

broken lineaments can mirror a Nature higher than itself, and in a finite way ever reflects the Infinite—*William Knight, addressed to the students of St. Andrews University, printed by the International Journal of Ethics, Philadelphia, July.*

Never yet
Share of truth was vainly set
In the world's wide fallow ;

After hands shall sow the seed,
After hands from hill and mead
Reap the harvest yellow.—*Whittier.*

If there is anything that keeps the
mind
Open to angel-visits and repels
The ministry of ill, 'tis human love !
God has made nothing worthy of
contempt.—*N. P. Willis.*

NOTES FOR TEACHERS.

LIMITATIONS IN ART.—A work must produce a distinct emotion—that is, must agreeably disturb the senses, not merely surprise and please the intellect. And here the limitation of several of our greatest painters, living and dead, is perceived. The extremists of this school, were they consistent, would place the eye in a pillory. Having determined the central point of vision it becomes necessary to rigorously subdue the will so that the eye should see no more in painting the picture than the optic nerves would permit to be registered while the eye remained on the central spot. Pushed to its legitimate conclusion, the painter should only paint what he saw during the time he was able to keep his eye religiously pilloried, for closing and even blinking the eyes must result in a loss of one impression, and the gain of another. But the effort to keep the gaze at sentinel for a period sufficiently long to give time to paint the picture must inevitably result in the loss of the power of visual appreciation. In this is seen the absurdity of trying to push an abstraction to extremities. Impressionistic art is simply art ; there is no art that is not impressionistic, in the larger meaning of the word. The decorators and

the romanticists are impressionists, and so even are the naturalists. But the naturalistic creed pushed to its extremity supplies fully as many absurdities as the foregoing. A naturalist in painting a certain out-of-door effect very properly confines his painting hours to the time which is co-extensive with that in which he conceived his *imotf*. But if he were stupid about this he would be driven to the same *impasse* as the impressionist, compelled to paint his picture then and there. Considering that his method demands amplification of detail, the obvious absurdity of his position is apparent.

It comes to this, then, that in painting, creeds are nothing ; the result is conclusive. Every method, every school demands of its adherents and members compromises and sacrifices. Thus amplification of detail entails some loss of spontaneity of effect. Absolute truth of impression cannot go hand in hand with the complete realization of the æsthetic possibilities of an object. But the picture need be none the less beautiful for that. As I have already hinted, the temperament of the painter—his limitations as much as his endowments—lead him to his choice of method. Therefore, it is the purest