

form, makes some interesting points in the elaboration of this idea. We read:

"Clearly time is necessary to verse. Too much of it is disastrous. Uttered at the rate of fifty quantities a minute an impossible drone meets the ear. One hundred and twenty quantities a minute, whether the quantity be composed of three or four syllables, is unnaturally fast; so that, roughly speaking, the limit of speed at which the verbal quantities are possible is about a rate of between sixty and one hundred beats to the minute. Just this is true of musical rhythms. Just this scope of beat confronts the physician when he feels the normal pulse. . . .

"Physiologically speaking, in the heart of the living world laid bare. Keep in mind the 'exaltation of function' it throws regularly into every one of its parts, and this on an average of seventy-six times a minute. Conceive, if you can, the force with which it pumps a circuit of life through the butterfly, through the panther, so fast, so steadily as seconds are ticked by the clock. See how recurrently it beats the brain. Is it strange if with such rigorous insistence the heart should have taught the head regular recurrence?"

"Not only this. Pygmy passage says simultaneously check the flow of blood from the heart, suddenly distending the arterial walls at the capillary junction. Is it conceivable that this inhibited energy justifies the nervous to suggesting compressing action? Restricted freedom here also tortures the body forward; in this case to poetry, to music and the dance. The mother rocks her infant because regular motion is required by her own organism, not the child's. We are rhythmic because the physical demands it. . . .

"A German writer compiles a table of the world's poetry, draws a hunger curve and a death curve, and asks why there is so much poetry than death, with the darkening and the brightening. The former is the more spiritual, so be sure, but the stimulus increases before the heart's action and makes more insistent the recurrent will. 'Out of the mouth the heart speaketh' in no metaphorical sense."

There is a species of worm whose body is a lantern, concludes the writer. "Having feeling, having will, it glows rhythmically, and within the limit of the general zoological pulse, as modified by exhilaration and lowered by repose. Let not the humblest poet despair. Some glowworms far celebrate his every measure with a gleam of fire."

COLLECTING AMERICAN PAINTINGS.

"AMERICAN art is dangerously near the point of becoming the fashion," writes Anna Nathan Meyer in *The World's Work* (July). In support of this statement she points to the number of art collectors who are specializing on American pictures. Some of these collectors have for years been quietly buying the work of comparatively unknown Americans. Miss Meyer cites as an instance Mr. T. Thomas B. Clark, who began collecting the work of Blake, Wyant, Inness, Whistler, Honeer, Honeer Martin, and other Americans when they were struggling for recognition back in 1872. By his sale in 1899 Mr. Clarke "really set the first market standard for American art." Another collector who has for years been interested in the work of American artists is Mr. W. T. Evans. The writer informs us that Mr. Evans placed Homer Martin in front of the general American landscape painter with Wyant and Inness following him. We learn, also, that this collector looks upon landscape as the typical expression of American art. At the opposite pole, continues the writer, stands Mr. Gellaly, who "grows impatient with the idea that American art is greater in the landscape." Of this collector's views we read further:

"According to him, it is the work of Whistler, of Dewing, of Thayer, of Sargent, of La Farge, of De Bier, of Bary, of Abbey, Alexander, and of the belatedly famous art of the rest of the contemporary world. Notwithstanding the greatness of the American painters of the figure, Mr. Gellaly nevertheless holds very close to his heart the subtle, exquisite endowing of na-

ture by Twachtman, by Robinson, by Tynon, and by Hassam. The strong simple power of the art of Martin is also precious to him, the imaginative power of Rydner, and the delicate fantasies of F. S. Church.

"He does not hesitate to say that the best painting going on today is being done by Americans. To him the salvation, the opportunity of the American painter lies in his freedom from tradition. There is in American art the freshness and strength of a nature that is expressing real emotion, real experience. The fact that the very atmosphere of the United States is not overcharged and self-conscious makes for direct, personal and individual expression."

Among other enthusiasts to be mentioned in American painting Miss Meyer mentions Dr. Alexander Humphreys, Mr. John Hassen Rhoades, Mr. F. E. C. whose collection will ultimately become one of the treasures of the nation, and Mr. Samuel Shaw, founder of the Shaw prize for painting.

DRAMATIC ART AND THE MASSES.

IN Russia and in France the lovers of the theater and of culture generally complain that the great masses of the people have remained practically strangers to the artistic drama. "Folk theaters" have been established at St. Petersburg and Moscow, but they are on an exceedingly low plane. The plays performed are as inferior as the acting is crude, and the masterpieces are not appreciated or understood. In Paris and other French centers the people—the workmen, sailors, clerks, etc.—are more intelligent than the corresponding classes in Russia yet even there it is felt that the stage is not reaching the people. Like Matthew Arnold, the leading French dramatic critics are in favor of "organizing the theater" to make it a potent influence, an educational and civilizing force.

The question is elaborately treated in a book by the eminent playwright, Adrien Béraud, in *Le Théâtre des Français*. The author had visited Germany and Austria for the purpose of studying their respective solutions of the problem. He believes that the Germans have done more than any other people to bring the theater to the masses or the masses into the theater, and he points to the Schiller theater and the one in Berlin as the models to be followed everywhere. He gives the following particulars about the Berlin theater in question:

"In point of fact, all German theaters are folk theaters, that many plays are written which are popular to all kinds of people. To the German theater is an evening school, but a school in which pleasure and amusement, as well as instruction, are furnished. In the selection of plays, in the fixing of prices for seats, and in various other ways the German managers strive to accommodate the masses instead of catering to the few. For the benefit of the less cultivated, for instance, children's spectacles are arranged with certain supplementary features, such as explanatory notes on the program, short summaries of the plots, sketches of the dramatists and the interpreter, etc."

"What does the Schiller theater present? Everything. There are no long runs, no stars to exhibit, and no fads to promote. New and young playwrights are given a chance, but the classical repertory, including foreign masterpieces, is the stay. In one week one can see Cædemon, Shakespeare, Molière, Goethe, Schiller, Ibsen, Sardou and others."

Berlin managers state that the Germans think intellectual and esthetic gratification quite as essential to the working classes as good wages and proper factory conditions. That is why they subsidize so many theaters. But a theater well managed and staged excellently without subsidy. The Schiller theater is again used as an illustration, the following figures being given:

"The theater, established in 1894, is operated by a stock company. In its second year it had 6,000 regular subscribers. The company is a strong and adequate tenor, and the salaries are paid. If the profits exceed 5 per cent., the company pays the actors a percentage of the receipts in addition. The price of seats are low. Orchestra chairs can be had at 50 cents evenings and 35