

the deliberate choice of the alumni. From their trained reflective powers they are prevented from falling victims to sudden impulse, but subject themselves in all acts to cool reflection. Thus they become exempt from considerations of interest and conventionality which are the usual inducements to marriage.

Farther, modern life calls for late marriages, so that there is still hope that many more will be married before they reach the age of sixty. Farther, the committee say that college women are not as prone to enter upon married life as the majority of women.

The *Journal* makes the following quotation from a keen philosopher: "The truth is that out of the many elements uniting in varied proportions to produce in man's breast that complex emotion we call love, the strongest are those produced by physical attractions; the next in strength are those produced by moral attractions; the weakest are those pro-

duced by intellectual attractions; and even these are less dependent upon acquired knowledge than on natural faculty, quickness, wit, insight. If any think the assertion a derogatory one, and inveigh against the masculine character for being thus swayed, we reply that they know little what they say when they thus call in question the divine ordinations."

The celibacy of college women will never be chosen by other than those who early determine to pursue professional callings. If such women do not marry after being educated, it is scarcely probable that they would have married had they not entered college at all. They are less of the marrying type than the average of women. The existence of such a type is apparent to every observer.

The facts thus presented do not give us any new views, but they throw a clearer light upon those previously held.—*American Lancet, Detroit.*

---

## ART IN THE DECORATION OF HOUSES.

IT was distinctly the fault of the age that when at last a few advanced men saw with a kind of horror the artistic degradation that, ten years ago and less, had come upon the people of the civilized world, and therefore taunting civilization with its barbarity, demanded in the name of honor a wider reaching of art and a truer reading of its nature. So it was, indeed, and the record of the first five years subsequent to the Centennial Exposition, so far as matters of art were concerned, gave good ground for holding that then at least no consistent and national art was possible in the United States. The history of the so-called "art revival" of the past decade is, in its reasons and results, a subject of peculiar interest, fascinating also, but not the object of this projected series of papers. It is named here only in so far as it was the cause of a natural but insidious public delusion, which vitiated fundamentally all the work which followed—the idea that art was fashion or fashion was art, for the two were inextricably mixed—the idea that what was sanctioned by fashion (what fashion was never asked) was for the time being the only perfect thing, and that one fixed scheme of decoration—color,

form and arrangement—was equally suited to the house of a clergyman and a stock broker, a philosopher and a lawyer, a poet and a pork-packer.

So flagrant and preposterous an error was possible only in an era of total artistic depravity, such as then was. Coming at that time it was the only possible logical outgrowth of the giving of art ideas to a people mentally unfitted. The error has still remained in this direction, although more knowledge has come in the matter of the technical qualities of art decoration. There is good knowledge growing of intrinsic beauty in line, color and arrangement, but still is individuality lacking—in fact, the vital reason of art. The explanation is evident, if harsh and unhonorable. Given a true desire of art, and the error would never exist; given a knowledge of even the first principles of art, a consciousness of the theory of beauty and the truth of beauty, these things would never have been. It is solely because the people as a whole—east of the Atlantic as well as west, for the popular reception of revealed art has been in England to the full as clumsy and unreasoning as was the case in America—were fundamentally ignorant of the nature-