A LAST PRAYER.

FATHER, I scarcely dare to pray,
So clear I see, now it is done,
That I have wasted half my day,
And left my work but just begun;

So clear I see that things I thought
Were right or harmless were a sin;
So clear I see that I have sought,
Unconscious, selfish aims to win;

So clear I see that I have hurt
The souls I might have helped to save,
That I have slothful been, inert,
Deaf to the calls thy leaders gave.

In outskirts of thy kingdoms vast,
Father, the humblest spot give me;
Set me the lowliest task thou hast,
Let me repentant work for thee!

August 8th.

THE LESSON OF GREEK ART.*

PART I. THE EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE.

THE very difficulty which we must feel in expressing by means of words the chief artistic characteristics of the works of Greek art points to one of the cardinal virtues inherent in it, namely, its simplicity.

The works were meant to be gazed upon, and not to be the subject of learned commentaries; they were intelligible to the people, appealed to their senses, their feelings, their moral and intellectual nature, by means of their own substance and form, without the need of a verbal explanation. But the remains are comparatively scanty and in a fragmentary condition, and therefore require instruction and study in order to be appreciated. Furthermore, they belong to an age removed from us by more than two thousand years, to a people differing from us in the natural, social, and religious conditions of life; and thus it is not only from the purely artistic, but especially from the historical point of view that we must regard them. Here it is that art becomes perhaps the chief, at least one of the most important means of apprehending and realizing the civilization of ancient Hellas.

Still, we must never forget that art to the Greeks was a great reality; that it was a part of their daily life, covering and affecting their smallest, humblest needs, as it was evoked by and expressed their highest aspirations. And, above all, the modern student must remember that the works were not meant to be stowed away in museums, by which most of us mean repositories of curious, outlandish, and fractured articles, of all out-of-the-way things that have nothing to do with the needs of daily life, and from the contemplation of which we return with the sense of having done something uncommon, almost amounting to a moral penance which is followed by a stern but pleasant self-approval.

Art with the Greeks was above all the outcome of a real need felt among the people, as it was at the same time the means of conveying to the whole public the most unalloyed and edifying pleasure. It was to the people a really intelligible language which conveyed to them in its impressive form the highest fruits of the culture of their time. And this it is which makes the position of Greek art so unique in the history of the world's civilization: the fact that, on the one hand, it was the adequate expression of the very best that the intellectual life of the people could offer, the highest and deepest of their thought; and that, on the other hand, its expressions were intelligible to the lowliest and humblest of Greek citizens. I will refer you to but one well-known instance in illustration of this fact: In the eastern pediment of the Parthenon Pheidias represented in the forms of mythology, in the most sensuous and easily intelligible form, one of the widest conceptions of cosmogony. The birth of Athene out of the head of Zeus is the cosmical conception of the birth of the clear atmosphere out of the depths of heaven. The clear-eyed daughter of Zeus is born on the heights of Olympus, in the presence of the gods, surrounded by the broadest personifications of nature. The scene is bounded at the one angle of the pediment by the rising sun-god, Helios, with his chariot, and at the other angle by the moon-goddess, Selene, descending into the regions of darkness with her steeds. We here have the widest metaphysical conceptions, Time and Space incorporate. And, moreover, they are put in such a form that these widest conceptions were intelligible and appealed to the most childlike of

* The essay here printed was originally delivered as a lecture at Chickering Hall, New York, January 29, 1884. It has been revised and amplified for publication here.—EDITOR.

minds among the Greek citizens.* The questions must present themselves to us: How came Greek art to be possessed of these attributes? And can this state of art be reproduced? As regards the second of these questions, most people answer hastily, "No, the time has gone by; that age will never again return," as if there were some mysterious essence underlying the growth and flower of Hellenic culture. But if we study the main conditions which led to this peculiar growth of Greek art, we may find that these conditions are to a certain degree reproducible; nay, that there is always something abnormal and wrong in the social constitution of a civilized community when the conditions are not similar.

The conditions which made Greek art intelligible to the mass of the population and adequately expressive of the highest culture of the age are above all to be found (1) in the education of the art-appreciating public, and (2) in the education of the productive artist.

In the first place, the chief characteristic of Greek popular education was, that it above all meant to produce men who were mentally as well as physically fully and normally developed on all sides of their nature. It is the roundness and versatility of the types of Greek social and political history which most strike us who belong to an age of over-specialization. A political leader like Pericles was at the same time a skilled soldier with full athletic training, a keen student of philosophy and of literature, and a votary of the highest art. A dreaming philosopher like Socrates was keenly alive to the political questions of his time, and, as a brave and hardy soldier, took part in the warlike expeditions of his country. As in the Palæstra the normally and fully developed human body was held up as the aim of physical education, and the defective growth of any one member was remedied by a series of athletic exercises; so the *musical* side, the intellectual training, and the full and normal development of the human mind on all sides was the supreme aim, and any deficiency in power or taste was vigorously counteracted.

But the chief distinctive feature of Greek education must be referred back to the distinctive Greek conception of the life for which this education was to prepare. Aristotle distinguishes two main aspects of the human soul: the active, laboring soul (νοῦς ποιητικός), and the passive, enjoying soul (νοῦς παθητικός). Education was not only to prepare for the life which consists in the material struggle for existence; but life to the Greeks had another half of equal importance with and practical bearing upon the material subsistence of the individual: it is the life of intellectual relaxation and enjoyment. Food was here to be provided to satisfy the moral and intellectual appetites of rational beings, in a manner most conducive to the moral health and vigor of the individual citizen and the people as a whole. Education was thus not only elementary or technical in character, but set itself the immediate aim of bestowing upon the fully-grown youth a fund of interests and appreciative power which would restore to its normal condition the mind strained in one direction during the hours of toil, and would furnish with interest old age when toil was no longer possible.

Finally, public feeling in Greece was so real a power that it drove the Greeks to demand and to create those forms of enjoyment that are essentially public in themselves, namely, the great works of art. It was not only the imminent danger of the advancing Persian foe which drove the citizens of Athens to concerted action, but after the war was over they joined with the same vigor and public-spirited eagerness not only to rebuild their needed homes, but to adorn them with the greatest works of art the world has ever seen; for art was to them a real need, as it responds to one side of human nature and life which remains the same throughout all ages.

In the second place, the education of the productive artists was equally characterized by this roundness and versatility of interest and training. They were not only carefully educated in the technical manipulation of their art, so that they could express with facility and clearness of form whatever they desired to express, but their education, even after the period that we should call school-days, as well as their intercourse with men of varied interests, were such as to make them conversant and in sympathy with all the varied intellectual interests and pursuits of their age. The artist as a man stood on the highest scale of the intellectual culture of his age. As a man he was the highest type of the civilized Greek; while as an artist he had the power to express clearly, in the sensuous language of his art, the high culture of which he himself was a living type. That Pheidias had

* Some readers may here object that the many theories which exist concerning the interpretation of this very work tend to prove the opposite of the simplicity which I claim for Greek art. I need but remind them that the interpretation of the whole scene and of Helios and Selene are beyond dispute, and that the differences which exist with regard to the meaning of the figures are caused by the fact that the arms holding the distinct attributes are all lost. A Greek child would recognize a male figure holding the thunderbolt as Zeus, a reclining female with fruits or corn as Demeter, or one with sea-animals as Thalassa. For further information on this subject I must refer the reader to Essay V. in my work on the art of Pheidias.

political interests, that in daily intercourse with Pericles he shared with him the anxiety of overcoming political crises, that he was well read in the ancient and contemporary literature of his country, that he was a student of philosophy and of mechanical science, made him no less careful a student of the human form, no less skillful a modeler and draughtsman, though it made him more adequately an exponent of the highest that was in his age.

Such were the conditions which made Greek art the clear and intelligible expression of the highest culture of that great age and people.

Human nature and the needs of human life have remained the same as they were in ancient Hellas, yet the expression of one side of human nature and the satisfaction of one need of human life are not the same. The best art is not clearly intelligible to the lowliest and most childlike of modern citizens; and our best art is not fully and adequately expressive of the highest culture that our age has produced. Why should this be? Some thoughtful people say that it is necessary. Historical evolution, they say, made the Greeks a great artistic people, and us not. We have developed in the direction of science which requires an attitude of mind opposed to the artistic spirit, and the more we have grown in the one the less can we grow in the other. It appears to me that out of the doctrine of evolution, so fruitful in advancing the sphere of human knowledge, there has grown an excrescence of historical generalization as vicious as it is faulty and readily accepted. And this becomes still more vicious when the study of the past is used to regulate action in the future. I would call it Fatalistic Evolutionism. The dictum of such a hasty social philosopher would run thus: "The Greeks were the great artistic people; natural and social evolution have made us the great scientific and *therefore* unartistic people; it is necessary that it should be so." There are many scientific errors in this reasoning; such is the oversight of the fact that the Greeks in their time were as scientific, that they expressed as fully the intellectual, cognitive side of their spirit, as they were artistic, and manifested the emotional, creative side of their genius. But among these fallacies the most interesting is the implied analogy between the life of one individual man and the life of a nation; another is the misconception of the nature of the individual human mind, its needs and functions. Because the individual man is limited in the exercise of his intellectual functions by time and physical power, the diffusion of his interests and attention over many things is to a certain extent at the expense of the power directed towards the consummation of one definite end. Still we must not forget that, as the human body is an organism, so the human mind is organic in its constitution; that, as such, the existence of the whole depends upon the proper and normal relation of all the organs and parts to one another; and that, though definite outer demands in the conditions of life may require a greater development of one organ, still the body and the mind, as a whole, will cease to exist and act if the proper relation of the parts to one another is fundamentally disturbed. Specialization has its limits so long as an organism is not a mechanism, as "*l'homme machine*" is nothing more than an exaggerated epigram. If this is the case even in the individual mind, it is still more the case in so complex an organism as a community, a state, or an age. The chief characteristic of the life of a whole people is its variety and change, and in a large community there is no fear of the same limitation of function and physical power; for its constituent units are so numerous and varied in their individuality that, if the conditions are properly regulated, full and normal expression will be found for the cultured life of the people on every side. In such a healthy community we shall meet with the proper expression of the immediate needs of the whole people for security and facility of intercourse; the full expression of the highest intellectual life of the people in the sphere of pure intellect and thought in science; and the adequate expression of the highest culture of the people in the direction of public enjoyment and the more emotional life of art. I should not like to overshoot the mark and state boldly that the great man is great all round; for history has given instances apparently showing that great specialists may be imperfectly developed or educated in directions not peculiarly their own; but I do not hesitate to say that a great age and a great people are great in all spheres, unless there be peculiar causes for some weakness either positively pernicious or positively inert. Because we are a great scientific age, we ought *therefore* also to be great in artistic creation; for it is the greatness and spiritual vitality of the age as a whole which show themselves in this one aspect.

Now, while the conditions of modern life have been favorable to the adequate expression of the highest intellectual culture in various directions, they have not been so in art. The study of the conditions which gave Greek art its chief characteristics will enable us to see where the weak points lie, and with concerted action on our part a good deal may in time be remedied. It is not in the spirit of fault-finding that I would point to

our weaknesses, but it is because I have the full faith that much may be done, and will be done, to remedy the evils, and moreover because I would fain believe that, from the indications of the present and the promise of the future, it is to the American Republic that this task is given.

The reasons which make it appear probable that to this country may belong this vocation will partly become evident as we proceed with this investigation. I may here briefly enumerate them as follows: Because we are comparatively unhampered by existing traditions and institutions which might impede the progress of a new or bold step. Because by the nature of our people we are representative of the various currents of culture characterizing European nations, and also by this fact we are predisposed to be historically sympathetic in an age in which historical (I do not mean romantic) feeling is a leading feature. Because, furthermore, we are a people possessed of the most general diffusion of education, in an age when, more than ever (for I maintain that to a certain degree the highest art was always so), great art must be democratic, must rise from the public demand, and must bear in itself the public character. And because, finally (and I consider this of great practical importance), there is in this country no recognized and stereotyped upper class which would lower the social status of the followers of art, and would thus counteract the highest natural selection of the artist from among the most distinguished members of a cultured community.

We differ from the Greeks as regards the artistic expression of the culture of the age in that our highest art is not readily intelligible to the simplest understanding of the modern citizen, and in that, though our age is a great one, we have no "great art," the art that is adequately expressive of the best and highest in us. In minor, especially in what I would call domestic art, we stand very high; but in an age moved by the very widest conceptions of human brotherhood, there ought to be a high art not merely corresponding to the home of the individual citizen and the secluded life of the private mansion, but expressive of the highest moral and intellectual attainments of the age, as our scientific attainments are fully representative of its culture.

We have traced back in the art of Greece the possession of these qualities to the education of the art-appreciating people and the producing artist; we must trace their want in our time to defects in the education of both these classes. We must examine, then, first, the education of the art-appreciating public, and see where its defects lie, and secondly, the education of the producing artists, and endeavor to discover the weakness in this sphere.

It is the just pride of this nation that more is done here by the government, central and local, for popular education than in any other country, Germany not excepted. The founders of the republic and the devisers of its constitution recognized from the very beginning the fundamental importance of popular education in a republican country, as it is, no doubt, the basis of a well-regulated commonwealth whatever be the actual form of government. And these great men had not in view merely that education which should prove of immediate use to the individual, in assisting him in gaining the means of honest subsistence or the power of reading and writing his voting papers, but they had in view the less apparent, though from the social and political point of view the most important, result of general education in its bearing upon the general welfare of the citizen, and in its tendency to create a high intellectual and moral tradition in the political community as a whole. This was expressed tersely by Washington in his farewell address. "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion," he says, "it is essential that the public opinion be enlightened." Now an interesting article by Mr. Charles F. Thwing, in Harper's Monthly Magazine (February, 1884), gives ample evidence of the great efforts made in this country for public education; while at the same time it shows how narrow and ill-conceived has been this notion of education, and especially how neglectful it has been of that side which would prepare the public for the appreciation of the highest art, and, by the need created in them for great works, would lead them to act upon the art-producing portion of the community, modifying the character of their work and encouraging their noblest efforts. According to Mr. Thwing, "the total amount by which the general government has aided the several states in education consists of the gift of 125,000 square miles, or about one-thirtieth part of the entire national domain, and of the gift of nearly thirty millions of dollars."

No doubt this proves the keenest appreciation of the value of public education, but it is important to remember that this is only for what must be called primary education, not for the highest education of the university, and still less of art academies. The exception to this rule quoted by Mr. Thwing is most interesting, as manifesting the general spirit which underlies this neglect of higher education. "In 1862 an act was passed donating lands to states and towns for colleges *for the*

benefit of agricultural and mechanical arts." The limitation of these grants towards higher education to purposes of agricultural and mechanical arts betrays the general tenor of mind actuating not only the majority of our political leaders, but also the vast majority of our thinking population. It is that most ill-conceived and vicious idea of "the practical" and "the useful." Against this watchword of coarse-minded demagogues and conscientious dupes of "experience in the struggle of life" (as misdirected and viciously egotistical in its generalized form and application as it is oftentimes of long standing and dearly bought) all well-disposed reasonable people ought to make war.

In order to gain the moral support of a community for an institution directly or indirectly educational in purpose, it is but necessary to show that it is what is termed practically useful. The whole community will then feel that there is a moral justification in the expenditure, while they consider this justification wanting if the institution can be classed under what might be termed the luxuries of education and civilization. The grounds upon which their sympathy is based and their moral conscientiousness soothed are the following: The utility of any purpose is clearly defined to most people if it can definitely appeal to the personal interest of each individual, or if he can at least conceive of himself as directly benefiting by it. We can all readily conceive of ourselves as gaining a livelihood as joiners, or at least we can appreciate the utility of this vocation from the need we have of its products in the surroundings of our daily life; and thus there would be no doubt in our mind of the decided utility of a school for joiners. But what is here ignored is the fact that in such cases public action is invoked, and that there is a difference between public and private utility. The very nature of public utility, as such, is often that its immediate application to any individual person is vague and more difficult to accomplish. Nay, we may almost put it as a formula, that the more public in character any institution grows, the smaller grows its apparent individual applicability to the use of any individual. The practice of individual doctors is of more apparent and direct utility than the action of a city board of health, and the work of this board of health than that of a national sanitary commission investigating recondite questions of medical science. The action of the one body of individuals directly concerns individuals, and is supported by them; that of the other concerns the public as a whole, and would hardly receive support from individuals, but is maintained by public administration. The practical utility of the policeman for the promotion of public peace and safety is more easily perceived and demonstrated than is that of the United States Supreme Court, of the postman than of the Postmaster-General; of an elementary village school than of a national university in which are studied and solved the great questions of highest science. But we must here note and insist upon the difference between public and private utility, and remember that in most cases private utility does and ought to stimulate private efforts, while institutions with public utility as their purpose are entirely dependent upon public support. But we find that the public action taken as regards education is the very reverse, and educational institutions the character of whose utility is essentially public (namely, the universities and the art academies) are left to the precarious liberality of individuals and corporations, on the very ground (confessed or implied) that they are not possessed of that utility which is chiefly characterized by its ready application to the individual citizen. It is, however, but fair to point to another ground which often actuates those who oppose the claims to public support of these highest institutions of education, as compared with the claims of the immediately useful schools. It is on the ground of the more generous feeling of democracy, in which the duty of the government is above all conceived as being directed towards the good of the many, and to let the few (who are capable of doing so) look after themselves. But it is against this very vicious circle that we are arguing, concerning which the Greeks teach us the great lesson. We shall see that the very spirit of art is democratic. If it be true that hitherto in our communities the higher education which produces the need of intellectual pleasure and its satisfaction has been restricted to the few, it is this very evil which ought to be remedied, and from the many ought no longer to be withheld their birthright of the faculty of enjoying what is beautiful and true and good. If it were true (which fortunately it is not in our country) that all superior education is restricted to the wealthy few, it is high time, in a republican country, that this be altered. I do not mean to propose the (for the present) impracticable idea that every citizen is to be sent to the university or art academy; but the spirit of which these institutions are the embodiment must be made a reality, a recognized tradition; its public utility must be acknowledged; its fruits must respond, as was the case with the Greeks, to a real need of daily life, of which an admixture is to be infiltrated from the earliest educational years into the system of every boy and girl. But

this is not the case with the spirit of our public schools; nay, even the many rich people among us do not avail themselves of the existing means of giving their sons and daughters the opportunities of acquiring the highest fruits of civilization, in sending them to universities, bestowing an enlightened and refined taste upon those who will have the material opportunities for encouraging the higher art-production, in beautifying their homes, and in showing their public spirit and liberality in the munificent donations which have distinguished our countrymen.

That art is aristocratic in contradistinction to democratic is fundamentally untrue, from whatever side we view it: *a priori* in its inner meaning, and historically as regards the facts of art history. Art is, and has been in its splendid periods, essentially democratic; that is, it has appealed to larger masses of people in contradistinction to individuals. Kant and Schiller have drawn the true distinction between ordinary pleasures and the pleasures of art; the first are selfish, the others are public. The ordinary, selfish pleasures depend upon possession or consumption by one person or one group of individuals; the æsthetic pleasures are those of contemplation or of sympathy common to many. An apple is eaten by one person or a horse possessed by him, and the possibility of some other person enjoying the fruit or using the horse is thereby debarred. The acquisition of these pleasures by any individual is potentially always at the cost of the possession of the same pleasure by some other person. In æsthetic pleasures it is not so. The monumentality of a great edifice, the beauty of a picture, the nobility of a statue, the harmony of a musical composition, the thrilling interest of a drama, and the charm of a book are not diminished in their virtue by the fact that a large number of people enjoy them. On the contrary, we might almost say that they gain in virtue, that they receive the "soul" of their existence through being admired and enjoyed. A building hidden from view, a picture unseen, a statue unveiled, a drama unperformed, a book unpublished or not read, are robbed of the soul of their æsthetic existence. Of course there are good souls and bad souls, and it is well that the latter should not live. The whole essence of art is its public, unselfish character, as its pleasures are disinterested and free from the grasping voracity of selfish possession, and it is thus essentially democratic in spirit.

Historically, too, the democratic character of art has ever manifested itself. The periods in history which are marked by the artistic development are also marked by the spread of appreciation among the people, and republican forms of government. Even if these republics were aristocratic in their constitution, the fact remains that the mass of the population in these periods and countries were thoroughly responsive to the higher artistic delights; nay, that they demanded them as a real need. There exists a common notion, as widespread as it is fallacious, that the splendid growth of art was peculiar to the reign of enlightened tyrants and languished under more democratic forms. This is so neither during the highest period of Greek art nor in the history of mediæval and renaissance art. With regard to Greece, what we have already said confirms the established fact that art was the popular expression of the genius of a people to whom it appealed strongly as a clear and intelligible language. In its highest period, as well as in the period of transition to this perfection, Greece was republican. It is true that in Greece, as well as in the Italian renaissance, individual rulers and usurpers, such as Alexander the Great, Attalus of Pergamon, the Medici, and the Popes, were liberal patrons of art, giving it especially a character of splendor. But this only means that these tyrants and rulers found in the composition of the people over whom they ruled or had just succeeded in gaining sway the existence of art and the need of its works, and that they felt driven by interest or inclination to increase or maintain this pursuit and to satisfy this popular demand. Art had reached its highest point in Greece more than a century before the rule of Alexander the Great, and the great artists, like Skopas, Praxiteles, and even Lysippus, were bred and inspired in the generation preceding him. The Pergamene and Rhodian period marks the decline of Greek art, and the splendor which princes like Attalus and Eumenes infused into it was a futile attempt consciously to reproduce the past culture of Greece proper.

In mediæval and renaissance history the same facts present themselves. In the North it is a free town like Nuremberg, with its guilds and craftsmen, that produces the highest art. Never were art and literature more thoroughly popular than in the springtide of prosperity at Nuremberg. In Flanders, at Ghent, Antwerp, and Bruges, art had the same homely and popular character; and though Bruges became the home of emperors and their court, it was in the merchant community that the princes found the means of satisfying their need for splendor and luxury. It must be remembered that the noblest order of the Golden Fleece is originally symbolical of the commercial prosperity of this market of textile fabrics. And when we come to the South, to Italy, we must not forget that it was not

in the *cinque cento* that began the spread of art in Italy, not with the Popes nor with the Medici, but that it was already a part of the mental condition of every Italian city long before this period, and had produced works of stupendous importance. As early as the thirteenth century we have the popular spread of the fruits of culture in Italy. Each city of any importance was anxious to possess a university. Beginning with Bologna and Modena in the twelfth century, follow Vicenza, Padua, Naples, Arezzo, Treviso, Pisa, Pavia,— in short, all the great free cities. At this early period the whole country was thus checkered with centers of high culture, and from these, immediately through each student of even lowly family, the realization of the existence and the appreciation of higher culture filtered through the whole population, and manifested itself in their desire and finally need for intellectual pleasures. In modern times it is because of this diffusion throughout the whole empire, this decentralization and multiplication, of the highest class of universities in Germany that the country ranks highest in the general spread of intellectual appreciativeness among modern nations. And the thirteenth century universities in Italy were well attended; and though at the more famous ones there were many foreign students, they were no doubt largely recruited from Italy. The University of Bologna at one time had about ten thousand students, a number never attained by a university of modern times. But even in small towns, where there was no hope of attracting large numbers of foreign students bringing immediate gain to the citizens, we have proof of the same recognition of learning and culture. Thus we hear that the small town of San Gimignano gave a special salary to a learned town clerk who was to give public lectures on civic law; that the same town gave pecuniary help to gifted young men to enable them to study abroad; that they received and honored with a public festival one of their citizens who had gained fame as a professor of law. But this sense for intellectual acquirement on the part of the population itself not only manifested itself in this indirect and passive form, but led them to desire to enjoy its fruits directly,— on the one hand in the lasting monuments of art which beautified their cities, on the other in the more ephemeral form of public festivals. The communalities had the duty of looking after the embellishment of the town, to buy private houses if needed to make a public square, to build palaces for public business and splendid cathedrals, and to erect artistic fountains and monuments. They would even assist with contributions the monasteries or private persons who undertook to build beautiful churches. It is frequently possible to prove in the present day how the example of one city in erecting a fine city-hall or fountain stimulated the neighboring town to erect another which was to surpass it in beauty. The Florentine document of the year 1300 is well known, in which Florence bestows immunity from taxation on Arnolfo, the architect of the baptistery, because she hoped thereby to possess a more beautiful temple than any other town in Tuscany.

The public amusements, illuminations, processions, races, dances, plays, and ingenious conceits of all kinds were recognized by the communities as a real material need of the people, and were therefore provided at public expense; they were considered by them as being useful. The grand notion of "play" as being neither useless nor frivolous marks a truly healthy community. What can be more simple and touching than the account of the festival given by the city of Treviso to which the neighboring towns were invited? The chief feature was the storming of a fortress, defended by the most beautiful ladies and their servants, by noblemen who made war with fruits, flowers, sweetmeats, and perfumes.

This will suffice to show that the growth of art in its highest form in Greece and Italy rose from the ground of a populace educated to and encouraged in the desire for intellectual edification, and that art is thus thoroughly democratic in spirit, and ought to appeal to the mass of the population. It will be so if the public education acknowledges the claim and stimulates the satisfaction of the need.

The whole spirit of modern education must be modified in this respect; that is, it must not be guided by this misconceived notion of "the useful." It is Goethe who said, with epigrammatic exaggeration: "See to the beautiful, the useful will look after itself." It is often most practical to begin with that which is least manifestly useful, especially when it is most in need of support and encouragement; while the manifestly useful is more likely to enforce the satisfaction of its own wants. The German architect Ferstel, who died recently, was in the rare position of seeing the completion, while comparatively young, of an immense cathedral-like church built on subscription. The secret of this singular *practical* success is to be found in the good advice which King Louis of Bavaria gave to the young architect. As he was beginning the *Votiv-Kirche* at Vienna, "Begin with the tower and finish it," said the King in Bavarian dialect; "the others will see to the nave when they can't use the church." Had he not followed this advice, it is almost certain that the beautiful church would, to

the present day and for some time to come, stand with uncompleted tower.

Well, in the organization of public education in this country, so far as public support is concerned, it may be most practical "to begin with the tower and to complete it"; but with a real tower, one existing for its beautiful form and from which there is a view far into distant lands, and not one conceived merely as a buttress to the nave.

We must begin with ordinary school education; and here the action which is to counteract the neglect of popular artistic feeling is to be direct and indirect: direct in the immediate teaching of art-appreciation; indirect in the modification of the spirit of general teaching.

I have said "the direct teaching of art-appreciation," and not art, because I hold that the two things ought to be kept distinctly separate, the distinction, namely, between art-appreciation and art-production,—art-appreciation, which constitutes one side of every normally developed intellectual citizen, and art-production, which constitutes the vocation of but a few. It is the confusion of these two distinctly different modes of viewing art that causes much mischief in our day. The artist labors and studies the causes with which he may produce certain effects, while the spectator is to enjoy the fruits of these labors, to feel the effects rather than to study the causes; nay the obtrusion of these causes, or rather of the intention and labor which are meant to produce artistic illusion, is at the very cost of this illusion.

This is not the occasion for the exhaustive discussion of this most important point. Suffice it to state that the teaching which I wish to advocate is the teaching of the history of art with a view to the appreciation of artistic works, and not drawing and painting, for it is this side which has been entirely neglected. I do not wish it to be understood that I disfavor the teaching of drawing in schools. On the contrary, I think that to express ourselves with pencil and brush, by means of the representation of things, ought to be a natural and normal part of the power of expression of civilized beings. In modern times we are too prone to believe, and to act in accordance with the belief, that words are the only means of communicating thought. Nay, I go so far as to regret the defection of the old system of "accomplishments"—education for young ladies in one point; namely, that the *purely amateur* spirit of teaching sketching in water-colors or pencil is going out in England. It has given way either to the great multiplication of would-be professional artists who fail to give pleasure to others with their work, and have left for themselves after their efforts the pain of unattained aims, or to the complete neglect of this delightful guide to the pleasant study and the most complete appreciation of nature, and lasting recorder of beautiful places seen and pleasant days spent. Surely the practice of sketching from nature is as pleasure-bringing and refining as the power of performing on a musical instrument.

But it is the teaching of art-appreciation in schools which must be impressed upon all those concerned with education, in order that with regard to general education we might in a direct way apply the lesson of Greek Art, and be like them in the normal constitution of a healthy civilization, equally developed on all sides. In England there is on foot at the present moment a movement which we sincerely hope will receive widest support. It is the Art for Schools Association, which sets itself the aim of distributing, at the very lowest price, reproductions of works of art to the various schools that ask for them. It required an association of individuals in England, where education is not to so high a degree in the hands of the public administration as is the case in this country with public schools. Still, even there the richly endowed institutions called public schools ought to take the matter into their own hands. Rugby has already set an excellent example in the establishment of a school museum. Harrow, too, has the beginning of one. But generally this side of education is completely neglected. In this country this branch of education ought to be thoroughly organized. Each school ought to be provided with a set of reproductions of the most representative works of art from all periods and countries. Photo-engravings, casts from works of sculpture, nay, even the chromo-lithographs with which the Arundel Society has won a well-deserved fame—these works should adorn the walls of school-rooms, and should accustom the eyes of the children from the earliest age to what is excellent in art, thus watching over and cultivating taste as well as sharpness of reasoning and clearness of intellect. Out of many testimonies to the lasting influence of early contemplation of good art, I will but recall the public testimony recently given by Mr. Lowell to the lasting effect which certain reproductions from the antique had upon him as a child when taken to the Boston Athenæum. But we are not to stop at the selected decoration of school-rooms. Each school is further to be provided with a complete set of reproductions systematically chosen to represent the chief stages in the history of art; and the teachers of history, and literature, and language are to be competent to illustrate

and explain the artistic manifestation of any period they are treating of, or any passages in ancient or modern authors which refer to the works of art under consideration. In the higher classes, finally, there ought to be a definite course of instruction in the history of art, without which no boy or girl ought to pass into the world or enter the university. The subjects just mentioned are not the only ones in connection with which the study of art might well be used to supplement and vitalize knowledge. The study of geography, for instance, as at present conceived, is one of the studies the restricted acceptation of which is a crying evil. It is true that it has been supplemented by physical geography, but it ought also to be supplemented by the study of the history of localities in the widest sense; that is, the knowledge not only of the political events marking the various localities, but also the culture that prevailed there, and the appearance of the country, illustrated by photographs of such places, and of the famous works of art which they contain. The various studies ought to be used to illustrate each other; the connection between the groups of studies is to be insisted upon; they are, in short, to be endowed with their own life as they are to be living in the mind of the student, a part of his own intellectual vitality, and not merely an alien element introduced for the time being under a mechanical process of pressure, and discarded as soon as the pressure is withdrawn.

But this leads us to the question of the indirect modification of the spirit of general teaching which is required in order to remedy the diseased state of the development of art. Expressed or only implied, there is a fear in teachers lest, in giving life, say, to the study of geography, in thus illustrating it by means of pictures and the stories of its men, the study be not made too amusing and interesting to maintain the serious character of work. This is the same spirit which we met before swaying the wand of practical utility. In this case it is the domination of the ethical and moral over the intellectual and artistic. The effect of compulsory learning upon the pupils is no doubt often good in making them realize the idea of duty, and in teaching them to control their inclination towards self-indulgence. But life presents so many occasions for teaching and practicing these moral qualities that they need hardly be multiplied for the young, generally overburdened with the feeling of renunciation and with all that counteracts the spirit of joyousness. At all events, immediate moral discipline is not the chief and direct aim of the pursuit of definite studies, and every means which tends to make systematic knowledge complete and to infuse it into the mental system of the pupil with greatest power or promise of tenacity is highly commendable. The general tone of school education is, above all, to be altered in its groundwork in this very direction. The teacher is to realize that one noble thing to strive after is the creation in the pupil of lasting interests and the joy of learning and apprehending. The *nous patheticos* of the Greeks, and not only the *nous poieticos*, is to be watched over and developed. The aim of school-teaching will not only be to fit man and woman best for the active struggle of existence, for the practically useful, but equally to create in them a great capital of interests which will refresh them when wearied with the active struggle, and will give them lasting elevating interests and pleasures when the power of active work has ceased; a capital of interests which do not depend upon possession or consumption, that are open to the rich and the poor, that are in themselves ennobling and strengthening as well as satisfying; in short, the artistic or æsthetic attitude of mind, whether applied to actual works of art or to intellectual and moral pursuits. Let the teacher infuse some of this spirit into whatever subject he teaches. Let him stop and dwell upon the beauty or truth of the passage he is translating, upon the fascination and charm in the history of words, and the graceful fretwork of the huge grammatical structure; let him call back to life the study of the past, and ennoble and mellow the study of the present by showing its systematic interrelation with all things which form the lasting whole of the universe. Surely it will not be to the detriment of the appreciation of truth or the practical application of facts acquired, but it will satisfy another need which is highly practical, inasmuch as it concerns the mental health and happiness of every man. Thus trained in school, the average boy will grow to a man capable of appreciating the best art of his time.

But education does not cease with the boy, and it is in the appreciation of this fact that again in this country we are peculiarly wanting. The capital of interests, once acquired, must be renewed and even increased, or else it will soon die away under the heavy calls from the eager life of interested work. In this country a hard-and-fast line is drawn between the life of play of the boy and the "serious" life of work of the man. A certain amount of toleration exists (though even here too little) towards the more playful thoughts and distractions of the boy at school; but when these years are over, play is to cease and work is to begin, and thereafter the one great and engrossing aim is in some form or other to gain

the means of subsistence, or to increase them as much as possible. All the previous thoughts of play are to be and are at once dismissed.

This is especially the case with athletic games. The boy who wins laurels as a base-ball player ceases this healthy amusement the moment he enters the active life of manhood, and leaves the adult playing to professionals. Even in the universities where athletic games are still cultivated there is with us a certain feeling that the student who rows or is prominent in other games is so, to a certain degree, at the expense of his reading habits. In England, I would venture to say, the most distinguished students, the high wranglers and senior classics, are generally, and have been, boating men. From two to four o'clock in the afternoon it is customary in the English universities, not only for students, but also for teachers, to take their outdoor exercise in some form. I have in my mind at this moment a number of gray-haired university teachers at Cambridge, each one of them a distinguished representative of his branch of science, who all indulge in some form of athletic exercise, be it tennis, rackets, fives, rowing, or riding. Of these a large number merely indulge in constitutional walks; but even of these there are few who would not at times take part in some game. There exists at Cambridge a rowing crew called the Ancient Mariners, consisting exclusively of "dons," and the "stroke" is generally a tutor of Trinity Hall who ceased to be an undergraduate forty years ago. A frequent oarsman of this crew was the late professor of political economy and postmaster-general, who, as is well known, despite his arduous duties and the grievous misfortune of blindness, skated and took all forms of horse-exercise. Luckily for England, adult games are not so exclusively in the hands of professionals, and have retained the freshness and charm of their attraction and the noble purpose which they are destined to serve. I dwell upon this matter of the comparative cultivation of athletic games, though at first sight it might appear alien to the main question before us, because their neglect in this country shows the general neglect of the spirit of play, the *nous patheticos*, struggling for recognition against the all-destroying domination of the spirit of work, the *nous poieticos*. It is at bottom the same spirit of play which underlies the cultivation of art, as with the Greeks it was the same impulse which on the physical side led them to develop so highly their athletic games as on the intellectual side it made them the great artistic nation. Herein we might follow the example of England, especially those who are in the happy position of being able to create leisure, if only they would desist from considering the acquisition of wealth the one great aim of their existence (would that the means were given to all!). I do not mean the establishment of a "leisure class" of which we hear so much. On the contrary, we are most fortunate in not having a class which distinguishes itself from the remainder of the population in that it is not actually productive and does not take an active position in the great coöperative community. May we never desist from withholding our complete respect from those who have no distinct vocation in life; only let us not consider the less apparently and immediately useful avocations as not being an active coefficient in this coöperative social community. But what we do require is the infusion of leisure into all our working classes, and the recognition of its just and moral claim to our consideration.

To return to the less physical aspect of the power of enjoying. It is here that in this country, especially with men, the same abrupt transition from the preparatory life at school to this serious life of business or profession takes place. The capital of interests and intellectual pleasures is no longer increased, but is slowly consumed, until all thoughts and aspirations are completely absorbed by the wearing cares or eager desires of gain and advancement. How often do we meet with the sad sight of the awkwardness or helplessness of people of fair intellect when circumstances have for the time being prevented them from following the ordinary pursuits of life; they are then deprived of the one object which can still exercise a stimulating influence upon their minds, the influence of which is wearing and not refreshing. And it is still sadder to meet with the frequent instances of people who have arrived at that age when the active vigor required for the ordinary vocations of life has been spent, when the "active mind" can no longer exercise its functions, and the "passive mind" has degenerated from early neglect; to see them either vegetating in comatose selfishness (they who before were active and unselfish), or worrying themselves and others with petulant seeking after something of interest which they fail to find (they who before were cheerful and burning with interest). We have instances of this before our eyes every day in this country.

Then picture to yourself, on the other hand, a retired veteran from the bloodless battle of modern economical life, whose vigor just fails to suffice for business or profession, but leaves him free to follow and then to be refreshed by the intellectual pursuit the germs of which took root in his school-days, and have grown

and budded by the side of the sturdy tree of earnest life-work; until, when the sap no longer suffices to nourish the great tree, life is not yet extinct, for the flower and shrub now bud and give growth and beauty to the whole life as it wanes. When they can no longer go to their office or their work, there remains to them the interest in books, in pictures or bric-à-brac, in prints, in some study of science, in music, the theater, their garden and botany, in shells, or beetles, or butterflies. Above all, they have learnt the art of being alone. The first and most common symptom of intellectual vulgarity, of intellectual anæmia, if I may use the term, is the incapacity of people to remain alone or quiet. They are so poor in the intellectual life-blood that the pulse of interest will not throb unless they have the outer stimulus of the chatter of people. A book, a beautiful scene, not to mention their own thoughts, cannot fascinate them even for an hour, and they must beg for the offal of interest from the social banquet. I hold that to teach people the art of being alone and enjoying it, is of more practical use than the immediate good that comes from much of the most practical school-teaching. And this power of moral enjoyment is not, and ought not to be, restricted to the rich or the well-to-do. It ought to be a popular good, as it was with the Greeks.

It is, moreover, the duty of popular government to foster and cultivate this power among the people, which they can do by means of the encouragement of those pleasures the very nature of which is that they are common and belong to the many, that they increase with the degree of participation; namely, the democratic pleasures of art. Nor do I conceive the term art in the narrow acceptation of painting, and sculpture, and architecture. The art that is to be encouraged by public administration is all that comes under the head of *intellectual play* common to the many and productive of moral edification. Public feasts. music, the drama, museums, libraries, reading-rooms, and the more immediately instructive amusement of lectures,—all these ought to be the great care of state, as they were in ancient Hellas; nay, even more so in a time which has not the restricted notions of national duties requiring the chief energy of the people to guard or to aggrandize their national domain against aliens whom they considered as their enemies, or at least not their friends. I see the day coming when this fact will have grown in the public consciousness until it will come to be realized by the government, that it is the supreme duty of the state to foster and cultivate the higher amusements of the people more than to play at antiquated Talleyrandism in foreign policy.

How little this is realized at present, especially in Europe, is shown most strikingly in England. Eastern and Egyptian questions are of such absorbing importance that the public care of intellectual pursuits and amusements would naturally appear trivial to most persons concerned with government. A relatively small sum for the acquisition of a work of art or the maintenance of a museum is withheld or granted after much discussion, where millions are devoted unhesitatingly to some object of "foreign policy."

As one of the most curious instances of the neglect, not to say contempt, which this group of public institutions suffers in England, I need but point to the administration of the British Museum. Of all the civil service of which the administration of this museum forms a part, this institution requires in its officers and assistants the greatest previous preparation and initial capital of intelligence; and still its appointments are lowest in the scale of salaries in the civil service. A clerk whose duty it is to add up the salaries of non-commissioned officers, or to copy letters and fill out forms, starts with a higher salary, rises at a higher ratio, and ends with a higher final salary, than an assistant who must catalogue and identify Greek and Oriental coins, who must watch over rare manuscripts, and is responsible for priceless articles of science and art. The principal officers of this greatest institution of the kind in the world, who ought all to be the highest representatives of their study, are paid far less than chief-assistant secretaries in the government offices. And this neglect is in a country where the larger schools and universities are richly endowed by private donations and bequests, and where the museums and libraries have been greatly enriched by the same means; where, in short, the burden is comparatively much smaller than it is in this country or in Germany. But it is encouraging to find that of late there is an awakening to the public duties in this direction, both with regard to school and after-school education of the people. Though not yet the act of the Government, the establishment of the Royal Academy of Music remains a public act. The recent Fisheries, Health, and Inventions exhibitions, with their concerts and promenades, have been made a means towards the cultivation of higher popular amusement.

It is here in America, however, where luckily there is no Eastern or Egyptian question, no oppressive standing army, and where the duty of public action with regard to education has been recognized from the very foun-

dation of the Republic, that more ought to be done in the direct intervention of public administration. Entertainments and lectures in the town and city halls, establishment and maintenance of museums, embellishment of towns in every respect,—these are to form an integral part of governmental function. As a rule government grants for artistic purposes are limited to architecture; but after the building is complete, a new sphere of public artistic activity ought to begin. The great sculptors and painters and decorators ought to be called in to make of each city hall, each government or public building, in itself a museum, a representative type of the highest advance in art that the place or period has been able to make. Our national capitol is to a certain degree decorated; but I should be sorry, not to say ashamed, to think that this is all the country can produce of highest art. If it is answered that the great art is wanting, I would but point to the fact that artistic demand will produce supply. I have on several occasions urged talented artists painting small domestic pictures, or modeling statuettes and reliefs, to try something great and worthy. Their answer has been: "Where can we find a market for our great works? We must work for the house of the well-to-do art patron, and the house will not hold a monumental work." I dare say that some, perhaps most, of these artists would have failed in this "great" work; but others, if only one, might have had the noble soul, the *alma gentile*, awakened, and a genius might have been born to us.

There are two broad classes of artistic works, the domestic and the monumental. The latter class is public in character, and ought either to be in a museum or part of some public building. Domestic art is growing every day and will find its support; it is the monumental art, beyond the reach of the individual (as it ought to be), which must be public property and ought to be encouraged by the representatives of the people.

Charles Waldstein.

BIRD ENEMIES.

HOW surely the birds know their enemies! See how the wrens and robins and bluebirds pursue and scold the cat, while they take little or no notice of the dog! Even the swallow will fight the cat, and, relying too confidently upon its powers of flight, sometimes swoops down so near to its enemy that it is caught by a sudden stroke of the cat's paw. The only case I know of in which our small birds fail to recognize their enemy is furnished by the shrike; apparently the little birds do not know that this modest-colored bird is an assassin. At least I have never seen them scold or molest him, or utter any outcries at his presence, as they usually do at birds of prey. Probably it is because the shrike is a rare visitant, and is not found in this part of the country during the nesting season of our songsters.

But the birds have nearly all found out the trick of the jay, and when he comes sneaking through the trees in May and June in quest of eggs, he is quickly exposed and roundly abused. It is amusing to see the robins hustle him out of the tree which holds their nest. They cry, "Thief, thief!" to the top of their voices as they charge upon him, and the jay retorts in a voice scarcely less complimentary as he makes off.

The jays have their enemies also, and need to keep an eye on their own eggs. It would be interesting to know if jays ever rob jays, or crows plunder crows; or is there honor among thieves even in the feathered tribes? I suspect the jay is often punished by birds which are otherwise innocent of nest-robbing. One season I found a jay's nest in a small cedar on the side of a wooded ridge. It held five eggs, every one of which had been punctured. Apparently some bird had driven its sharp beak through their shells, with the sole intention of destroying them, for no part of the contents of the eggs had been removed. It looked like a case of revenge; as if some thrush or warbler, whose nest had suffered at the hands of the jays, had watched its opportunity and had in this way retaliated upon its enemies. An egg for an egg. The jays were lingering near, very demure and silent, and probably ready to join a crusade against nest-robbers.

The great bugaboo of the birds is the owl. The owl snatches them from off their roosts at night, and gobbles up their eggs and young in their nests. He is a veritable ogre to them, and his presence fills them with consternation and alarm.

One season, to protect my early cherries, I placed a large stuffed owl amid the branches of the tree. Such a racket as there instantly

THE LESSON OF GREEK ART.

PART II. THE EDUCATION OF THE ARTIST.

IF the artistic education of the people is furthered in school by the immediate teaching of art history, as well as by the modification of the general spirit of school-teaching, and, after school, by the encouragement and active development of intellectual pleasures among the public, as well as by the direct encouragement of art by the public administration, then the first condition which made art with the Greeks what it was, a language intelligible to the mass of the population, may be realized in this country. But if art be made thus generally intelligible to the people, we must also add to it the second characteristic — that it be adequately expressive of the highest and best in our age; and this can only be attained by the education of the art-producing few. However much may be done by the actual demand for great works on the part of the public, great art requires great artists.

The reason why our art is not adequately expressive of the best that is in our age is that the artist is not representative of the highest culture of our age. In Greece this was not the case. An artist like Pheidias was not only thoroughly skilled in all the technicalities of his art, not only did he study under different teachers, such as Hegias the Athenian and Polykleitos the Argive, but, above all, he was alive to and interested in all that moved his time ; a friend of Pericles and Anaxagoras the philosopher, he responded to the political and scientific life of his time, and, as is shown by his familiarity with the Homeric poems, was well versed in the ancient and contemporary literature of his age. His position under Pericles was not only that of a sculptor, but he was what we should call a minister of public works, and in this time of great artistic activity he must have been in constant official relation with his cultured political friend, so close that he was made the butt of the political intrigues against Pericles. To live thus in close intimacy with the great political leader of the time, himself the center of all cultured interest, and above all to have been a free-born Greek boy with the universal education given then, made of this genius in art a most perfect representative of the best culture of his age, expressing himself in the language of art, as Pericles was such a type and expressed himself in poetical action and oratory, Æschylos in tragic poetry, and subsequently Plato in philosophy. The same has been ever the case in the periods of the highest art. The versatile renaissance types of Leonardo da Vinci and Michael Angelo are known to all. The position of the latter has many analogies to that of Pheidias. The great artists of the flower of the renaissance were all full representatives of their age in their personalities; they were the peers in culture of the leaders in politics, in literature, and in science, nay, often took an active part in these collateral spheres. This is far from being the case in modern times; the artist is not thus a coördinate representative of the highest culture of our times. Nay, I make bold to say, that if we were to take an equal number of literary men, scientific men, physicians and other professional men, cultivated business men, and artists, the artists would rank lowest on the scale of general culture apart from their special vocation. It arises from the deficient education of the generality of our artists. When once a boy has manifested his talent, and it is decided that he should follow art as a profession, immediately after he has left school, or frequently before this period, he begins his artistic training to the exclusion of all other pursuits. How is it possible for one thus prepared to acquire or retain his position on the height of contemporary culture? No doubt ours is a time of great specialization, I might almost say unfortunately, if it had not such splendid results to show. Though in scientific and professional pursuits a certain amount of specialization is absolutely essential to the production of great work, the two exceptions to this rule are literature and art. The special subject here dealt with is general life. " Greift nur hinein in's volle Menschenleben, und wo ihr's packt da ist es interessant," is the advice given in Goethe's " Faust " to the poet. The artist chooses from life and nature, and he must appreciate and know them in all their aspects. And, what is still more important in these two spheres of intellectual activity, the man gives himself in his work; his personality is of a supreme importance in modifying or giving character to his work, not to be found in the pursuit of science or professions dealing more with things and their relations independent of the personality of him who treats of them. It is the subjective character of art-production, in contradistinction to the objective spirit of scientific work, which makes it less possible for the artist to specialize. The artist gives himself in his work, and therefore depends upon the constitution of this self whether the work will

be great or not. But if the personalities of the artists are not representative of the best in our age, it is hopeless to expect a really representative great art.

The practical question then presents itself to us: How can this deficiency in the education of the artist be remedied? The first demand is that the artists should partake of the higher education; they should have a university education as well as the literary men, the men of science and professions. The potential artist at school, the boy in whom the desire towards artistic production is expressed, and the capacities are manifest, should not at once neglect his general education. On the other hand, I am fully alive to the exceeding importance of familiarizing the artist from the earliest age with the technical language which he is to use. It is so in painting and sculpture, as it is so in music. The use of the brush and of colors and the handling of clay ought in the early years to be made so much a part of the boy or girl, that the process of applying them ought to be almost unconscious, an act of second nature; so that he shall hardly know why he uses his brush in this or that manner, takes a certain quantity of one color and not of another; as little as the violinist knows why he uses a certain degree of wrist-pressure in bowing a certain passage, or the pianist considers each note he plays. But because it is advisable to train the future artist from an early period in the technicalities of his art, there is no reason why his general education should therefore be stunted and he should neglect his other studies at school. The two things can be combined, and the amount of practice which is required to familiarize the boy at school with the technicalities of art, so far as it is required at this age, is gained with but slight intrusion upon his leisure.

But it is after school that the critical period comes. It is now that those feelings and thoughts are to take form which are to mark the character of his compositions; and it is generally then that the art-student leaves school and, either abroad or at home, begins his work at the academy or at some studio. If he is industrious, he will work much; if not, he will spend much of his time in idle dreaming or in stupid dissipation, which a certain unreasoning and vicious tradition has established as being conducive to the growth of an artistic imagination. In either case the care for the further growth of general intelligence and taste has ceased with this age, and he necessarily falls behind the ranks in general culture. It is out of the question that every art-student should defer the period of his active apprenticeship to the completion of the university course. It is true, also, that at some art-schools, such as the Beaux-Arts at Paris, the Munich and Berlin Academies, there are also lectures on subjects kindred to art. But this is not what is required; general education cannot be clipped and modeled to suit a special vocation.

The practical solution of the difficulty is, that there should be established an inner relation between the university and the art-academy with a view to the education of the art-student. Most great centers of artistic education have universities. Facilities ought to be granted to the art-student to attend the lectures of university professors, and the attendance on these lectures would act as a relaxation from the special work which he follows. Nobody will maintain that to hear a great representative of philosophy, of physics, of biology, or of history giving in an hour's discourse the fruits of his life-work, is not a great pleasure to a person possessed of higher intellectual instincts. If this does not give him pleasure, then there is something fundamentally coarse and wrong in his nature, which will manifest itself in all his productions. I do not wish to restrict this education to the subjects bearing upon art, such as, especially, the historical sciences. It is not the artist as such who is to be taught in these lectures, it is the man who is to receive the higher culture of his age. Nobody is truly representative of our culture who is not conversant with the great advancement of natural science. Now, I know many business men who delight in reading works of natural science, and who, without pretending to special knowledge in this sphere, are thoroughly alive to all that moves the scientific world; the instances of artists thus interested are very few. I would not have it understood that I wish to make the artist learned; still less that he is to apply the fruits of this higher education directly to his art. This is often the case when the education is but half acquired; we then see futile attempts to paint "scientifically," to give long quotations from obscure authors and works, to paint with a "realistic purpose," and all the other mental aberrations, as frequent in literature as they are in art. The undue obtrusion of any element in work or behavior always points to immaturity and to the fact that the element obtruded is but newly and, therefore, but half acquired. The artist who has lived through the great mental life of modern scientific investigation need not paint biological or physical pictures, or theorize on the relation of colors; but the tree, the scene of nature or history which he paints will be different in so far as his whole personality has undergone a change since he has assimilated a new sphere of knowledge. The same scene painted by sev-

eral artists differs in each case, because the artists differ in their way of looking at the scene as their whole character and intellect differ. Widen and ennoble a mind, and you will alter its whole character. If the artist is a full representative of the highest in his age, there is some chance of his work partaking of this high standard, provided his technical training and natural talent give him the completeness of artistic expression; but if he is below the highest standard of culture in his age, no amount of technical skill and talent will make his work truly representative of his age.

But, as in the education of the public we noticed the importance of the education in the life succeeding the school and university years, so here there is an education which comes after the art-academy, and which, it appears to me, is again neglected in the case of the artist. This is the educational side of social life. If most men were asked how much they had learned at school and university and how much in social intercourse with intellectual people, it would be difficult to give too high a limit to the latter. But it appears to me that artists are more exempt from this healthy friction than the representatives of almost any other liberal vocation. They are more exclusive or more clannish than any other class. They associate chiefly with one another, or with professedly art-appreciating people whose conversation, if not unintellectual, is generally "shoppy"; and thus, as a rule, even in after life the healthy interchange of interests and experience does not take place. Furthermore, there is often a depressing and intimidating atmosphere in a circle exclusively made up of workers in one field, which robs especially the young striver of the freshness and fearlessness of creative impulse. He leaves the society of his colleagues an intellectual coward, haunted by the critical eyes of his older fellow-workers,— a coward as regards great enterprise, he who before was a hero. How many an intellect has been stunted in growth and how much that was original planed down to the level of commonplace through the sway of shop-circles. After a good day's work in his studio the artist ought to seek the society of those in no way connected with art, where he can learn what moves the superior mind in other spheres of thought and action, and where he can keep alive his general interests developed by a sound education. What is wanted all over the civilized world is the *salon* of old days, the intellectual exchange with a thoroughly pleasant social tone. It does not exist in Paris, nor in London; though a few years ago the Sunday afternoons of George Henry Lewes and his wife very nearly held this position.

At all events, we shall not have the highest art until our most skilled artists are also the most thoroughly cultured men. May the beginning be made in this country. We are at the first stage, and therefore possessed of greater organs and power of beginning anew; but, also, there are here possibilities of going wrong.

When the conditions favorable to the production of a great art in this country are realized so far as the education of the art-appreciating public and the productive artist are concerned, an important practical question presents itself in the form: What direction is artistic work in this country to take? For there are presented to the artist beginning his career many modes of conception and execution characterizing the European schools, definite lines of work already existing which he cannot ignore. These will necessarily influence him, and will present themselves for acceptance. As a matter of fact, it appears to me that the chief influence upon the art of America is exercised by the art of France. The greater number of our distinguished artists have gone to France for their training, and it is but natural, in this occupation as in all others, that the pupil should be an enthusiastic admirer of the methods followed in the school in which he has been trained. The greater and stronger the enthusiasm, the more will it be exclusive, and the more absolute will be the adhesion to the school. Furthermore, with the freshness which characterizes us, every movement is in danger of partaking of a "rage" or "craze," which always implies the exaggeration and exclusiveness of ill-balanced admiration. It appears to me that there is at this moment an unhealthy predominance of the French element in our art. It is unhealthy, inasmuch as it goes beyond the admiration of the qualities and aims at the complete introduction of the national characteristics of this foreign art,— not merely admitting its wholesome influence, but degenerating into imitation. The complete acceptance of alien models in art or literature is always unhealthy; inasmuch as it is untrue, it is singularly so in our country. There is one characteristic in which it is well for every country to imitate France: that is, the honesty and "professionality," if I may invent such a word, of its work. Despite the proverbial levity of character of the French people, I would venture to say that there is no country in which the thorough realization of technical work, as distinguished from play, in literature and art, is more completely felt and acted upon than in France. The author and the artist learn from the very beginning that there is a labor-side to the inspired, *feu-sacré* ebullition of poetry and art, and their work bears the traces of this thorough mastery of the

technicalities of their art-craft, be it in a novel, an essay, a drama, a picture, or a statue. They are thus comparatively free from the amateur productions which abound even in the professional publications and exhibitions of this country and of England. The line between the amateur and professional is definitely drawn, and the professional author or artist never forgets the craftsman who lives or ought to live in the artist. But to attempt adopting or imitating the spirit and idiosyncrasies of their art is as absurd as it is vicious and futile. Moreover, it generally leads to the feeble reproduction of what is eccentric in their art, and sometimes even of what is condemnable, while the true spirit and character is lost. Is it not better to be good Americans than feeble Frenchmen?

This is not the direction the American art of the future ought to take. It ought to be neither French nor English nor German — it is to be American. We are to be ourselves, truly ourselves, expressing what is in us with the greatest truthfulness, the most patient and conscientious labor. But the question may be raised: What are we? Is there anything definite to express, especially on the artistic side of our nature? I believe it is an opinion of American character long ago exploded in the minds of those who know us, that we are at heart a materialistic people. If anything, we are inclined to be artistic, and though not *learned* in art, we have the true instinct of artistic production; namely, the freshness of inventive power, and the delight of self-expression. We naturally lack confidence in our own power as regards intellectual products, and it is but right that at this early stage we should be diffident; but when we have gained the recognition of our older European kin this confidence will come.

To recognize what manner of men we are, what our failings and advantages, in order that we may strive at thus expressing ourselves fully and truly, we do well in turning to the past of Greece and in studying the history of a people abounding in the most curious and interesting analogies to our own. It is the history of the Greek settlements in the south of Italy and Sicily. They were, as we are, originally colonies from the mother-country, and carried with them the traditions and culture of an old country. They grew in power, wealth, and refinement as we are growing. It is an historical absurdity to make an hypothesis on what might have been if things had not happened as they did. Still I venture to follow up the idea that, had the Greek colonies of Magna Græcia joined in a great federation instead of making war upon one another and consuming among each other their great inner vitality, the course of the world's history might have been essentially altered and the continuity of the highest Greek culture might have been greater than it has been. I have on another occasion, from a more special point of view, drawn attention to the fact that the reactive influence of the culture of these countries upon the culture of Greece proper has not been sufficiently recognized, and that this influence can hardly be over-estimated It was here that the great philosophers were born, here that they endeavored to realize their ideas of social and political reform; not only Pythagoras and Parmenides, but also Plato. It was here that art freed itself from conventional shackles, here that the great games, so important in their influence upon the unity of Greece, received their chief patronage and encouragement. It was the theater of reforms, the trial-ground for new movements. They, as we, maintained the love and reverence for their parent homes; they were possessed, as we are, with the strong desire to vie with the Old World; and they felt the same joy if one of their citizens was victor in the Olympian games that we feel when one of our countrymen has been victorious in a European contest.

But it is in their art that their example is most instructive. Their great artists, such as Pythagoras of Rhegium, took their training at home and in the old country; but not only in one school, at Athens or Sparta: they laid themselves open to the influence of all. The result was freedom from the traditional shackles and thorough sympathy with their perfections; and this gave Pythagoras the power to be the great innovator in the free rendering of the human figure. The works coming from this country, works perfect in conception and execution, are thoroughly Hellenic in character, but cannot be classed under any one school; nor are they made up of the several parts. They have a new national character of their own, and one that would have grown in perfection had their own nationality grown to full constitution and lasting unity.

We, the Magna Græcians of the West, let us lay ourselves open to all that is good and great in the cultured life of the Old World. Let us learn from France, Germany, and England, and imbibe it all with unprejudiced desire of learning; but let us then express our own selves with truth and without affectation and with honest work, and let the character which will be in our work be *sui generis* and of a good kind. We have passed beyond the danger which engulfed the great cities of southern Italy and Sicily, we have put by inner dissension, and have reaffirmed a unity which will grow with the power of each organ of the whole body, with the spread of wealth, spiritual and natural.

We have also had our reactive influence

upon the culture of the Old World, and we are and have been the trial-ground for great reforms and new movements. We have taught the world the lesson of freedom and self-government. We are at present preaching to Europe the downfall of Talleyrandism and of "foreign" diplomatic policy. We are most effectually teaching them by economical competition the absurdity and economical impossibility of large standing armies, the childish outcome of their antiquated romantic policy of aggression and gold-laced, order-bedecked, Vienna-Conference prestige. We are positively teaching the lesson of the supreme importance of the Home Office, so to speak, and all its vital social and economical questions, over the Foreign Office with its stagey glitter and Quixotic pomp and mystery. We are teaching them lessons more effectually than the French philosophers of nature and of nature's right, more effectually than the blood-lesson of the French Revolution, than the enthusiastic and thoughtful writers of the German *Aufklärung*. Let us finally teach the world the great lesson that it is the supreme duty of the state to foster and develop all that leads to the civilizing amusement and the intellectual edification of the people.

I FEAR that I have criticised much and have given much advice, more than my experience or years justify: I have been sententious and dogmatic. My only apology must be that the lesson I have attempted to give to my countrymen is not one of my own devising, but that it is the lesson of Greek Art of which I have been the feeble interpreter.

Charles Waldstein.

CANADA.

O CHILD of nations, giant-limbed,
Who stand'st amid the nations now
Unheeded, unadored, unhymned,
With unanointed brow!

How long the ignoble sloth, how long
The trust in greatness not thine own?
Surely the lion's brood is strong
To front the world alone!

How long the indolence, ere thou dare
Achieve thy destiny, seize thy fame,—
Ere our proud eyes behold thee bear
A nation's franchise, nation's name?

The Saxon force, the Celtic fire,
These are thy manhood's heritage!
Why rest with babes and slaves? Seek higher
The place of race and age!

I see to every wind unfurled
The flag that bears the maple-wreath;
Thy swift keels furrow round the world
Its blood-red folds beneath;—

Thy swift keels cleave the farthest seas;
Thy white sails swell with alien gales;
To stream on each remotest breeze,
The black smoke of thy pipes exhales.

O Falterer! let thy past convince
Thy future,—all the growth, the gain,
The fame since Cartier knew thee, since
Thy shores beheld Champlain!

Montcalm and Wolfe! Wolfe and Montcalm!
Quebec, thy storied citadel,
Attest in burning song and psalm
How here thy heroes fell!

O thou that bor'st the battle's brunt
At Queenston and at Lundy's Lane,—
On whose scant ranks but iron front
The battle broke in vain,—

Whose was the danger, whose the day,
From whose triumphant throats the cheers,
At Chrysler's Farm, at Chateauguay,
Storming like clarion-bursts our ears?

On soft Pacific slopes—beside
Strange floods that northward rave and fall—
Where chafes Acadia's chainless tide—
Thy sons await thy call!

They wait; but some in exile, some
With strangers housed, in stranger lands;
And some Canadian lips are dumb
Beneath Egyptian sands!

O mystic Nile! thy secret yields
Before us; thy most ancient dreams
Are mixed with far Canadian fields
And murmur of Canadian streams.

But thou, my country, dream not thou!
Wake, and behold how night is done,—
How on thy breast and o'er thy brow
Bursts the uprising sun!

Charles G. D. Roberts.