

of history that has a tangible permanent form. Ruskin is right indeed in proclaiming the book of art alone as quite trustworthy among the great nations' three manuscripts. The acts are facts that may be misunderstood, misinterpreted, or forgotten. The words are either the conscientiously assorted drybones of history, or the isolated thoughts and opinions of an individual who need not necessarily be the expression of the thought and opinions of his period or race. But the art of any epoch expresses the very soul and essence of the people by means of the most universal of all languages.

We are not here concerned with art in general, but with art as applied to war memorials. In some way every picture or piece of sculpture representing an incident of warfare may be regarded as a war memorial, provided that it belongs to the time with which it deals, and expresses the spirit of that time. The most painstaking archaeological reconstructions of past periods have neither documentary, nor historic value, and cannot, strictly speaking, be regarded as war memorials. Considered from that point of view, Meissonier's famous series of exquisitely wrought paintings dealing with the first Napoleon's battles, highly esteemed though they be by collectors and lovers of miniature-like finish, fade into insignificance before the technically vastly inferior and generally rather dull pictorial war records of Horace Vernet. Among the innumerable battle pictures that fill the vast galleries at Versailles, intended as a memorial to the military glories of France, none are more significant than those by Van der Meulen, who though by no means a master of the first rank, had witnessed Louis XIV's military exploits and called up for future generations the pageantry and panoply of seventeenth century campaigning. Who could have patience to-day with the learned academic "histories" of an Ary Scheffer, a Steuben, or a Schnetz, in that unutterably dull *Galerie des Batailles*?

The war memorials of antiquity—Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek and Roman—belong almost exclusively to the domain of plastic art. Ancient Egypt was prolific in monuments commemorating her war-like achievements, or rather the victories and conquests of her rulers who were credited with the attributes of divinity and loom in gigantic proportions over the pigmies with whom the battlefields are crowded. These scenes, carved in low relief on the walls of temples and tombs are wholly innocent of perspective and foreshortening, and the landscape setting, where it occurs at all, is treated like a map on a vertical surface. The most imposing of these reliefs, at Karnak, depicts, on a wall surface of over 200 ft. in length, the battles of Seti I., the father of the great Ramses. Still earlier, dating from the 15th century, B.C., is Thutmose III's huge obelisk from Karnak, now in Constantinople, with the hieroglyphic inscription: "Thutmose, who crossed the great Bend of Naharin (Euphrates) with might and with victory at the head of his army."

It was not unusual for the Egyptian conquerors to mark the extreme limits of their expeditions, in Ethiopia and in Asia, by memorial columns or obelisks, or to have their image carved in gigantic size on some rock by the roadside. Herodotus mentions several of these columns in Palestine bearing the Pharaoh's name and boasts of victory, where the enemy put up a brave fight, and the figure of a woman, as a symbol of submissive cowardice, where his progress met with no armed resistance. Of the roadside reliefs, three are still in existence near Berût. In one of them Ramses II. is seen leading a captured enemy before his father Amon; in the two others he is smiting an opponent before the gods Ptah and Ra. Another relief, mentioned by Herodotus, on a rock between Sardes and Smyrna, is so un-Egyptian in style, that it seems far more likely to be of Chaldæan origin. Ramses II.