

# Art in the Machine Age,

**D**URING a great part of history, the arts were an indivisible part of the life of a community. It is difficult, as Karl Bücher pointed out, to say where work leaves off and art begins: drama is in origin the significant rehearsal of the "thing done," the planting of seed and the gathering of harvest; song and dance rhythmically recapture the ecstasy of courtship or martial triumph; painting and sculpture visualize divinity, or realize, in more perfect composure, the forms of men and landscapes; to live is to experience art. Among all the occupations known to men and practised by them down to modern times, the only one that was degraded, to the exclusion of art, in the process of conducting the work or shaping the materials or sharing in civic life, was that of the miner. From the miserable slaves who worked the silver mines of Athens to the serfs who remained in the mines of Great Britain up to the nineteenth century, the miner alone was condemned—along with the public executioner—to exist without benefit of the arts.

The industrial period begins with a reversal of this condition. The miner develops the steam engine and invents the railroad; for a while, the steam engine, the railroad, and a great array of mechanical contrivances occupy the centre of men's activities; and the one art which throughout human history had been a symbol of degradation dominates the scene, displacing human desires and human standards, and erecting, as an Iron Calf for the multitude to worship, the notions of mechanical efficiency and merely pecuniary wealth. Every art feels the shock of this change: living becomes subordinate to working, and working is no longer enriched by the whole personality. The new working class, as it is called, can alas! neither produce art nor respond to it; the intricate folk dances disappear; the folk songs lose both in fun and in depth; the manufactured furniture, rugs, curtains, and dress materials that take the place of the old products of handicraft lose all esthetic value; by the middle of the nineteenth century the age of non-art has, apparently, begun.

Was the displacement of art that marked the introduction of machinery a permanent or a temporary process? It was impossible to answer this question in John Ruskin's time; but by now I think we may say confidently that the process was only a temporary one. While those who value the traditional arts are chiefly conscious of the loss, we are now also conscious of the fact that industrialism has produced new arts, associated with the application of precise methods and machine tools. Will these new industrial arts altogether replace the traditional ones? Will the traditional arts recover some of their lost ground? Has the machine age developed a new esthetic, or is its bias essentially anti-esthetic? Will the expression of the human personality through the arts regain its ancient place and will art once more accompany all human activity? These are some of the questions we must ask.

The primary result, without doubt, of modern methods of production and intercourse upon the cities and countrysides of the Western World was the wholesale defacement of the landscape and the reckless misuse and perversion of almost every natural resource; above all, the stark misuse of the workers themselves.

The coal that was brought to the surface to run the engines in the new factories resulted in the horrid débris of the pithead; carried by railways into the new towns, it created the smokepall which shut out sunlight, reduced the aerial colors to foggy grey, and, falling in a sooty film which effaced every gradation of color in street and building, it sank into the lungs and the pores of the industrial denizen. In certain industries, the escaping gases or finely divided particles destroyed the surrounding vegetation; while in others the refuse dumped into the streams killed the animal life and made the water unfit to drink or to swim in. The dissolution of solid forms in the later paintings of Turner and in those of Whistler in the next generation, was partly a witness of the early coal régime. Without the soft obliteration of fog, the landscape was hideous: the sole beauty that remained was that of atmosphere.

In this environment architecture totally collapsed, except so far as it was still carried forward by the

momentum acquired in an earlier age. It was even worse with the more intimate forms of decoration and furniture. Knowledge and taste occupied different compartments: the industrialist was one person, the esthete was another; the operative was one person, the designer was another. The utilitarian was right when he insisted upon living in his own age and taking advantage of the instruments this age had produced; the romanticist was right when he was aware that the human personality could not be split up, and that a philosophy which arbitrarily limits our practical functions and divorces them from questions of taste and beauty, is an instrument of degradation.

\*\*\*

But when we turn from the traditional arts to the new arts that arose with the machine economy the picture becomes somewhat different. Engineering as an exact art came into existence during the Renaissance and entered upon a period of astonishing growth in the eighteenth century, the century that saw the perfected steam engine, the power loom, and the iron bridge. Even in its primitive applications, in the art of fortification in the seven-



LEWIS MUMFORD  
Copyright by Bachrach

teenth century, engineering showed results which placed it, at times, on the level of architecture.

With the development of mathematics and physics, the art of engineering flourished. By exact measurements, by tested formulæ, by fine calibrations, a new technique in handling materials came into existence whose success was measured, not by its incorporation of the human touch and the human personality, but by its total elimination of these characteristics. Engineering deals in known quantities: it seeks to achieve calculable results; and its highest products have been in those departments where the unknown or uncertain factors could be reduced to a minimum. By making cast-iron and steel available as a common material of art throughout Western Europe and America, metallurgy placed at our disposal a substance more pliable than stone or wood, and much more hard and tough and strong in its various possible mixtures than copper and its alloys; while in the lathe, the drill, and later the planing machine, the art of adapting this metal to the finest mechanical adjustments was made possible. The specialized machine itself is a derivative product: it is the machine-tool that is the source of our triumphs in the exact arts.

Without steel, our machine tools might have produced instruments of exquisite accuracy, but they would have been few in number; without machine tools, our plentiful supply of iron would have had little formal effect upon design, for this material would still have been subjected to the characteristic modifications of handicraft. Both these possibilities were explored in the early development of technology; for up to the eighteenth century the exact arts had produced as their crowning achievements only small instruments like clocks and watches, while as soon as iron came into general use, the early designer succumbed to the temptation to treat it in

the fashion of handicraft stuff, with modelled and cast embellishments in the form of flowers and birds and fruit—decorations which appear equally on the barrels of cannons, on the girders of bridges, and on the vacant parts of the earliest typewriters.

In spite of numerous sorties down these blind alleys, engineering by the middle of the nineteenth century, when the Crystal Palace was built in London, had begun to find its legitimate task and its proper canons of workmanship. The first complete demonstration of its power to produce great work of art came in the construction of the Brooklyn Bridge in New York. Without doubt, the Brooklyn Bridge is one of the great masterpieces of nineteenth century engineering, and, considered by the standards of esthetics, it is perhaps the most complete work of architecture on a large scale that the century can show—a perfect expression, in line and mass, of all that the structure demands from the engineering elements, and of all that the eye requires in their disposition.

That engineering demands imaginative design and is not the less an art because all the esthetic conditions must be achieved within a narrow set of material limitations, is likewise established by the large number of badly designed engineering structures that we have produced: against a Brooklyn Bridge one may pit the uncouth design of the Williamsburgh Bridge, against the Army Supply Base in South Brooklyn one might put a score of unrhythmic, boxlike factories; and in general, for every example of strong imaginative engineering one might put a dozen examples of feeble work to prove that, while the impersonal arts are as capable of beauty as the humane arts, the mere employment of mathematical formulæ or the close adherence to machine patterns is no guarantee whatever of esthetic success.

\*\*\*

During the last thirty years we have become more conscious of the esthetic possibilities of the exact arts, and it is no accident that our newest instruments—the automobile and the aeroplane, are not the weakest but the best of our machine products, a distinction which they share with American kitchen equipment and bathroom fixtures. Under our very eyes an improvement in design has taken place, transforming the awkward mass and the broken lines of the primitive auto into the unified mass and the sleek stream-lines of the modern car; or, by an even greater revolution in design, turning the imperfectly related planes of the push-power aeroplane into the more buoyant, gull-like tractor plane of to-day with body and wing both gaining in beauty as they were adapted more carefully to the mechanical requirements of flight. So strong, so logical are these designs that they have inevitably a powerful imaginative effect; and one does not wonder at the impulse many European architects have succumbed to to copy the forms of the aeroplane or the steamship, even in buildings where their functions are foreign or irrelevant.

In appreciating the great achievements of modern engineering, as an art, we must not, however, forget their limitations. The fact is that all the indisputable triumphs of the exact arts have been in fields where the human element has been eliminated, or where the function of the machine itself expresses the only human desire involved—as the aeroplane expresses the ancient human desire for the power of flight. The real test of our ability as artists and engineers will come when we attempt to apply the machine-technique into fields of activity where the personality as a whole must be considered, and where social adaptations and psychological stresses and strains are just as important factors as tensile strength, load, or mechanical efficiency in operation.

Up to the present our use of machine methods has been muddled by two different attitudes. One has been the pathetic error of using machine methods to achieve forms and qualities that are antagonistic to the nature of the machine: under this head comes the introduction of machine-carving in the manufacture of, say, Tudor chairs in order to stimulate the ancient handicraft designs on a scale that will meet the vulgar mind. For anyone with an honest sense of design, the cheapest bent wood chair is superior to the faked replica of the machine. The contrary error is that of holding that the bent wood



# by Louis Mumford



machined chair is admirably suited to modern purposes because it is solely and entirely a product of the machine: this neglects the simple fact that it is totally unadapted in design to the contours of the human body in all but one or two brief stiff postures. To deny that the machine can produce art is a fallacy; to believe that everything the machine produces is excellent art is also a romantic fallacy. To curb the machine and limit art to handicraft is a denial of opportunity. To extend the machine even into provinces where it has no function to perform is likewise a denial of opportunity.

It is not only in the arts that have been fructified by science that there has been a distinct gain. Once the disruption of the traditional arts was complete, it became possible to revive them on a modern basis; and since, roughly, 1880, there has gone on a revival in typography, textiles, furniture, in architecture and city planning which shows, I think, that science and technics, while they have altered the basis of these arts, have not done away with the possibilities of their proper growth and development. I shall concentrate on architecture and city design; for these are the master arts; and they flourish only to the extent that they can call freely on the accessory crafts.



Beginning first in America, among the group of original minds that began to design the warehouses and office buildings of Chicago during the eighties, a fresh impetus in architectural design has now spread throughout Western Civilization. What is in back of it? Modern architecture differs from all the revivals that began with the Renaissance in that it springs out of a new logic of structure, instead of deriving from the last stage in architectural development—the ornament. This logic is founded on certain capital facts: first, that our habits of living have changed; second, that the functions of a building have been modified partly by the introduction of mechanical utilities for heat, drainage, equalization of temperature; finally, that modern technology has provided a whole range of new materials and methods—the steel cage and ferro-concrete construction for example—which have altered the essential problems of design.

As a result, the content and potential rhythm of a modern building has changed. Mr. Frank Lloyd Wright has altered the proportions of wall and window, making his ceilings low and his windows continuous; Mr. Erich Mendelsohn, in the Einstein Tower, has created ferro-concrete as a completely plastic material: P. P. Oud in Holland and Messrs. Stein and Wright in America have designed dwelling houses whose esthetic value comes solely through the spacing and grouping of simple, standardized units; whilst the most original skyscraper architects, Messrs. Corbett, Kahn, Walker, Harmon, and Hood, have created vast structures which, by sheer mass and proportion and disposition of the parts sometimes acquire the dignity of great building. There is nothing in European or American architecture since the seventeenth century to equal in originality of design and in positive conception the important buildings of the last thirty years, buildings like the Marshall Field Warehouse, the Monadnock Building, the Los Angeles Public Library, the Shelton Hotel, the Barclay-Vesey Building, the interior of the Hill Auditorium at Ann Arbor, the railroad station at Helsingfors, the Town Hall at Stockholm, the Bourse at Amsterdam, the concert-hall at Breslau—to mention only a handful of examples chosen at random. It is almost as impossible to characterize all the varied manifestations of this architecture, particularly during the last twenty years, as it is to characterize the Gothic; but, like the Gothic of the thirteenth century, it perhaps witnesses a common impulse towards synthesis throughout Western Civilization.

Our achievements in architecture have been curbed by the fact that except in certain European cities the architect has lost his sense of the whole: the best buildings are not assured, by adequate city planning, of the best sites, or even of relatively important ones; so that, while in the actual order of development we have risen from good engineering to good architecture, and may eventually rise from good architecture to good city design, as numerous plans for city extensions and new communities al-

ready promise, it is only by reversing this process and securing control of the social situation that we shall be able to extend and perpetuate the advances we have made. What does this mean? It means modifying public taste through the creation of a new esthetic; it means curbing extravagant ground rents and preventing the misuse of sites; in general, it means treating the community itself as a major element in design. Before architecture can produce more than isolated masterpieces, our social skill must be pushed at least as far as our engineering skill, defining the several functions of a city and controlling the use of land for the benefit of the whole community. Where this has been done by public authority in Holland, Germany, and England, architecture has profited.



We come at last to city design. If one excepts the extravagant and socially dubious improvements made in Paris and Vienna during the nineteenth century, city design almost completely disappeared. With indisputable gains in mechanical efficiency, in the manufacture and transportation of certain products, there was a vast loss in the communal art of living. In the new cities the housing accommodation, not merely for the industrial workers but for a good part of the middle classes, was below decent hygienic standards; private gardens disappeared, and as the cities increased in area, population, and wealth the amount of sunlight, fresh air, open spaces relatively diminished.

There were many criticisms of this condition from Engels to Ruskin, from the physician who planned the imaginary town of Hygeia to the industrial magnates who attempted to improve conditions in Pullman, Port Sunlight, and Essen; but the first adequate conception of the problem was formulated by Sir Ebenezer Howard when he published his classic proposal for garden cities under the title, "Tomorrow." Mr. Howard pointed out that the nineteenth century city had become amorphous: it had neither shape nor bounds: the only interrelation of its parts was an interrelation of mechanical utilities, sewers, water-mains, and transportation systems—and even these were designed at haphazard.

Adequate design, Mr. Howard saw, was not a matter of merely providing architectural approaches or "civic centres," nor was it a matter of elaborating further the physical utilities: it was essentially a sociological matter, and it must face every problem of the city's existence; any fine esthetic result could only be the crown of a long series of efforts. Modern city design involved planning cities as units in relation to natural resources and recreation areas; it meant planning of house-sites and gardens and schools so that children could be bred under conditions that would further their physical survival and their culture: it called for the provision of factory-sites and the coördination of industries; and finally, it demanded as a condition of continuous growth the creation of new city-units, surrounded by rural areas, but with all the benefits of urban coöperation, schools, amusements, libraries, theatres, hospitals, and so forth. Modern city design meant the adequate resolution of all these problems—problems which actual city planning by engineers and architects not merely shirked but never even posed for themselves.

Mr. Howard's conception of city growth as growth by communities, related to their region and to its industrial life, challenged the existing methods and habits; for it shifted the whole emphasis from mechanical planning and patchwork, to comprehensive social planning. Although Mr. Howard's conceptions have actually been embodied in two English cities, Welwyn and Letchworth, and although they have deeply modified the current conceptions of city planning in Europe, and to a smaller extent in America, city planning is still the least progressive of the arts; and the new cities of the western world are not organic centres but inefficient mechanical agglomerations. This state of affairs need not excite our wonder; for compared with any single specialized industry, the coördinations and transformations required for modern city planning are infinitely more complicated, and the human variables are much more difficult to handle. Despite this tardiness in development, our city planning must eventually not merely reach the point that Messrs. How-

ard and Unwin had reached by 1904; it must even pass beyond it; for our new technological achievements in the automobile, the aeroplane, long distance communications and giant power transmission have made our existing centres inefficient and obsolete.

City design is the art of orchestrating human functions in the community. As, through the applications of the scientific method, our ability to forecast and control our purposes increases, regional planning must provide the framework for city design, architecture must avail itself more and more of community planning and engineering must give precedence to architecture—thus reversing the present condition under which there is a vast proliferation of misconceived and misapplied physical utilities and perpetual scamping of human purpose and design. This is not an abstract conclusion; it emerges from the actual situation in the arts to-day. Once the framework for a human life is prepared, the arts that arise naturally under these happy auspices will appear, not constrained, specialized, shrunken, often insignificant, as they are to-day, but in something like the original virility that characterized them throughout western Europe before the introduction of the machine.



In sum, we can now see, I believe, that the machine age is not a fixed monument in relation to which the arts must get their bearings. The machine age began with great discoveries in the physical sciences, with the application of experiment and invention to mechanical contraptions, and with the domination of engineering as the supreme art. Its early growth was marked by the dilapidation of all the traditional arts—except those which by their nature could retreat to the cloister. In the arts which arise out of personality and social needs, the machine age has developed slowly; but with the increasing application of biological knowledge to hygiene, agriculture, and medicine, of psychology to education, and of the social sciences to the actual problems of industry, planning and city design and regional development, the one-sided emphasis on mechanical technique, which marked the early transition, should eventually give way to a more even-handed competence in dealing with every aspect of life. With the existence of greater opportunities for leisure, provided potentially by the machine economy but still far from actual achievement, the personal and contemplative arts, which were either isolated or reduced to frivolity in the early stages of industrialism, should flourish again.



There is, of course, no certainty that any of these things will happen. A disastrous series of wars might even throw us back into a pre-industrial era, or drive the spirit into a superstitious ideology in which compliance with inscrutable powers outside ourselves, powers working fear, disaster, death, would take the place of that active if unnameable faith which buoys up all those who now heartily pursue the arts and sciences. It is even possible that our financial organizations, taking advantage of sundry narrow psychological skills, may find a way of keeping the arts and sciences tethered to the market, and of emasculating them of every hypothesis that would upset the profit-making mechanism. Any or all of these perversions and miscarriages may come to pass; but none of them will arise out of the legitimate method of science, nor will they occur because tested and verifiable knowledge discourages the arts and annuls the function of the artist.

Science cannot take the place of religion and philosophy; nor can engineering arrogate to itself the provinces of all the other arts. Our sciences, our ideologies, and our arts are, on the contrary, essential to humane living; and their expression is wholeness in Life.

*The foregoing article is to constitute the greater part of a chapter of the volume entitled "Whither Mankind?" an interpretation of the Machine Age, edited by Charles A. Beard and shortly to be published by Longman's, Green & Company. Its writer, Lewis Mumford, is the author of "The Golden Day" (Bon & Liveright), and of numerous essays and studies.*



## Books of Special Interest

### Unpublished Letters

BALZAC AND SOUVERAIN. Edited by WALTER SCOTT HASTINGS. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. 1927. \$15.

Reviewed by E. PRESTON DARGAN  
University of Chicago

AMONG the most revealing pages in Balzac's life-history are those concerning his relations with publishers. These figures emerge as definitely as if they belonged to the "Comédie Humaine" itself. We come to know the "odious" Madame Béchet, Edmond Werdet, gossip and "vulture," and the crafty Chlendorowski. We learn afresh how closely Balzac commingled his financial affairs and his literary ambitions.

Such are the interests of the present volume, consisting mainly of fifty-six hitherto unpublished letters from Balzac to Hippolyte Souverain. This *éditeur* stood sponsor for numerous novels during the author's grand climacteric (1833-1844). The original holographs are the property of Mr. Gabriel Wells, who in various ways has appeared as the "twentieth century godfather of Balzac." The volume republishes also certain complementary letters from Souverain to the novelist. The editing has been carefully done by Professor W. S. Hastings, already known for his work on Balzac's plays. The commentary or running text, if not always explicit, is thoroughly reliable and readable. Professor Hastings has had to surmount great difficulties in transcribing, grouping, and dating the letters. The result is a well-knit and complete chapter from Balzac's professional life.

At best, the author maintained an armed truce with his publishers; at worst, it was a guerilla warfare of recriminations. "M. de Balzac est un homme à ne jamais imprimer," declared a printer to Souverain. We need not dwell on the familiar tale of how this "Manslayer" rewrote large portions of his novels on proof-sheets. Such revisions meant infinite delays; and Souverain complains mainly of overdue proof-sheets, unfurnished copy, and carelessness as

to contracts. On the other hand, the letters are constantly referring to money matters; here it is Balzac who accuses *le superbe Hippolyte* of sharp dealing and wants more liberality including frequent advances. In short, an atmosphere of mutual distrust long prevailed. The editor of the volume seems too good-natured in endeavoring to clear this atmosphere. It is hardly true that the "first signs of coldness" date from 1843. All along there are too many signs of irritation, threats of legal proceedings, and clearly expressed suspicion.

As for literary matters, the chief lesson I learn is that one cannot understand the composition of the "Comédie Humaine" without due regard to Balzac's correspondence and his mutable contracts with publishers. A dozen masterpieces were brought out by Souverain in these years. Concerning them we glean much information. It is noteworthy that sometimes a volume is to be filled out by writing, rather hastily, an additional tale or two. To set up part of one volume required of the compositors three hundred hours of proof-corrections. The cost of polishing "Pierrette" exceeded what the author was paid for that story. Sweeping revisions were made for "Le Curé de Village" as for "Un Grand Homme de Province à Paris." Occasionally the publisher is allowed to make the necessary corrections, but Balzac vehemently protests against Souverain's passing a "revise" without the author's consent. Frequently we hear of obligations unfulfilled, because the novelist has undertaken fresh enterprises to the prejudice of a previous contract. We can understand Souverain's constant lament that Balzac is "always promising," but seldom performing.

Yet the Titan's productivity during this period was enormous. The volume shows that he wrote incessantly, as one hag-ridden. It is what killed him ultimately. Even in 1843 his printers nearly drove him to death. The break with Souverain, as publisher came at this time. But later, while Balzac was ill in Russia, the tone of the correspondence reveals that cordial relations were for the first time established. Not only

did Souverain help the suffering author financially (he had done this before), but he came forward with various friendly services, which included the purveying of the latest Parisian gossip and books to the Ukraine!

Professor Hastings is likely to be credited with a notable discovery about this Russian sojourn. It is indicated from a monogram on one of the letters that Balzac was in a State hospital during the autumn of 1849, instead of at his fiancée's home. If this be fully proven, it would count as another instance of Madame Hanska's neglect.

Altogether, this is a volume which for external beauty and intrinsic value should appeal to every Balzac amateur.

### Historical Criticism

LINCOLN OR LEE. By WILLIAM E. DODD. New York: The Century Co. 1928. \$2.

Reviewed by L. E. ROBINSON

IN three chapters Mr. Dodd has essayed a very difficult task even for a historian of his attainments. He attempts in brief compass a "comparison and contrast" of Lincoln and Lee through a *résumé* of their conduct and fortune as leaders of their respective sides in what he somewhat naively calls "the war between the states." The swiftly-moving and well-written parallel of the two leaders sketches the opening of the Civil War and the events of the epic duel that followed; it indicates Lincoln's successful management of Palmerston's attitude and English public opinion, and stresses the hostility the President encountered in Congress, in the cabinet, and elsewhere. Up to Gettysburg, Lincoln loses and Lee wins. After Gettysburg, which Lee lost because "his greatness was his ruin," the Confederate leader declined before the superior force of Grant, who, in spite of excessive losses, persisted in fighting Lee's army.

Lee is called "the greatest of American, if not English-speaking, commanders." He was the best representative of his time of the "aristocratic principle." He was great and knew he was great. He represented the section that had abandoned the social philosophy of Jefferson, its greatest thinker, for the "harder doctrine of Hamilton and John Marshall, the doctrine of inequality among men." Lincoln, politically sympathetic with Jefferson's doctrine of equality among men, was gentle and submissive to the will of the majority. It is perplexing to find a good American historian referring to Lincoln as "unreligious"; to his assassination as having hurried him "into an earlier and a greater immortality than life itself could have given." It is an open question whether Lee's last five years "completed" or redeemed his "immortality."

Mr. Dodd's little book is an interesting if journalistic essay in historical criticism. He has selected the two greatest and most interesting Civil War leaders for parallel study. In his estimate he has been influenced obviously by his own observation that "Americans love success" and by the idea of "the narrow and accidental margin of success." The President and the General are regarded too exclusively from the same level of responsibility and action. There is some reason, however, for this point of view, since Lincoln was primarily a statesman with major military problems forced upon his unwarlike temper, and Lee was a trained soldier whose life affords no data for study in the service or ideals of democratic government. Mr. Dodd keeps before his reader Lincoln's hope of "lifting the weights from the shoulders of all men"; little is made of his major objective of the Union as the means of achieving that hope; little is made of his military vision and judgment, so clearly summarized two years ago by the English General Ballard; little or nothing is made of his philosophy of individualism as the ideal of republican government set out in his permanent contribution to American political literature, far and away superior to any contributed by others on either side of the struggle. Lincoln was the thinker and spokesman of his era on its political side. Lee was the finest flower of manhood and of generalship furnished by his side of the controversy, and the last five years of his life were, from all we know, beautiful. In their private lives and character both leaders were irreproachable. As protagonists of their period, Lincoln stood for the humanity and development of all men; Lee stood for an aristocratic ideal of great antiquity, doomed to pass away before the newer world tendencies of popular education and economic opportunity. As a historian, Mr. Dodd declines to interpret his facts; perhaps he is right. Possibly he does not care to have these three chapters looked upon as the estimate of a critical historical essay.

### The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage

By LESLIE HOTSON

Professor Hotson's recent book on the death of Marlowe is now followed by an equally brilliant work on the Commonwealth and Restoration theatrical companies, based on an important body of new facts from the records of the Court of Chancery. It offers much hitherto unpublished material on the history of various early London theatres; and, for the Cromwellian period, it gives many lively accounts of surreptitious performances, collected from contemporary news-books. Fully illustrated. \$5.00.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

2 RANDALL HALL  
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.



## Elsie Singmaster

has taken two lovely girls and their equally charming widowed mother (all of whom were in love with the same man) and told how each got what she wanted in a story packed with humor, rich observation, and the sense of reality that makes a novel significant. \$2.00 everywhere. Houghton Mifflin Company

Ask for  
**What Everybody Wanted**

"Turn with a Viking shout to the pages of  
**THE NORNS ARE SPINNING,**"

says *The New York Herald Tribune*, "where the ferocity and the kindness and the fortitude of the old Norse ride like a stallion through woods mysterious in winter and misty in the long summer twilight. Then go on with a thoroughly thrilling story."

*The Saturday Review* says: "High hearts and a thrilling story run through this fine, exciting, beautifully written Viking saga."

*The New York Times* says: "Written with velvety smoothness, it thunders like a burst of Wagnerian music and dies into quiet interludes. It is an important book."

"The Norns Are Spinning" is written by Andreas Haukland, published by Macy-Masius in a decidedly beautiful edition, and can be had at all book-shops for \$2.50.

**MACY-MASIUS**  
THE VANGUARD PRESS



By

LIAM O'FLAHERTY

## THE ASSASSIN

LIAM O'FLAHERTY has written five novels which have won recognition in England, France, Russia, and America. His latest is a dramatic story of political assassination during the Irish Revolution. In it Mr. O'Flaherty evokes the states of mind of the murderers as they plan and carry out their crime and escape capture. The assassination he narrates is modeled upon an actual event which occurred last year.

"That genius lurks behind the fabrication of 'The Assassin' all who read this highly distinctive tale will readily admit."

—*New York Times*.

Second Printing, \$2.50

HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY