

Southern prisoners in retaliation for the refusal of quarter to black soldiers, although he disapproves of the arming of the slaves.

The comments on the *Alabama* case are of peculiar interest because of Mr. Taylor's personal acquaintance with Capt. Semmes, whom he describes as one of the most astute and accomplished lawyers of his time. His criticism of this case and of the development of international law concerning the duties of neutrals toward belligerents is intelligent and thorough, and contains perhaps the best condensed review of the subject available. In general, we may say that the treatise covers the ground pretty completely, its pages numbering nearly 800. The authorities are conveniently cited in footnotes. The index is unusually full, covering 115 pages, and there is also a list of authorities cited. The treatise will no doubt prove a useful manual, especially for reference, although the author's opinions may not always command respect.

#### *Early Renaissance Architecture in England:*

A Historical and Descriptive Account of the Tudor, Elizabethan, and Jacobean Periods, 1500-1625. For the Use of Students and Others. By J. Alfred Gotch, F.S.A. With 87 collotype and other plates, and 230 illustrations in the text. London: B. T. Batsford; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xxii, 281.

Although it has been disputed whether there ever was a true Renaissance of the arts in England, the English writers who are the most accurate and the most enthusiastic of our time, are accepting the term Renaissance architecture for all the buildings and their details—all the tombs, garden terraces, and decorative art generally—which come in date after the first introduction of classical forms from Italy into England. As with Mr. Blomfield, so with Messrs. Belcher and Macartney, and with the author of the work before us. What we have to consider is, whether the term Renaissance has been properly applied in these cases. About this it is evident that there must be differences of opinion.

The true Renaissance is the Italian movement dating from 1420 to about the beginning of the sixteenth century, and losing itself then in the completed cinquecento style which cannot in strictness be associated with the "revival," being an ultimate result. The appearance of classical details, with the change in general design in the north—that is to say, in the countries which we now know as France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Sweden—is about eighty-five years later than in Italy; but the term Renaissance is with great propriety extended to cover it because it was inspired by almost exactly the same motives as in Italy. It is not possible to detect in the history of English art any such universal change; the Gothic taste held on and influenced all the buildings of the British Isles down to the time of the outbreak of the Civil War, when the few designs made by Inigo Jones and by one or two men of his time who were "Italianate" in their feelings and experience, are to be compared, if at all, with the classically inspired buildings of the Continent. If, so far as style is concerned, the term Renaissance were to be applied to anything English, it should be applied to these—to designs like that for Whitehall Palace, of which only

the "Banqueting House" was ever built; but this design was not made until after the middle of the seventeenth century. On the other hand, if the term Renaissance is to be applied not to the style of any given building but to a changing spirit in the significance of design, then the Renaissance begins in England in sculptured detail, as early as 1520, while the first piece of non-Gothic design in general forms as well as in detail is, as selected and given by Mr. Gotch, the screen in King's College Chapel, Cambridge (plate viii.); this screen being dated by him 1532-36. It is evident that the term should be applied rather to this and its contemporary buildings, and that we are driven to accept, as the time of the Renaissance, a long historical period, during which Gothic details were used side by side with those of very positive non-Gothic character; during which the proportion and the grouping of country houses were still mediæval, while the horizontal cornice, the flat roof, and the classical order came into royal palace and London front; during which mediæval feeling and mediæval methods of work held their own successfully against the invading taste for neo-classic design. This is the Renaissance in England; and it covers the whole space between the accession of Henry VIII., 1509, and the beginning of the serious struggle between Charles and his Parliament, about 1635, or between 1500 and 1625, as the title-page will have it. Mr. Gotch stops with the end of the reign of James I.; and to make even dates covering exactly a century and a quarter, he begins with the year 1500. Nothing can be said against these limits given for the early Renaissance, but it must be remarked that what the English writers call the early Renaissance should, in our opinion, be called the Renaissance alone, without qualifying term, while the art of the epoch following the Civil War should be called by some other name. The term Renaissance expresses the single idea of a rejuvenation of art, of a commencement on new lines, of a fresh start; and there is no reason in the world for extending it, as is too common in English writing, to cover the periods of decline and even of decay.

Mr. Gotch is the author of a folio work entitled 'The Architecture of the Renaissance in England,' devoted to large photographic views of English buildings, exteriors and interiors, general views, and details, with descriptive text and an introductory essay. The present work is altogether different in character, and the assurance given in the preface can be taken literally; namely, that the two works have nothing in common beyond the fact that they cover nearly the same period. The more recent is an historical handbook, and one of extraordinary value for its thorough examination into the true history of the time, unswayed more than is reasonable by the dignified or pretentious character of buildings which still exist in their entirety. Thus, it is easy to trace the development of Elizabethan architecture in the pages beginning with "The Invasion of the Foreign Style" (page 10) through the next chapter, which deals with "The Development of the House Plan," and then through a series of chapters which deal with the details until chapter xi. takes up afresh the subject of the plan in connection with the work of John Thorpe and the later sixteenth century. The book is of necessity devoted

mainly to domestic architecture. It is plainly stated on page 215 that there is no ecclesiastical architecture of early Renaissance character in England; nor is this the first occurrence of this statement. In fact, the disposition which the English show to this day to build churches in some modification of mediæval style, while the domestic and civic buildings near at hand are neo-classic in some form, took its origin in the early days. Moreover, the full classical treatment even of civic buildings was never accepted during all this Renaissance period. As is stated on page 95, "An Elizabethan house could no more have been designed by Palladio or Du Cerceau or Vriesse than a play like those which Shakspeare gave us could have been written by one of the novelists, essayists, or dramatists of Italy, France, or Germany." In this fact, however, in this very impurity of style, this mingling of different and even hostile elements, is found the true charm of the Elizabethan and Jacobean architecture. This architecture, taken altogether, is the latest instance in which Europeans have allowed themselves to work according to accepted traditions of cutting stone and wood and fitting parts together. It is the latest workman's style in Europe.

The book can be read continuously by any person interested in history as a narrative. Students who ask for synopses and tables of facts only, and abhor the idea of story-telling even if the story be true and well told, are not the readers we have now in mind. Here is one side of the life of one small European nation, and the history of this for 125 years is made to cover 266 pages—although, indeed, one-fifth, or perhaps one-fourth, of this space is occupied by text illustrations. It recommends itself to no one to whom the solid object, the tangible, ponderable, and visible work of art is indifferent—for there are many such men, and some of them are found to write about matters of graphic and plastic art. By readers for whom it is intended it can be laid down with a feeling of perfect content with the use they have made of their time.

*The Works of Thomas Kyd.* Edited from the Original Texts with Introduction, Notes, and Facsimiles, by Frederick S. Boas, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford, Professor of History and English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast; Author of 'Shakspeare and his Predecessors,' etc. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: H. Frowde. 1901. Pp. cxvi, 470.

When Klein, some twenty-five years ago, wrote his two volumes on the English Drama in his 'Geschichte des Dramas,' he spoke of Kyd as the "most impersonal of all poets." Since that time, however, our knowledge not only of Kyd but of his fellow-dramatists has been appreciably increased. Mr. Lee's 'Life of Shakspeare' has brushed aside the imaginative inferences from the plays which tried to pass as biography, and from authenticated facts has given us a real and living man. And the same scholar, with Goodwin, Schick, and others, has brought to light much that was hidden in the life of Kyd. The results of these investigations are embodied by Professor Boas, together with his own, in the Introduction to his edition of the Works of Kyd. There are still twenty-three years

of the dramatist's life which remain a blank, and these Professor Boas seeks to fill in by tracing the course of his poetic development as inferable from his works. At best, this is fragmentary and cannot be regarded as conclusive. Thus, to infer from the evidence of his plays and translations that he was not college-bred is certainly perilous. A college course does not always make a man a perfect construer, and Kyd's mistakes in translation from Latin, French, and Italian may be paralleled without great difficulty in the works of equally brilliant men who are college graduates. Even if he does speak of Thrasymene as "so dezart," and translates "Marius, l'honneur d'Arpin" as "Marius, Arpin's friend," we should not necessarily infer with Professor Boas that he did not graduate from either of the Universities.

In any case, Kyd's learning, or lack of it, seems to have made him the butt of one bitter writer of invective, the fiery Nash, who, it is generally agreed, was striking at Kyd in his Preface to Greene's "Menaphon" and incidentally furnishing some biography. Nash, as Professor Boas says, was correct enough when he sneered at Kyd as one of those who "intermeddle with Italian translations: wherein how poorelie they have plodded . . . let all indifferent Gentlemen that have travailed in that tongue discern by their twopenie pamphlets"; but Nash gives too loose a rein to his satirical fancy when he says Kyd "could scarce lie latinize [his] necke verse if [he] should have neede." Accurate scholarship, fortunately, was not a prerequisite to dramatic excellence, though some of the University wits would have had it so; nor was every University wit a perfect Latinist.

The editor of Kyd is beset from the beginning of his work with perplexing problems. As soon as he has gathered together the fragments of his author's life, he meets various disturbing questions about his known works and about those which are to be admitted into the canon. Happily, we know that the "Spanish Tragedy" is by Kyd, but we have to determine its date by internal evidence. Over this seemingly insignificant question much ink has been spilt. Was the play written before or after the Armada? The subtleties of those who fix its date at 1589-90 must, however, vanish, as Professor Boas contends, before the argument that no play dealing with Spanish affairs and written by an Englishman would be likely to contain only trivial references to vague and semi-mythical victories of English arms in the days of John of Gaunt, when the Armada was still fresh in the memory of all England. The date 1585-7, fixed upon by Professor Boas, makes more manifest the influence of Kyd on the development of English tragedy, and it is this which gives importance to the question.

Besides the "Spanish Tragedy," only one other play is known to be Kyd's, and it is his translation of Garnier's "Cornélie." By means of these two plays, accordingly, the canon of his dramas has to be determined. There are, in all, four plays which appear for examination: "Titus Andronicus," "Jeronimo," "Soliman and Perseda," and the suppositional "Ur-Hamlet," the original of Shakspeare's play. The first two Professor Boas believes not to be Kyd's; the last two undoubtedly his. The problem is complicated in the case of "Titus" by the admission

that we probably have not the earliest form in the present version—and the former alone is attributed to Kyd; and, in the case of the "Ur-Hamlet," by the loss of this play, which is most closely represented by the 1603 Shakspeare quarto. There are striking resemblances between all these plays and the "Spanish Tragedy," and also differences. The greatest care must, accordingly, be taken in estimating the relative values of these points of similarity and difference, if from them we are to determine a common or a divided authorship.

In the case of "Jeronimo" the resemblances to the "Spanish Tragedy" are largely suggested by the latter work, to which the former was intended as a forepiece; and the play might readily be composed by a fifth-rate dramatist who wished to profit by the revived popularity of the greater work. Disregarding conventional and accidental correspondences, there are no resemblances between the two plays too subtle to be explained as imitative. The lack of conformity, on the other hand, between certain events in the forepiece and the record of them in the "Spanish Tragedy" might easily be overlooked by a careless imitator, but not by the common author of the two plays.

In his discussion of the authorship of the "Ur-Hamlet," Professor Boas should rest his main argument on the striking similarities of dramatic technique between the 1603 quarto and the "Spanish Tragedy," as supplementary, of course, to the strong evidence of Nash's "Preface." The variations of "Hamlet" from its ultimate source in Belleforest correspond so closely to leading features in the plot of the "Spanish Tragedy" as to be strongly corroborative of the common authorship of these plays. On the whole, Professor Boas presents these arguments forcibly; some of his correspondences are, however, too trivial to carry weight. But it is in the resemblances of phrase between the 1603 quarto and the known works of Kyd that our editor believes he has "practically irresistible internal tests" of Kyd's authorship of the "Ur-Hamlet." To us they do not seem convincing. They might easily be the product of imitation. Such exist in the case of "Jeronimo" and the "Spanish Tragedy," of the 1604 quarto of "Hamlet" and the "Spanish Tragedy." Indeed, Professor Boas himself, in discussing the authorship of "Titus," points out just such resemblances in phrase between this play and the "Spanish Tragedy," but is content to disregard them without explanation as evidence of common authorship. There are, too, resemblances in technique between "Titus" and the "Spanish Tragedy" which are more significant than some of those Professor Boas mentions between the 1603 quarto and the same play, and these, also, he disregards. These smaller matters should be given very little weight in determining authorship. It is the mere jugglery of criticism when they are classed as corroborative evidence in the case of probable common authorship, and as mere imitation in that of probable divided authorship. That which determines us in accepting Kyd as the author of the "Ur-Hamlet" and questioning his complicity in "Titus" is the radical difference between the two plays. "Titus" surpasses in its orgy of horrors and its ingenuity of ferociousness anything in

Kyd's accredited works or what we can conceive the "Ur-Hamlet" to have been. This, with the total absence of the comic, would seem to argue most strongly against Kyd's authorship of the play.

In the matter of the text, Professor Boas has left very little to be desired. He has given us the first complete edition of Kyd's works. Hitherto, with the exception of the "Spanish Tragedy," his plays were accessible only in the collections. Of his pamphlets, the "Householder's Philosophy" existed only in the quarto of 1588, and the "Murder of John Brewen" had been reprinted in Collier's "Illustrations of Early English Popular Literature" (1863), and was out of print. The text follows the best quarto in the case of each work, and varies only when necessary. All needless emendations (for which see Fleischer's "Bemerkungen") are rigidly excluded. The notes are neither too full nor too scanty. There are remarkably few typographical errors. The following have been noted: On p. xciv, line 12, the reference to the "Spanish Tragedy" should be III., xi, 43; on p. 31, line 60, for "ambitious" read "ambitious"; the footnote on page 69 to line 148 reads: "See Note," but there is no corresponding note; the reference in the note to "Spanish Tragedy" III., vi, 16, should read "52" for "51"; on page 322 the page-heading should be "Act II," not "Act I."

*Musings by Campfire and Wayside.* By William Cunningham Gray. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1902. 8vo, pp. 337. Illustrated.

This volume of *causerie* by the late editor of the *Interior* contains some chapters enlarged from an earlier output of 'Musings,' though much of the contents is now first printed. A portion of the book failed to receive the author's revision, as one may notice by a few misspelled proper names and one misplaced paragraph. These defects are, however, of slight importance. The book has what many of our young Western critics mistake for evidences of culture—a simple, unaffected flow of words, as of chat on a veranda in the twilight between old friends; evidences of good taste, native rather than acquired, of homely common sense, of a genuine love of outdoor life, of latent fires of indignation ready to blaze at the puff of injustice. Some of it is charming, nearly all is pleasant reading, and there is little of the newspaper flavor. It is the apotheosis of the literary column in the Saturday evening edition, a development in words of musings, whimsies quaint or kindly, speculations of a dandelion about the pine tops, of a log-cabin builder about the universe. As a self-revelation of an earnest, kindly nature, free from pedantry yet innocent of training, reverent yet audacious, but without the undertones of strength which are the indications of real power, the book will find a welcome, and doubtless a wide audience. But it is of those which open the door to literature rather than exemplify it, which sound the note of aspiration rather than the psalm of one who stands already on the heights. Of literary finish or the assured confidence of style it has and claims nothing.

It is elegantly printed and tastefully bound; and the illustrations, from photographs by the author, are well reproduced and of a quality akin to the text.