

vised Statutes (before the appearance of the present publication) was obliged to search first the Revised Statutes themselves and then the various supplements, which supplements, however, "are nothing more than a condensation of the Statutes at Large," reproducing the statutes "in chronological order, not revised or consolidated." All these supplements had to be examined, "because many provisions contained in them, as well as in the Revised Statutes, have been repealed or superseded or amended (and often reamended) by later provisions." This new compilation, on the other hand, collects all the general laws, arranges them according to subject-matter, under the familiar titles of the Revised Statutes. To sum up the whole story, it contains "everything that should be included in a new revision if one were now to be made." Such a compilation should be a useful book of reference. It labors, of course, like all books of its class, under one disadvantage—it is not a Government publication; it has no legislative sanction, no official authority, and consequently is only "one more book." He who in preparing his brief is lucky enough to have it at his elbow may be saved much labor, but it will not dispense him from the duty of looking through the Revised Statutes, or the supplements to the Revised Statutes, or, we may add, through current legislation subsequent to both Revised and Compiled Statutes. Voluminous indices and tables, nearly six hundred pages in extent, crown the work.

—The 'Jeanne d'Arc' of Mr. T. Douglas Murray (McClure, Phillips & Co.) will be made welcome in many a college library which is prevented by poverty from buying the rare and expensive volumes of Quicherat. The Maid of Orleans already has her numerous biographers, and Mr. Murray's name does not go to swell the list. His function, though apparently more modest, is none the less important, for he turns into plain English and presents in accessible form the most remarkable documents which are connected with her career. Every one knows that, some time after her capture, Joan was tried at Rouen by a special tribunal and found guilty of being "boastful, foolish, treacherous, deceitful, cruel, blood-thirsty, seditious, blasphemous, undutiful, rash, a fatalist, uncharitable, idolatrous, schismatical, apostate, and finally a heretic." This unpleasant list of epithets meant, of course, that she should lose her life, and burned she was, as all the world remembers. But probably all the world does not remember that the *procès-verbal* of her trial was exhumed by Jules Quicherat and published at Paris in 1841, under the title, 'Procès de Condamnation et de Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc.' The death sentence was pronounced in 1431 and execution immediately followed; but twenty-four years later, when the English had been driven out of the country and the French nation was at liberty to feel a sense of gratitude, another court declared that, after all, Joan was no heretic. This second tribunal met under papal sanction in the cathedral of Paris, and, like the first, left definite record of itself. The evidence which led to rehabilitation or official whitewashing survives in the MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale, and may now be had, as well as the first batch of evidence, from the pages

of Mr. Murray. The Latin text of Quicherat has thus been translated, made into a single volume, printed handsomely, and interspersed with excellent illustrations. Mr. Murray contributes a short introduction, but his labors have been chiefly confined to note-making and the preparation of an English version. One characteristic of the original evidence is the crabbedness and abruptness of its style. Mr. Murray's translation makes the text run somewhat more smoothly than the examiners, Joan and the reporters have left it, but such variation as we have noticed in the course of a short comparison does not constitute a blemish. Altogether it is a very useful piece of work, and well worth the doing. For one thing, it makes available a splendid body of data relating to the Hundred Years' War; for another, it shows exactly how a mediæval trial for magic and heresy was conducted; but chiefly it enables those who are unfamiliar with Latin to realize the depths of a tragedy that outruns the fancied pathos of "King Lear."

#### A NEW AMERICAN ENCYCLOPÆDIA.

*The New International Encyclopædia.* Editors: Daniel Coit Gilman, LL.D.; Harry Thurston Peck, Ph.D., LL.D.; Frank Moore Colby, M.A. Vols. I.—III. A—Canada. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1902.

It is well known to how great an extent American encyclopædias have been based on one edition or other of 'Chambers's Encyclopædia,' which in its turn was based on the 'Conversations-Lexicon' of Brockhaus. The use made of 'Chambers,' and the extent to which it was spoiled—in both senses of the word—varied with the skill and space of the plunderers, but the trail of the booty was everywhere, and reproachful ghosts haunted and haunt many alien pages. In this there was some poetic justice, though little commercial honesty; Chambers had confessedly translated much from Brockhaus, and the American editors—yet without confession—reconveyed the stolen property. But such gains seldom prosper their new holders. In this case the articles taken over were variously maltreated, abbreviated, edited, to suit the American public and to give space for the dealing with peculiarly American rubrics. The result was that the user of such an encyclopædia felt driven at every turn to examine whether he might not find in Chambers the original and unutilized article, reserving his American reference for American things only.

But the Germanizing of our educational tools goes on steadily, and think what we may of German scholars as men of letters in an ideal sense, there can be no question of their absolute supremacy as journeymen of letters, as patient compilers of exactly sifted and verified fact. While the German philosopher and critic has the reputation of intense subjectivity, of a power of accepting as certain his own personal and momentary impressions, the German hack-writer—using the word in no opprobrious sense—has a power of objectifying and putting into compact form the certified results, no more and no less, of any scientific investigation. His presentation of these results may be bald, clumsy, involved; but to the reader who takes time to read carefully, the matter is all there. Of such men are the writers in

Brockhaus and Meyer, and in imitation of them and their methods there is assuredly great reward. Similar is the ability of the German editor. His labors and responsibilities are great. His contributors must be anonymous; otherwise they would feel it necessary to frame theories of their own and make new contributions to knowledge in their articles, and, for such, an encyclopædia should have no place. Being anonymous, the responsibility for their work rests upon the whole book; each part depends upon each and will be judged with it. The editor must see to it that the articles are sufficient, that they are properly divided, correlated and proportioned. When they are inadequate, he cannot shield himself behind the great names of the writers; for that the whole encyclopædia must suffer. It is therefore plain that an encyclopædia arranged on this plan must have at its service a staff of conscientious, laborious, learned collaborators, and an editor or editors of autocratic powers, truly encyclopædic knowledge, endless patience, and sleepless vigilance—especially the last. In Germany, under German conditions, and in view of the German character and peculiar abilities, these things are possible. It may be doubted whether with us, even at a prohibitive price, a Meyer or a Brockhaus could be produced.

The present encyclopædia starts with a preface of promise: it is practically to furnish an English Brockhaus. The prospectus goes still further, and gives an extensive list of contributors and editors of departments. This list undoubtedly shows up well, but the fact remains that, on the unsigned principle, it is impossible to say who individually is responsible for any particular article. Thus, on the one hand, if an article is criticised, the blame must be distributed over many eminent names, and, on the other, if the encyclopædia as a whole is criticised and its publishers blamed, they can point triumphantly in their defence to the same eminent names. What better could we do? they may ask; to which the public can say little, but can have its own opinion of the whole affair. To bring all to a point, absolute anonymity and the responsibility frankly shouldered by the publishers is the sole alternative of signed articles and the responsibility of the signer.

Accepting, however, the articles as anonymous and impersonal in the full German sense, the great weakness of the present work is undoubtedly in the editing, major and minor. There are certainly scholars in the country equal to this great argument. The problem was to find them, to set them properly to work, to see that they did the work, and to reproduce accurately their results. To a great extent they have been found, to a lesser extent their tasks have been properly assigned, very often they have not been kept up to their true standards, and most generally their results have been carelessly reproduced. The last—the proofreading—is glaring throughout the first two volumes; in the third a considerable improvement appears, though errors still continue. As specimens may serve (vol. I., p. 53), "unfriendly" for friendly; (p. 139), "public persecutor" for persecutor; (p. 232), "Tiruskahi" for Firzokhi; (p. 288) "Compluum" for Complutum; (p. 308) "picturesque" for picaresque; (p. 342) "al-jozair" for al-jazair; (plate of alpha-

bets opposite p. 392) Hebrew letter Tsade for Ayin; (p. 431) the article on Ambrose's Tavern is completely pried by the omission of a line or lines; (vol. ii., p. 41) "Kilbrennan" for Kilbrannan; (p. 311) article Babbage, another case of repetition and omission of a line; (p. 489) "Jarfar" repeatedly for Ja'far; (p. 679) "largest the" for largest and; (p. 705) no capital to "Polish"; (p. 737) "Mzabit" for Mzabite; (p. 70) "Mysterionun" for Mysteriorum; (p. 771) "signalmments" for *signalements*; (p. 808) "collected" for collated; (p. 812) "Rhenish" for Rhemish; (vol. iii., p. 280) "Lazarde" for Lagarde; (p. 398) "Greeks" for Gauls; (p. 503) "with out religion" for "with our religion"; (p. 536) "Ancram" for Ancrum; (p. 682) "Bard" for Barb; (p. 729) "Ballick" for Balliol. This list could be very easily extended. It is not based on any systematic search, and does not take account of simple misspellings of English words.

To return to the contributors: many of them have done their work excellently. This holds especially of the articles on chemistry and anatomy—indeed, on natural and physical science generally—on mathematics and psychology. The last is of the modern type, and the articles on it contrast often with those on the lives and systems of different philosophers. Thus, that on Berkeley is not in the same class with the corresponding article in the last edition of Chambers, nor is that on Bentham. Generally, it may be said that biography, while very broad, is not very full, very accurate, or very attractive. The number of entries is enormous, and the assertion that this encyclopædia is unique on that side may easily be correct. But, in comparing these biographies with those in Chambers, there is hardly a case where the present book is not the poorer. This stands out the more clearly the more important the biography is. Especially in literature, there is nothing here that can stand beside the carefully written studies, which are the distinction of the Edinburgh work. This is the stranger because, in the preface, the editors repudiate what they call "the encyclopædic style," and profess to have urged upon their contributors that lighter and more personal touch which "would characterize their contributions to any literary publication of a high class." We can only entreat them, with an open mind, to compare their productions on Aristophanes, Beaumont and Fletcher, Burns, Byron, Sir Thomas Browne, Boccaccio, almost any figure in literature, with the corresponding article in Chambers. Disproportion is another defect conspicuous in these biographies. It cannot be regarded as happy that Calvin has nearly four pages, with an addition of a page and a half on Calvinism, while Byron has one and a quarter, Burns a little over one, Augustine two, and Athanasius one—exactly the same as Richard Baxter and H. W. Beecher. Again, Sir Walter Besant and Mrs. Besant have practically the same space, each of less than half a column, while Bhartrihari, a Sanskrit poet of not exactly the first rank, has a column and a half. This is evidently due to weakness or carelessness on the part of the editors. Their writers were not held in hand, and each got practically the space which he claimed. The same disproportion appears in other subjects. Thus, Anemometer has nearly two pages—is worth as much as Augustine!—and Blindspot has

nearly a page and a-half. The theatre has also secured to itself much space. Dion Boucicault has a column, and the latest actor or actress is secure of a generous mention. Music has a better claim, and has been even better treated. Beethoven has four pages, Bach three and a half, and the general articles are full, and for the most part good. Beethoven's personality, it is true, might have been treated more sympathetically, his friendships less flippantly, and his place as the highest exponent of the classical and the prophet of the romantic in music could have been more clearly shown. This is one of the articles where the finer touch is missed. Nor are absurd blunders lacking. Under Andante we learn that *con moto* means "with emotion," misinformation derived straight from Chambers, which had nodded for once. Again a case for editorial vigilance.

Military matters have the fulness which suits this militant age. There is the inevitable complacency over the army of the United States; but the only serious defect is under Armies, where the part played by the Byzantine Empire in developing military science is unrecognized. If this writer will consider how long the Eastern Empire kept Mohammedanism at bay, he will find a very curious problem in the art of war.

The articles dealing with Asia are of an uncertain value. The Aryan East in general, and in especial the Iranian, is good, sometimes even too full for proportion. The Semitic East, on the other hand, is generally weak, inadequate, and inaccurate. Thus, the contrast is very striking between the sections on Assyrian and Babylonian art and architecture, which are good, and the general articles on Assyria and Babylonia, which are very poor. The same holds of Arabic rubrics, which are often most carelessly handled, and of those from the Old Testament, which are highly unequal. Throughout, the masterful hand of an editor is called for. New Testament articles are much better, but short. The great twenty-four-page article on the Bible is highly composite, and equally irregular in merit.

Already it is evident that Art and Architecture have fallen into competent hands. The development of this side of the Encyclopædia may be awaited with genuine interest. In geography the same fulness is being attempted as in biography, and with the same uncertain results. For America, the articles will be useful; for other countries, Meyer or Brockhaus will probably be consulted. A department new to general encyclopædias but of justifiable existence is that of fiction. Unfortunately, characterization has been attempted besides mere localization. Almost of necessity this has resulted in a singular crudity. Nor are omissions and errors lacking. The 'Bride of Lammermoor' is "further described as a legend of Montrose"; the 'Black Dwarf' is "founded on a Scottish legend" in evident oblivion as to the real David Ritchie, and one of the Aminees in the 'Arabian Nights' is combined with the sister of another.

Finally, the following farrago of notes may not be out of place. There are many articles in which it would have been better to reproduce Chambers entire rather than mutilated. So Alchemy and Allotrophy, though the latter has been rewritten; Alloy, on the other hand, has been improved. So, too, Bella, which omits all reference to

the modern tubular kind; Bentley, which misunderstands his plan for the restoration of the text of the New Testament, and disregards entirely his unique edition of 'Paradise Lost.' Further, on Andorra, Chambers has been misunderstood, and the little republic put "under the joint protection of France and Spain." As a matter of fact, its relations are to France and to the Bishop of Urgel; thus, in the last instance, to France and the Pope. The origin of the article Berber is not so simple, but it would have been at least safer to abide by Chambers, and not to have equated *βάρβαρος* with "foreign, alien," instead of "stammering, uncivilized"; the latter is also the meaning of the Arabic term cited. Under John Anderson, the institution which he founded by his will is strangely misrepresented. A reproduction of Chambers would have shown its almost unique character, at the end of the eighteenth century, as a college for workmen. It still exists, but has never called itself a "university." Into Archpriest it would also have been well to incorporate Chambers or an equivalent; the article here gives only one small side. Al-cazar is from an Arabic singular, not a plural; the error may have come from a confusion with the origin of Luxor. On Arran, any one who had been in Brodick Bay during an easterly gale would hardly call it an excellent harbor. It is an open roadstead. The date of Beckford's birth is left uncorrected. We now know it was October 1, 1760, not September 29, 1759. The discredited legend of the origin of 'Vathek' is also given without comment. Yet the bibliography added to the article, if examined, would have yielded these very corrections. The same thing occurs elsewhere. Beitullah (ii., 665) is the Kaaba, and does not contain it. On Bonnivard (*sic*) we find the old account of that most unedifying "patriot" which would have vastly amused him; the bibliography is absurd. But still more absurd is that attached to the notice of Bertrand de Born. There we are referred to that veracious chronicle, Hewlett's 'Richard Yea-and-Nay.' Simple inadequacy is what ails the article on Beruni. The greatest master of scientific method among Mohammedans, a man standing alone in his time, is cleared in nine lines and some blunders. Contrast the treatment noticed above of Bhartrihari; the Sanskritist evidently fought harder for space than the Arabist. In the article on Andree there is no knowledge of his fate; similarly, Lord Acton and E. Ashmead-Bartlett are still alive. Dr. G. F. Moore, too, is given as President of Andover Seminary.

There can be no doubt that the blame for all this lies primarily with the editors. Excellent contributors have been found for many subjects, and could be found for all. But all contributors require to be kept up to a certain standard; their work requires to be proportioned, concatenated, polished, which is the sphere of the editor. In these volumes the editors have not filled their sphere. From planning to proofreading their work has been slipshod. Further examples of this are easy to find. In the alphabetical order the Arabic article *al* is sometimes reckoned, sometimes not. Thus we find al-Farabi under A and al-Beruni under B. Again, in volume i., pp. 26, 27, under Aberdeen and University of Aberdeen there is a considerable repetition. Similar-

ly, in volume iii., pp. 536-539, under Elspeth Buchan and Buchanites, and pp. 815, 816, under Richard Cameron and Cameronians. In volume ii., pp. 669 and 693, we have an unexplained difference of spelling between Belerium and Bellerium. The two possible derivations are not recognized, and the articles are left in contradiction. At least one diagram (volume i., p. 340) is equipped with letters to which no explanation is added in the text. In bibliography, again, the lack of editorial care is conspicuous. To some articles an excellent bibliography is appended; in others not a single authority is cited, and the reader is left in a blind alley. It need hardly be said how fatal is such a defect; in a confessedly general encyclopædia such as this, references should be given freely to books, journals, and specialist cyclopædias. The same holds of the illustrations. Apparently if a contributor demanded certain illustrations, he got them; if not, there was no more about it. As a consequence, the number of small cuts in the text should be greatly increased. For these we would willingly sacrifice the numerous reproductions of celebrated pictures, portraits, statues, etc., beautiful as they are; for such things there should be no place here. Under Alps a special map would have been much more to the purpose than the very pretty picture of Chillon and the Dent du Midi. The maps in general are disappointing. How the opinion could be hazarded (preface, page viii.) that "the illustrations of every kind will be found superior to anything hitherto attempted in any encyclopædia" must remain a mystery. Except as beautiful pictures, they cannot compare in number, usefulness, and attractiveness with those in Meyer.

It is with deep regret that this judgment is passed on a work like the present, with its enormous expenditure of labor and wide sphere of possible usefulness. But only four volumes are published (the last as we put this in type), and the door of repentance for the editors is still wide. By free cutting of the stereotype plates and unwearied vigilance as to the text still to come, much may be done and undone, and a good encyclopædia may yet be produced.

### THREE BOOKS ON ARTS RELATED TO ARCHITECTURE.

*A Discussion of Composition; Especially as Applied to Architecture.* By John Vredenburg Van Pelt, Professor in charge of the College of Architecture, Cornell University. Illustrated by the Author. The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. viii, 275.

*Windows: A Book about Stained and Painted Glass.* By Lewis F. Day. Second edition. London: Batsford; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. Pp. viii, 419.

*Furniture of the Olden Time.* By Frances Clary Morse. The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. xvii, 371.

The title of the book first named above is so far inadequate that the treatise in question reaches out to include all the elements of design. The first part, consisting of forty pages, deals with the essential characteristics assumed to be necessary in design—sincerity, carefulness, and the like. The second part, of forty-four pages, deals with the principles of composition and the more usual forms of composition, as in pic-

tures, and this part may be thought to have furnished the title to the work. Part three is concerned with the decorative application of principles already laid down, and also with general principles assumed to be obviously of importance, to be axioms of design. Part four has to do with "Practical Suggestions in Design," and in the thirty pages of which it is composed there is little suggestion of the importance or character of composition in the design, which is treated in relation to structure and material, and sincerity, or the reverse. Parts five and six deal with the plans of buildings, and mingled with this is much discussion of that curious theory, born of the atelier and its "paper work," that a plan as drawn on paper is of some value by itself. In reading this, we have to remember that our author is the head of an architectural school avowedly based upon the teaching of the great Paris institution.

In such a book of practice, with necessarily brief and peremptory statements, and written, as this one is, by a very intelligent man, there will, of course, be many valuable suggestions. Just as there are scraps from Ruskin full of that brilliant good sense which that writer is capable of, and which he gives his readers in alternation with paradox and bad logic, so there are many quotations in the original French from the treatise on Decorative Composition by Henri Mayeux. So G. Baldwin Brown is quoted for the value of prehistoric monuments, and Henri Deglane for the scarcely necessary assurance that you had better carry a sketch-book about with you and draw continually with a soft pencil, using few lines. In like manner, the author's own conclusions are printed side by side with the dicta of his teachers and guides; and the passages so arranged are separately of value, or at least have the possibility of value. One looks in vain for a statement of general principles, however; and, without denying for a moment the immense difficulty of arranging a book of maxims in accordance with any general principles of thought, the question still remains unanswered whether such treatises can have any importance. And yet the book is full of the evidences of knowledge and of a sound feeling for fine art in many of its forms. It is not easy to forgo a positive assertion that the Sainte Geneviève paintings in the Pantheon of Paris are very ugly, nor to admit the force of the quotation from Herbert Spencer, a writer whose greatness need not blind us to the fact that he never looks at fine art from the inside, but treats it as a branch of science. On the other hand, there is an excellent passage (pp. 169 to 177) in which decorative glass, as in modern and ancient windows, is explained; and it may be stated that this is a subject which is very seldom treated with intelligence. It is an odd comment upon the architectural tendency of the twentieth century that, in the discussion of Planning (part vi.), eight pages are given to dwelling-houses and sixteen pages to buildings used for instruction, while only a page and three-quarters at the very end are devoted to "ecclesiastic buildings."

Mr. Day's book on Decorative Windows is fortunate in its title, all things being considered. The phrases "stained glass" and "painted glass" are each of them very inadequate, and erroneous in making a part

stand for the whole; and to couple these terms together under the fitting general term is a good thought. The matter of decorative glass is, as remarked above, extremely difficult to treat. No illustrations can adequately explain it except to the most highly trained observer. And of this fact there is proper mention made in a prefatory note, page ix. Again, words are apt to fail in describing the purpose of the design in glass, and, of course, in criticism of the designer's achievement. Now, as the author of the volume before us has seen all those difficulties very clearly, and knows well how glass was made and used in early times, and how the modern processes have grown up—always excepting those American methods of which he knows only the feeble beginnings, as is natural—it follows that the book is sure to have value to any person who is in earnest about the study of the subject. Whether one approaches the matter of rich windows from the point of view of the student of glass and glassware, as a specially interesting industrial art; or as a matter of decorative design, as a mosaic helped out with painting; or whether it is as a part of ecclesiastical architecture that one is thinking of the mediæval glass at least; or whether the painter by profession is interested in the strange facts of the radical difference between colored work in translucent material and that upon opaque surfaces and seen only by reflected light—in any of these cases he will find that Mr. Day has seen the difficulties and the remedies, and has put them before himself and before his readers.

To infer from this that the volume is wholly satisfactory would be to infer too much. Book i., ninety-five pages long, is devoted to craftsmanship; Book ii., containing much more than half the volume, deals with the "course of design"; and Book iii., eighty pages more, deals with various subjects, such as "story windows" (with a sort of list of windows in Europe that are worth seeing), and has a final chapter devoted to the restoration of old glass. There are two indices, one to the text and one to the illustrations; the latter organized alphabetically, as is the former—an innovation indeed, and worthy to be noted. Were such an index a common feature, it would make of the twentieth-century books, with their abundant illustration by photographic process, an iconographic cyclopædia. It is of less importance, to be sure, in the present work than it might be in another, because the examples given are fragments in very many cases, as indeed is natural. You turn from the item "Reims" and find a square of a clerestory window—a piece perhaps three feet high and not quite four feet wide; hence the knowledge of its location, even in a church as important as the great cathedral of the town named, is of less consequence. On the other hand, the references from "Gouda," six in number, lead you to whole windows, and this is the more satisfactory inasmuch as no pictures of those very remarkable Dutch windows of the seventeenth century are easily accessible.

A decorative window is a mosaic of translucent material, with this peculiarity, that the translucency is interrupted by relatively broad opaque lines made by the "leads"