. That is, it consists of a number of parallel national histories, the object being as great completeness as possible within the rather narrow limits. Each considerable nation has a chapter, and in each chapter nearly every king receives mention. As there are abundant chronological and genealogical tables; this completeness makes a book very convenient for reference, but not adapted for consecutive reading. In mediæval and modern history we have besides a division into periods, so that the history of England, for example, must be sought in ten different places, three in the mediæval and seven in the modern volume. If this number of periods appears excessive for the time since 1453, it is perhaps inadequate for the time before that date.

Professor Rawlinson's 'Manual' is so well and favorably known that it is not necessary to speak in detail of his share, which is to all intents and purposes an adaptation of the earlier work. The special characteristic of Dr. Stokes's work is a praiseworthy effort to give his chapters a degree of variety and interest which the general plan of the series makes rather difficult. Hence, no doubt, the small number of periods, allowing to each period a greater fullness and consecutiveness. Hence, also, the judicious emphasis and expansion in the account, for example, of Charlemagne, and the introduction of details of special interest, like the mention (p. 54) of "the oldest architectural plan in the world," at St. Gall. Such details can be introduced only by the omission of irrelevant matter, and here the work is less satisfactory. For example, it is not stated (p. 50) that Pippin the Short made himself king; Dagobert I., the most important king between Clovis and Pippin, is only mentioned incidentally, while half a page is given (p. 48) to the wholly unimportant Dagobert II.—apparently because there is an interesting bit of literary history in connection with him, standing in especial relation to Ireland.

Mr. Patton's part of the work ('Modern History') suffers from the excessive number of divisions; yet is done very well in detail. In the chapter on the United States the Whig party is regularly called "Republican," *e. g.*, "In 1841 the Republicans were returned to power by an overwhelming majority." Although the *Caroline* affair made a good deal of noise at the time, it is certainly an exaggeration (and a damaging one) to say that Van Buren "destroyed his popularity by the firmness with which he repressed those who in the Northern States wished to help a rebellion in Canada" (p. 510). On page 508 Indiana is not mentioned among the States admitted to the Union. On page 511 is a curious mixture of dates—that Texas was annexed in 1845, "and Iowa also in 1846" (!), both being admitted to the Union when Polk became President, in "1849"; on the following page Taylor is said to have become President in 1849. One of the most useful features of the entire work is the table, prefixed to this volume, of "the populations, religions, and governments of the world, with the colonies and dependencies of the European and other States." Here we find a com-

plete list of these colonies, with the population and date of acquisition of each.

Prof. Hull's volume aims to give "an outline of the Geological events through which our Globe has passed since it assumed its form and became the abode of animals and plants." No such "summary of the Historical portion of the Science has hitherto," he says, "appeared in this country [England]." As a book designed especially for historical students, it will be heartily welcomed.

*Chauvenet's Treatise on Elementary Geometry*. Revised and abridged by William Byerly, Professor of Mathematics at Harvard University. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

PROF. CHAUVENET was one of the most accomplished mathematicians in America, and the text-books which he published came rapidly into extensive use. But his own knowledge was so wide and so deep, and he had such an overmastering desire to treat everything in an exhaustive manner, that his text-books often contained much which, however interesting and necessary it might be to those who intended to make the teaching of mathematics their business, or to follow a profession (like astronomy or engineering) that requires the constant application of mathematics, the average teacher and pupil would be compelled to pass over from mere want of time. Prof. Byerly's abridgment is a handsome octavo of 322 pages, and is quite large enough. Nothing really essential in the original treatise is omitted. The student who has mastered the book will be well prepared to enter upon the study of the higher branches of mathematics, and this will be the wisest course for him to pursue. Auguste Comte considered Clairaut's 'Éléments de Géométrie' as constituting a sufficient preparation for higher studies, and that work is a small 12mo of 128 pages.

The study of geometry, as usually pursued, is a mere exercise of memory; the student learns the statements and formal demonstrations of a certain number of propositions, and there the matter ends. Give him a new proposition not contained in his text-book, and, even though it may be a direct consequence of one he has learned, he is yet often perfectly helpless. He may have learned much, but can do nothing at all. To prevent this result, and to compel the student to do something "on his own hook," is one of the chief objects of Prof. Byerly's revision, and hence arises one of the chief differences between it and the original work. In the latter, the "exercises" were all placed in a mass at the end of the work, where as a rule they were left undisturbed by teachers or pupils. Prof. Byerly has added many new ones, and, while giving a considerable number at the end of each book, he has placed most of them in direct connection with the theorems they serve to illustrate or most nearly resemble in substance or in form of demonstration, and in such a position that the student will necessarily regard them as part and parcel of his lesson and of the science he is studying. For these "exercises," as they are called, are themselves theorems often quite as general and always to be proved in the same manner as the ordinary theorems of geometry. One of Prof. Byerly's methods of abridgment has been the omission of the Introduction to Modern Geometry, which formed a long appendix to the original work. There was probably here and there a professor or teacher of mathematical tastes who looked it over as matter of curiosity; otherwise it merely added to the bulk and cost of the book for no practical end.

On the whole, Prof. Byerly's omissions, al-