

In the box was a golden heart which, when shaken, was found to contain liquid! Voltaire's heart was thus preserved in spirits.

To some among the illustrious these post-mortem vicissitudes will suggest arguments for cremation. Bishop Gore has boldly asserted that this rite transgresses no theological dogma, and he states further that the opposition of the Roman Church is based, not on grounds of faith, but of custom only. No one

who has visited the catacombs of Paris, packed as they are with grimly arranged bones taken from the various cemeteries of the city, will feel that respect for the anatomy of an ancestor survives many centuries of social change. After all, it is the soul in man that matters. And it was only the English public school boy who, inspired by Nordic intellectuality, translated *De mortuis, nil nisi bonum* into the words, "Among the dead, there is nothing but bone."

Sex in Art

By LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT

Contributing Editor of The Outlook

IN an article on Emily Dickinson, which appeared in these columns about a month ago, I asked the question, Why have women written so little enduring poetry? I mentioned the work of Sappho and Mrs. Browning as an indication that the limitations of poetic genius are not merely limitations of sex. And I suggested that some one might make an anthology of poems by women to be called "A Silver Treasury of Women's Songs and Lyrics," in imitation of Palgrave's "Golden Treasury," which does not contain, if my recollection is correct, a single poem by a woman.

My question and suggestion have brought me several interesting letters. One correspondent objects to the title "A Silver Treasury of Women's Songs and Lyrics" on the ground that it is tautological, songs and lyrics being merely different names for the same thing. Admitting the soft impeachment, and hoping that my correspondent will make the anthology and with it a better title than I have succeeded in inventing, I pass on to one or two other letters.

Gently correcting my ignorance of any existing anthology of poems by women, a friendly lady in Washington sends me nine cards from the catalogue of the Library of Congress recording books all of which deal with the subject of "poetesses" or "female poets" and most of which are anthological in character. There is, for example, a volume entitled "Pearls from the American Female Poets" which were gathered fifty years ago and strung together by one Caroline May, an English spinster who, I happen

to know, adopted this country as her home and was a lover of the poets, especially Dante. The special claim to distinction to which she felt she was entitled was her youthful acquaintance-ship with Gustave Doré, the great French illustrator who furnished the gruesome pictures for a monumental edition of Dante's "Inferno."

Another anthology, earlier than Miss May's, was one published in Boston in 1837. It was "prepared especially for young ladies" by Mrs. Sarah Josepha Hale, with the elaborate and almost anatomical title of "The Ladies' Wreath; A Selection from the Female Poetic Writers of England and America."

In 1857 Thomas Buchanan Read (who was the author of "Sheridan's Ride," declaimed by thousands upon thousands of American schoolboys, and who, although a male poet, was enough of a poet to have known better than to use physiological terms in connection with his art) edited "The Female Poets of America: With Portraits, Biographical Notices, and Specimens of their Writings."

There is also in the Library of Congress an anthology of poems by Indian women translated from Sanskrit, Bengali, Hindi, Tamil, and other Indic languages. Perhaps the most interesting of these nine library cards is that which describes, not a book, but a catalogue of a sale which was held many years ago in a London auction-room familiar, sometimes with associations of happiness and sometimes with associations of despair, to all book collectors. It deserves reprinting in full and reads as follows:

Catalogue of the extraordinary

library, unique of its kind, formed by the late Rev. F. J. Stainforth, consisting entirely of works of British and American poetesses, and female dramatic writers, together with some interesting unpublished manuscripts and autograph letters . . . which will be sold at auction, by Messrs. Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge . . . on . . . the 1st, of July, 1867, and five following days . . . [London] Printed by J. Davy & Sons [1867]. Interleaved; prices and purchaser's names in margin.

It is difficult to say which is the more comically offensive term—"poetess" or "female poet." Art is the one domain of life which is and ought to be asexual. Only the grammatically prudish say pianiste for pianist, or songstress for singer, or female painter for painter. Usage gives some sanction to sculptress, and necessity compels us to distinguish the sex in actor and actress because dramatic representation is necessarily sexual while dramatic creation is not. The heroine of a play must be an actress, but the writer of a play, although a woman, is its author, not its authoress. I am not so sure that the title which I suggested for an anthology of poetry by women, tautological as it may be, is not more artistic than those which try to preserve a sex distinction between poets and poetesses.

These observations on the folly of maintaining the differentiation between male and female in creative art quite naturally bring me to another letter from a lady in Montana, who tells me very courteously that I ought not to expect women to write poetry, or compose music, or paint pictures, or carve marble, because they are so deeply engaged in greater creative work—that of perpetuating the race. "Not until the stars have altered their courses and woman-kind has laid down her crown of motherhood will the greatest painters, sculptors, and poets be other than men." There is a great deal of truth in this. Bernard Shaw, in one of the most amusingly satirical but least known of his plays, "Press Cuttings," puts it a little differently. General Mitchener is having an argument with his charwoman at the War Office in London:

Mitchener. When a man has risked his life on eight battlefields, Mrs. Farrell, he has given sufficient proof of his self-control to be excused a little strong language.

Mrs. Farrell. Would you put up

with bad language from me because I've risked me life eight times in child-bed?

Mitchener. My dear Mrs. Farrell, you surely would not compare a risk of that harmless domestic kind to the fearful risks of the battlefield.

Mrs. Farrell. I wouldn't compare risks run to bear livin' people into the world to risks run to blow them out of it. A mother's risk is jooty: a soldier's is nothing but devilmint.

Mitchener (nettled). Let me tell you, Mrs. Farrell, that if the men did not fight, the women would have to fight themselves. We spare you that, at all events.

Mrs. Farrell. You can't help yourselves. If three-quarters of you was killed we could replace you with the help of the other quarter. If three-quarters of us was killed how many people would there be in England in another generation? If it wasn't for that the men'd put the fightin' on us just as they put all the other dhrudgery. What would you do if we was all kilt? Would you go to bed and have twins?

It goes, of course, without argument that the woman who has the capacity to bear and rear a family is doing the bravest and greatest creative work in the world, from which she ought not to be diverted. But the point under discussion is not whether woman ought to write more enduring poetry but whether she can. That she has not done so is explained, I think, not by the prime function of her sex or by any physiological reasons, but by the long centuries of suppression of her intellectual faculties. Mary Somerville, the great English mathematician, had to study mathematics secretly because a scientific career was considered by the English gentry, to which social group she belonged, to be unwomanly.

Where women have been free, or have struggled for their own freedom, they have taken high and sometimes the highest rank in certain fields of creative art. Jane Austen, George Eliot, and perhaps Mrs. Stowe in fiction; Jenny Lind and

Lilli Lehmann in song; Rosa Bonheur and Cecilia Beaux in painting; Teresa Carreño and Fanny Bloomfield-Zeisler as pianists; Maria Mitchell in astronomy; Mary Somerville and Marie Curie in physical science; and Queen Elizabeth and Catherine of Russia in statesmanship, are some of the names of women of great creative genius that will come at once into the mind of any one thinking, not merely about the achievements, but about the intellectual capacities of women.

It is a puzzling question. If woman has reached the level of Rosa Bonheur in painting, why can she not rise still higher to the level of Rembrandt and Velasquez? If she has reached the level of Carreño in the performance of music, why can she not rise to the level of Chopin as a composer? Are her limitations in creative art those surmountable ones of education and experience or are they the inherent and immutable limitations of sex?

German Promises and Fulfillment

By ELBERT FRANCIS BALDWIN

The Outlook's Editor in Europe

SINCE the war, as a guaranty of Germany's good faith in meeting her treaty promises, the Allied Powers have occupied the Rhine's left bank. The northern part is known as the Cologne zone. According to the Versailles Treaty, it was to have been returned to Germany last January had she fulfilled the promises signed by her in that document.

Her financial promises, as they now exist under the Dawes Plan, are being promptly met. Not so her military promises. Indeed, so flagrantly has she evaded them as abundantly to justify the Allied note dated June 2 and delivered two days later in Berlin by the representatives of England, France, Belgium, Italy, and Japan. It shows, in a more detailed way than anything so far has done, Germany's determination to maintain the essentials of a large-scale military organization capable of offensive action. The Versailles Treaty provided for an exclusively small-scale military organization for the maintenance of order on German territory and for the defense of German frontiers.

Before the zone was to have been returned to Germany the Allied Powers informed the Berlin Government that

Germany's extent of fulfillment of her promises did not justify them in granting the evacuation, and that they were awaiting the Interallied Military Control Commission's final report before advising Germany of what remained for her to do—just as if she did not know! This report has since been received and examined. I have read its full text, and have observed that, from its information, the Allied note points out treaty infractions in connection, among others, with the following subjects:

Size of Army

ARTICLE 160 of the Treaty prescribes that the German army should not exceed seven divisions of infantry and three of cavalry. This article, says the note, has been complied with. Good. Yet in reading its *texte intégral* I did not discover that to each division the Germans have attributed three of those of their old army corps and that at mobilization each battalion would become a regiment and each regiment a division, all being multiplied by three.

Moreover, Article 160 stipulates that the army shall not exceed 100,000 men. Officially this stipulation has been met. But, as the note justly adds, many men

have been serving short enlistment periods, bringing the total number in excess of 100,000. The note might have quoted the statement of Herr Gessler, Minister of War. He admitted the inclusion of short-term recruits towards the close of 1923, Germany being, he claimed, on the verge of civil war. But, with the passing of this danger, he affirmed, the short-term system came to an end. If so, how does it happen, as a Bavarian paper informs us, that Prince Albrecht, Prince Rupprecht's son, has just entered the infantry for a course before beginning his university studies? Unfortunately, nothing in the note, I find, records the number of such recruits since the war. German recognition of the accuracy of the Allies' criticism and their demands for the complete abolition of temporary enlistment is indicated, as I expected it would be, by the proportionate lack of angry German reaction in this respect.

Furthermore, Article 160 suppresses the General Staff. To circumvent this article the Germans have instituted an analogous organization, the Heeresleitung. The Powers demand that this veiled General Staff be suppressed also and that the powers of the Commander-