

tended cruises of the great commerce-destroyers. In other fields of professional duty must be mentioned the work done at Richmond by Brooke, the creator of the naval ordnance of the Confederacy, and in England by Bulloch, the agent through whose consummate tact and steadfastness of purpose the *Alabama*, the *Florida*, the *Shenandoah*, and the *Georgia* were fitted out as Confederate cruisers.

In writing a book upon this great and attractive subject, Mr. Scharf has been fortunate in having an absolutely unoccupied field. Having been himself one of the pupils of the Naval Academy at Richmond, and having borne a creditable part in some of the famous exploits of his service, he has exceptional advantages for his task of authorship. He has shown evident diligence in accumulating materials, and his book includes a valuable collection of *mémoires pour servir*. A more careful revision would have saved him from many little inaccuracies in names and dates, and from occasional lapses in the use of his mother tongue. In many chapters his materials have been loosely thrown together, with little regard to style or to structural arrangement. In these respects the book is seriously defective.

The most extraordinary feature, however, of Mr. Scharf's otherwise useful book is the undercurrent of political animosity and bitterness which penetrates all his references to the causes of the war and the conduct and motives of the Union leaders. In holding that secession was a constitutional right, he only expresses the sincere conviction of the majority of Southern men before the war; but he goes far beyond this, and appears to think that no other view was possible to men of sincerity and average intelligence. Indeed, it is not quite clear that he regards the war as having done anything towards a settlement of the question. "Whether the theory of a national or a compact government," he says in his opening sentences, "be the true theory of the Constitution, now and hereafter, it is not necessary to discuss," which would seem to indicate that the question is still open for discussion. The condition of affairs at the beginning of the war is explained by the statement that "in 1861 events had presented to the States that most unexpected result—the soldiers and sailors, educated by the Federal Government in its character as agent of the States, were called on by that agent to fight against its principal—by the servant to make war on the master, by the creature to destroy the creator."

Starting with this "anomalous condition of the relations of the States to the Federal Union," as Mr. Scharf correctly designates it, the reader will not be surprised to learn that the war was a bloody work of repression, perfidiously undertaken by a tyrannical government, in the interests of a political party, and that the leaders in the secession movement were the innocent victims of a trick perpetrated by Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet. This opinion recurs again and again, and its manner of presentation is more remarkable for the author's tone of unquestioned authority, and for a certain grandeur of diction, than for cogency of reasoning. A few passages will suffice to illustrate. Thus on p. 20:

"The recital of these facts, as they existed at the South in 1861, establishes beyond controversy that no preparation for war had been made by any Southern State prior to secession; that not one of the States desired war; that there ought not to have been war, and that there would not have been war except to 'save the Republican party from rupture.' The facts of the times and the acts of men cannot be covered up from the search and exposure of the historian, who, when he comes to write the causes of the terrible war of 1861-65, must discover and expose those who, to secure themselves in the possession

of political place, deliberately played with the excited passions of the hour to involve the country in war, and dissolve the Union, so that its reconquest would perpetuate their party ascendancy, or that the loss of the Southern States would deprive their political opponents of the great bulk of their strength, and thus secure for themselves the possession of power in either the reconstructed Union or in the divided and dismembered northern part."

Here is another passage:

"Mr. Lincoln and his advisers had outwitted and overreached all the precautions of peace taken at the South, and, by deftly and cunningly drawing the fire of the Charleston batteries, had inaugurated war. The latent spirit of devotion to the Union, which the echoes of the guns at Charleston aroused into such terrible force and proportion, stopped not to consider the trick by which the war had been begun. It only saw the flag of the Union in the smoke of battle, and, whether right or wrong, rushed to its defence. But neither that expression of loyalty to the Union, nor the extraordinary efforts in its defence, nor the triumphs of its army and navy, will be able to cover up and conceal from the reprehension of history the shameful subterfuge of provisioning Sumter as a start to war; but history will separate the glory of the people's defence from the shame of the politician's trick."

In regard to the Southern officers who resigned from the old navy, every candid student of history is ready to acknowledge that, during the trying period that preceded their resignation, they discharged their duties with scrupulous fidelity. It is, therefore, hardly necessary to give this lucid explanation of their conduct:

"They did not presume to take upon themselves the duty of dividing the navy among the States, notwithstanding it was the common property of all the States. In the excitement of the times, it would have been pardonable conduct to have brought their ships to the defence of the States; but their sense of honor, and a sailor's duty to the government whose commission he bore, required that he should divest himself of every selfish motive before he returned his commission to the Federal Government."

The author's comments upon persons and events are what might be expected from the general statement of his views. The hotel-keeper who killed Ellsworth at Alexandria is a hero. "Among all the acts of personal bravery during the war," says Mr. Scharf, "not one exceeds in heroism that total indifference to personal safety which inspired the noble Jackson to brave in his single person a whole regiment of the enemy." Farragut is an "apostate," who turns "at the prompting of self-interest against the people among whom he was born"; and his differences with the Navy Department in the last year of his life lead the author to moralize in this pathetic fashion: "It is the old story—they loved the treason, and they rewarded with honors and prize-money the exploits of the apostate son of the South, but they never took him wholly and singly to their hearts." If, as Mr. Scharf states, it was "petty malice" that led the Secretary of the Navy in the heat of civil war to designate the Southern naval officers as deserters, what shall be said of an author who, twenty years after the war is over, has the presumption to say that the great Admiral was induced by the "prompting of self-interest" to stand by the dag and the Union, and that his countrymen "never took him wholly and singly to their hearts"?

It would be a waste of time to dwell upon the preposterous absurdities of this kind with which Mr. Scharf has seen fit to mar his history. He exhausts the language of petulance in his criticisms of Mr. Seward and Mr. Welles. The climax of childishness is reached in a delightfully funny passage on page 428, in which the Secretary of State is charged with having "dirtied the pages of American diplomacy" by an indelicate allusion:

"The euphemism by which, when a household

is gladdened by the birth of a babe, the convalescence of the mother is described in technical and courtly phrase, 'that the mother is getting on as well as could be expected,' was introduced by Mr. Seward in a despatch to Mr. Adams, as 'The work of pacification in the region concerned is going on as successfully as could be expected. You hear of occasional guerilla raids, but these are the after-pangs of revolution in that quarter which has proved an abortion.'"

Mr. Scharf is hardly fair in lashing Mr. Seward so unmercifully for a metaphor which he does not hesitate to use himself. On p. 725 he speaks of "the prevailing ambition that the bosom of the James should bear ironclad ships over which the Confederate ensign should float," and he adds: "This pregnant desire gave birth to the *Richmond*." Indelicacy is a very grave fault, but it is well with this, as with other offences, for some one who is without sin to do the stone-throwing.

If Mr. Scharf, as he declares in his preface, is attempting to vindicate "the political views of Confederate officers," he has shot very wide of the mark; for it may be doubted whether there are many of his companions in arms who would subscribe to his extravagances. Capt. Bulloch, who did more than any other naval officer to sustain the Confederacy during its four years' struggle, and who may fairly be considered a representative man of his class, says, in a work every page of which excites admiration by its dignity, its clear insight, its breadth of view, and its moderation: "The South has accepted the result of the war; business and social relations are again intermingling the people of the two sections on terms of friendship and intimacy, and the great majority on both sides can now recur to the events of the war, and discuss them as historical incidents, and not as subjects for strife and recrimination." In his address in New York on the last 4th of July, Gov. Lee declared, with just pride, that "Virginia was not sulking in a corner." It is charitable to hope that sooner or later the historian of the Confederate Navy will emulate Virginia's noble example, and fall into line with Capt. Bulloch and his "great majority."

## RECENT PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

*Preliminary Report of the Commission appointed by the University of Pennsylvania to Investigate Modern Spiritualism*, in accordance with the Request of the late Henry Seybert. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1887. 8vo, pp. 159.

*Proceedings of the [English] Society for Psychical Research*. Part XI. May, 1887. London: Trübner & Co.

The first report of the Seybert Commission has been awaited with interest, but it is certainly somewhat disappointing. To be sure, the only disappointment that we here can testify to has little to do with the merely negative character of the results so far reached by the Committee. In common with most people who give themselves over to the modern spirit and like to trust its instincts, we, of course, have expected no positive results of any very serious importance. But then it has seemed to us that the Seybert Committee has a work to do that must go far beyond mere special criticism of the so-called "facts" of modern Spiritualism. Granted that one finds little but fraud and delusion in most classes of these "facts," is it enough simply to report one's failure, with a considerable display of literary skill, and with a manifest readiness to assure the world that one is not easily to be fooled? We think that this is not enough for men who have undertaken the peculiar responsibilities of the Seybert Commissioners. If up to the present time the Committee have found only deception and

foolishness in those spiritualistic "manifestations" that have come under their notice, it is more than ever their duty so to set forth their researches as to aid in the work of educating the people at large to the point where they also shall be somewhat better able to distinguish imposture from reality. The real task before the Committee is, in fact, plainly much *more* to instruct the general public than to "expose" this or that rascal. A Bladé or a Mansfield may be very fair game to bag, and it is amusing enough to read how clever men like the writers of this Report have dealt with such spiritual influences; but it is unfortunate that the Committee have laid so much stress on this part of their story.

Seybert wanted them to "investigate" Spiritualism, as one of the "systems which assume to represent the truth"; and they have certainly labored hard and well upon this task as far as they have gone. But Seybert surely planned this investigation principally as an authoritative and persuasive method of teaching the people. He wanted the world to become Spiritualistic. He had faith that if an unprejudiced body of learned men, appointed by a university, could be induced to give time to the subject, they would become convinced of the truth of the faith that he himself followed. And his aim plainly was to have such an authoritative verdict used as a means of doing away with modern prejudices, and of gaining for Spiritualism a hearing in the world's best circles. Now, unfortunately, yet, of course, very naturally, the appointed judges find themselves so far unable to say one word that could satisfy Seybert's hopes and wishes were he alive to hear from them. It is surely but fair that, with such a preliminary result on their hands, they should at least bear Seybert's wish in mind enough to make their report a strong appeal, not to us who are sceptics and need no repentance and have always made game of Spiritualism, but to the lost sheep themselves, and to the still more important sheep who are in danger of being lost. To make this appeal the Seybert Commission need not have done any mere preaching. That, indeed, was not their affair and will not be. But they surely might have avoided a tone that is amusing enough to us, but which must be distinctly and solely offensive to the very class whom they were most called upon to assist.

Perhaps we are hypercritical, but to our minds the case stands thus: the belief of many people in spiritualistic phenomena of the illusory types that the Seybert Commission have so far met with, is plainly founded upon the very common popular confidence in any honest man's power to judge for himself whatever he personally sees, and to report accurately whatever he has seen. This confidence is an ancient piece of folk-lore. To get rid of it altogether is impossible. We can only fight it wherever we meet it. The untrained human senses are in no wise accurate instruments for the study of unwonted facts; and the untrained human memory both is, and, for the practical purposes of living, ought to be, a largely unhistorical faculty. These are simple truths, but folk-lore has been from the first against them. What a sensible man sees, is there; what an honest man relates, must have happened: these two superstitions form the rock on which Spiritualism builds. To do something towards mining away that ancient rock, is the business of any man who undertakes to deal with such beliefs. Now by implication, to be sure, the Seybert Committee set forth in their report considerations of genuine value for this purpose. They mention the difficulties of observation in just this field, and they relate a number of instances of plausible tricks that would have deceived most ordinary observers, but that did not deceive them. Yet they so relate these in-

stances, and so mention these difficulties, that the moral will be lost on all who are in real danger of falling a prey to this particular delusion.

In short, this report offers to the ordinary "almost persuaded" Spiritualist the treatment of the north wind, not that of the sun. This almost-persuaded man says that he does not profess to understand it all so very well, but he did see his dead wife and his baby at the materializing séance, in the dim light. The spirits even spoke to him, and he did once find written inside the closed slate a message from his lost friend, which referred to a fact unknown, he is certain, to any one now living but himself. Furthermore, the trance-medium did once tell him this or that wonderful thing. All this he is sure of, because he saw and heard it himself, and he has heard similar tales from numberless other people at "fact-meetings" and in private talks. However it all may be possible, then, the dead, he declares, do live again, and, after a fashion, do come back. Such an "inquirer" now turns, let us suppose, to this report, and he finds simply what he will call scoffing. Logically it may be justified, but practically it will be only mischievous to him. He says, "I saw so and so: I remember plainly such and such startling things." The Seybert Commission say, with much humor and great neatness of language, that they went to various places and never managed to see anything but tricks, and have remembered nothing but vanity. Experience shows that this mode of treating an honest and deluded man only hardens him. He loses confidence in your powers, because he loses the sense of your sympathy. To his "I saw," you respond with a smiling "I saw nothing." To his "fact" you have nothing to oppose but your private inability to find any facts. His bag is full of what, in his ignorance, he calls game. You are tolerably sure that the "game" is only crows and sparrows; but you do nothing to instruct him adequately about that. You only assure him that your own bag is so far empty, and you report that you suspect the woods of being empty too. This makes, to his mind, a poor "preliminary report." He only doubts your sportsmanship, and tenderly lugs his bag of crows homeward.

In a passage of magnificent humor, Bunyan makes Christian and his fellow meet one "Atheist," trudging along with his back to the heavenly glow that marks the direction of the Celestial City. "Where are you going?" says Atheist to the Pilgrims. "To the Celestial City," is in substance their response. Atheist bursts into uncontrollable laughter. "You fools," he says, "I have been hunting for that place these twenty years, and have seen nothing of it yet. Plainly it doesn't exist." We cite wholly from an inaccurate memory, and can only hope to remind the reader of this once familiar short and easy method of refuting theism. Now, while the Seybert Commission are not so dogmatic as was Atheist, and profess themselves still open to conviction, their method of telling their tale will seem to the spiritualistically inclined almost as unpromising as his. Yet they surely might have avoided leaving this impression, had they shown more care in rendering their account. We should have said, in the first place, that all their humor and their scorn of fraud—feelings perfectly justifiable in themselves—must be rigidly suppressed in this Report. The facts have their own humor, and the reader might have been left to see it if he would. But the man in danger from Spiritualism is in danger partly because he lacks, in considering just this one topic, all sense of humor. You can never help him by making sport of him, or of the type of mediumship that he chances to like best. What you can hope to do is to show him, in plain and dry speech, not so

much that fraud is possible (for that he knows), but that his untrained senses no more give him in this field protection against fraud than his finger-nails would give him protection against the claws of a pack of wild-cats. Do this for him and you have helped him. But just this lesson, which the Seybert Commission had so much chance of teaching, they have kept, as it were, purposely in the background. All their stories of meetings with mediums are not only related in the first place as particular incidents, but, in the summing up, are still left as such for the reader's amusement. Little effort is made to show how far these forms of "manifestation" are typical of the generally reported "facts," or how far the sorts of fraud actually discovered do represent the means whereby the untrained observer is commonly misled. The effect of the whole mass of evidence will therefore be either baffling or harassing, or both, to nearly all who need the help of the Committee's advice; and thus far, for the amusement of the ninety and nine, the lost sheep is not only left in the wilderness, but is laughed at and hooted further off still.

All this criticism turns upon our own conception of the important and delicate task of the Committee. Accepting as they do the trust of a Spiritualist, they are especially bound to act so as to meet the actual and very serious mental needs and perils of the class most inclined to Spiritualism. They are bound, that is, to remember their function as teachers, and they must not take refuge behind the mere word "investigate," when the didactic object of the investigation was plainly so prominent in Seybert's mind. They must, above all, try to keep the cordial confidence of sincere and still moderately rational Spiritualists. For the rest, of course, we have perfect confidence in the accuracy of the results of the Committee's work as far as it has gone. We regret that gentlemen of such ability should have worked so long without more to reward them. But when they accepted their task they knew the chances. If they some day tell their story in a more useful form, we believe that their labors for the cause of general enlightenment will become far more significant than they as yet seem. As for one further matter, the best particular investigation in the book seems to us to be Prof. Fullerton's report on the actual evidence that exists in support of Zöllner's interpretation of his famous experiments with Bladé. A more successful reduction of a wondrous tale to its lowest and wholly insignificant terms is seldom met with in so brief and convincing a statement. The result was quite worth the European trip which was in part devoted to Prof. Fullerton's research; and the account of the whole is given in a style to which our foregoing criticisms scarcely at all apply. The very instructive story is told with perfect sobriety and simplicity.

In the number of the English Society's Psychological Research Proceedings now before us, a very successful attempt occurs to do what we have blamed the Seybert Commission for not undertaking. To expose a slate-writing medium is one thing; to show the entire untrustworthiness of every ordinary and untrained observer of slate-writing manifestations is quite another and a much more important thing. A slate-writer exposed is, at best, only one fraud the less in this world of the father of lies; the next fraud has almost an equal chance of being believed. But if you can get a series of observers to attend slate-writing exhibitions that are actually only conjuring tricks, and if you can promptly get full written reports from these observers, there is a chance of showing conclusively, by a comparison of the various reports with one another and with the actual facts, how worthless the best untrained witness is as to all the critical incidents of such an exhibition. Such a result is compara-

tively general in its character. It may thus be possible to convince intelligent but untrained men that their observation and their memory are alike worthless in such a region. If they become aware of this, perhaps the next slate-writing medium who offers them his services will find their curiosity more languid, and their judgment of his miracles less confident. In the paper on "The Possibilities of Mal-Observation and Lapse of Memory, from a Practical Point of View," Mr. Richard Hodgson and Mr. S. J. Davey have set forth the outcome of just such an experimental investigation as this. Mr. Davey furnished the conjuring for the experiments, and Mr. Hodgson conducted the greater part of the work of criticising the reports that were written out by the observers. Result: a most interesting study of human fallibility. To be sure, the study is still very inexact, for obvious reasons. If the investigation is to go much further, instantaneous photography, or some other mechanically accurate method of registering certain of the actual events, must be introduced to control the reports of the observers. But meanwhile a fine piece of work has been done, and one that gives new reason to hope for very good results from Mr. Hodgson's stay in this country as Secretary of the American Society for Psychical Research.

The number of the Proceedings before us contains several other interesting papers, two of which bear witness afresh to the endless and rather dangerous ingenuity of Mr. F. W. H. Myers. Into the boundless and silent sea of recent hypnotic research this modern mariner's ship bursts with an appalling speed. The white foam flies, and the furrow streams forth free. We do not assert, indeed, that the mariner himself has ever yet killed the albatross of truth. We advise him, however, to be very careful of his cross-bow.

#### REBER'S MEDIEVAL ART.

*History of Medieval Art.* By Dr. Franz von Reber, Director of the Bavarian Royal and State Galleries of Paintings, Professor in the University and Polytechnic of Munich. Translated by Joseph Thacher Clarke. With 422 illustrations and a glossary of technical terms. Harper & Bros.

DR. REBER'S "History of Medieval Art" has in its degree the same excellences as his volume on "Ancient Art," translated by the same writer and issued by the same publisher five years ago, and then reviewed in the *Nation*. The earlier volume had the advantage of covering a more arable field, and one in which Dr. Reber was more entirely at home. The divisions of the subject were more distinct, its branches less intricately interlaced, its material more manageable. Indeed, it would be hard to find a subject less patient of a condensed historical treatment than medieval art. The only predecessor who had adequately treated it, so far as we know, was Schnaase; and Dr. Reber has set himself the harder task of condensing into a single octavo volume the theme which in Schnaase's "Geschichte der bildenden Künste" occupies five.

If, therefore, the present book has not so much directness, decision, and clear exegesis as the last, nor so many interesting deductions and suggestions, it is not to be wondered at. It is only matter for congratulation that the work is well done, and the result valuable. Dr. Reber's plan differs somewhat from that of most of his predecessors in favor of more compactness and continuity of arrangement. His distribution of his subject seems to us just and well balanced, his opinions on general questions eminently reasonable, and there is a commendable absence of

partisanship. The intricate mingling of Latin and Byzantine influences in western Europe, the domination of the Latin; the successive preeminence and subordination of Saxony, the Rhinelands, the southern and northern provinces of France; the Gothic supremacy of central France; the late awakening of Italy—all these have their due place and value. The leading place is necessarily given to architecture, which was in the Middle Ages, even more than in preceding ages, the mother and queen of the arts. Guided by this clue, the reader finds the development made as clear as he could expect. The web is a very tangled one, and to present it with all the threads laid out in a plain pattern would be to misrepresent it. The discussion of the development and complication of Romanesque architecture in Germany is lucid and judicious, though somewhat overloaded with detail. The rise and spread of pointed architecture is equally well described. In all this a geographical arrangement of the discussion seems inevitable. When it comes to painting and sculpture, political, physical, and even ethnical boundaries seem to be much less significant, and the lines of development to be disturbed or effaced, rather than displayed, by a geographical treatment. Here, we think, Dr. Reber might with advantage have pruned down his work still further. The leading lines in this part are much fewer and the facts multiply. The distribution which seems necessary for architecture gives the book the character of a handbook. The commentary must be either very minute or very sparing, and to give the facts without full commentary offers a dry and bony result.

Here and there a salient point is slighted, which we should have liked to see dwelt upon with more emphasis. For instance, the transfer of architectural control, at the end of the twelfth century, from the monastic orders to the laity, was one of the most important phenomena in the history of mediæval architecture. The influence of the Church, and especially the cloistered clergy, in conserving and developing the arts from the sixth century till the twelfth or thirteenth, is indeed so important that no mediæval history is adequate which does not insist upon it. Something more might have been said with advantage, perhaps, about early Christian mosaics, about the use of vegetable forms in the ornament of the thirteenth century, and the change in plan due to the addition of lateral chapels to churches in the fourteenth century. If the exposition of such points as these had taken the place of some cataloguing of artists and works of art here and there, the book would hardly have lost by it. In truth, its chief literary fault is the accumulation of detail which merely makes a fuller record, but adds no ideas, and rather cumbrous the narrative with facts.

The reader will still notice a little of the over-assurance in explaining things from the inside which was visible in the older volume. Dr. Reber never seems quite able to get away from the classic point of view. He is apt to accuse the Romanesque builders of not understanding the classic buildings about them, or of failing in their efforts to imitate them; and to forget that, while the Teutons were content to take hints from the work of their forerunners, they appear to have preferred their own ways of using them. We think he is tempted to press too far the theories which Semper and other acute German writers have imprinted on the criticism of their countrymen—theories of definite climatic forms, of architectural details derived directly from the processes of other arts. These theories are of substantial value, but of too facile application. The dogmatic use of them is repellent, and tends to divert the reader's mind from the effort for artistic effect, which is always present, and is respon-

sible for many things, we believe, for which nowadays it gets no credit.

Every one who has busied himself with this sort of investigation knows how difficult is absolute accuracy of detail, and is disposed to be indulgent to minor errors. That there should be more or less of them in a book of this kind is to be expected, but we find slips that seem unnecessary. We may warn the reader against some we notice. Thus, on p. 48, the author cites the Mosque of Omar at Bethlehem. There is no Mosque of Omar at Bethlehem, we believe, and Dr. Reber must mean the building popularly so called in Jerusalem, but more properly known as the Dome of the Rock. In describing Mohammedan architecture, the name *Mihrab* is given to the covered part of the mosque, wherein the worshippers assemble, and the prayer-niche is called the *Kiblah*. In reality, the *Mihrab* is the niche, and the *Kiblah* properly denotes the direction of Mecca, towards which the niche is set; but they are often confounded. On pp. 176 and 177 we find a plan and section of the "Mosque of Jumma at Bijapur." The unskilled reader will probably interpret this by the analogy of the Mosque of Omar or of Amru. The usual form of the name is Jama Masjid (or Jumma Musjid), which means Assembly Mosque or Chief Mosque. Most Mohammedan cities have mosques so named, and commonly spoken of in English as the Friday Mosques, because service is held there on Friday, the Mohammedan Sabbath. The interior view given of the Mosque of Amru, by the way, does not agree with the description on the next page, the arches being depicted as semicircular, but described as pointed horseshoes. There is an analogous discrepancy between the plan and section of the Cathedral of Noyon, where the plan shows four-part vaulting, which is correct, and the section six-part vaulting. Dr. Reber takes pains to assign the first appearance of the horseshoe arch to Sassanian architecture, forgetting that the Buddhist Chaitya halls and Viharas, before and about the Christian era as well as later, are full of it. The exchange of names between the spires of Chartres and the church at Vendôme, p. 495, is a blunder in proof-reading; to speak of Chartres as having piers alternating with round shafts may be a slip of the same kind. In several places the main or central tower of a mediæval castle is called the *barbacan*; but this is the keep, and the barbacan is an outwork. St. Nicaise for St. Nicaise is venial; and *al fresco* (in the open air) for a *fresco* (fresco painting) is more amusing than serious. The indiscriminate and inaccurate use of "cloister" for monastery and convent comes evidently of translating too phonetically the German generic word *Kloster*. It saves some trouble, but makes difficulty where both the generic and specific are required, as where we have "the Cloister [*Kreuzgang* ?] in the Convent [*Kloster* ?] of Gerusalemme, Bologna," which was really not a convent, but a monastery.

We have not seen the book in German, and cannot speak of the translation from comparison, but it seems to be in general exceedingly well done. It is terse, clear, and vigorous; only once in a while does the terseness impede the clearness. Mr. Clarke, however, now and then shows an unaccountable reluctance to subject himself to the received terminology of architecture. He gives us "Kernel" (German *Kern*) for the bell of a capitol, "vaulting-post" for vaulting-shaft, "arcade" (French) for a single arch, "surmounted" arches for stilted. "Trapeze-shaped capitals" smacks more of athletics than of geometry, and "chapter" for capital is perhaps as "surmounted" as the arch it sustains. We cannot believe in these liberties; it is difficult enough at the best to maintain order and clearness in architectural language, and if every new